

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE
ROSSENDALE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN
Regulation 18 Consultation



24 July 2017 – 09 October 2017

CONTENTS

Reference	Site or Policy Name	Pages
DRAFT LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION SITES		1
Employment Site Allocations		1
EMP2.02	Henrietta Street	1
EMP2.07	Kings Cloughfold	1
EMP2.12	Extension to Mayfield Chicks	1
EMP2.14	Large Site at Hud Hey	2
EMP2.15	Land north of Hud Hey	3
EMP2.19	Carrs Industrial Estate	17
EMP2.23	Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension	20
EMP2.26	Extension of New Hall Hey	34
EMP2.29	Land at Robert Street	34
EMP2.31	New Hall Hey	44
EMP2.32	New Hall Hey Road	44
EMP2.34	Extension to New Hall Hey	44
EMP2.35	Baxenden Chemicals Ltd, Rising Bridge	45
EMP2.38	Land adj Hollin Gate Farm	46
EMP2.40	Toll Bar Business Park	80
EMP2.50	Riverside Business Park	94
EMP2.51	Forest Mill	112
EMP2.52	Isle of Man Mill	121
EMP2.53	Waterfoot Mills	122
EMP2.54	Warth Mill	136
Gypsies and Travellers Transit Site Allocation		136
HS16.1	Little Tooter Quarry, Sharneyford	136
Housing Site Allocations		187
HS2.001	Land off Greensnook Lane	187
HS2.003	Land at Higher Cross Row	188
HS2.004	Land off Rockcliffe Road, Bacup	191
HS2.005	Off Fernhill Drive and Anvil Street, Stacksteads	194

HS2.006	Greems Farm and Bull Hall Barn, Bacup	205
HS2.007	Land off Cowtoot Lane, Bacup	226
HS2.008	Land south of the Weir Public House	238
HS2.009	Land west of Burnley Road, Weir	244
HS2.010	Irwell Springs	250
HS2.011	Land at Huttock Top Farm, Bacup	254
HS2.012	Huttock Top, Bacup	300
HS2.013	Land south of Huttock Top Farm, Bacup	342
HS2.014	Land off Burnley Road and Meadows Avenue, Bacup	389
HS2.016	Land behind Penine Road and to the north east of Pennine Road	390
HS2.017	Tong Farm, Bacup	393
HS2.022	Thorn Bank, Bacup	393
HS2.023	Land east of Rochdale Road, Bacup	394
HS2.024	Land at Blackwood Road and north of Blackwood Road, Stacksteads	396
HS2.025	Glen Mill, 640 Newchurch Road, Stacksteads	396
HS2.028	Booth Road / Woodland Mount	396
HS2.029	Land west of Sow Clough	406
HS2.032	Land off Newchurch Old Road, Bacup	407
HS2.033	Land at Kirkhill Avenue, Haslingden	453
HS2.034	Land rear of Highfield Nursing Home	469
HS2.037	Land adjacent Park Avenue / Criccieth Close, Haslingden	470
HS2.040	Land adjacent 53 Grane Road, Haslingden	471
HS2.042	Hollin Way, Rawtenstall	471
HS2.044	Land at Hollin Lane and north of Hollin Lane, Rawtenstall	471
HS2.045	Willow Avenue off Lime Tree Grove, Rawtenstall	478
HS2.047	Land adjacent Goodshaw Lane and Swinshaw Hall, Loveclough	481
HS2.048	Land south of 1293 Burnley Road, Loveclough	497
HS2.049	Loveclough Working Mens Club	497
HS2.050	Turton Hollow	499
HS2.051	Land adjacent Laburnum Cottages	501
HS2.052	Land south of Goodshaw Fold Road	511
HS2.053	Johnny Barn Farm and east of Johnny Barn Farm	515
HS2.054	Land between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road and west of Dobbin Lane	531
HS2.056	Land at Hurst Platt, Rawtenstall	559
HS2.057	Land at Conway Road, Higher Cloughfold	564
HS2.058	Land at Higher Cloughfold	570
HS2.060	Haslam Farm, north of Duckworth Lane	574
HS2.062	Former Hospital, Haslingden Road	628

HS2.064	Land at Oakenhead Wood	631
HS2.066	Land behind no. 173 to 187 Haslingden Old Road	634
HS2.068	Land east of Lower Clowes Road	644
HS2.071	Horse and Jockey Hotel, land to the west of Moorland View, land between Blackburn Road and A56, land west of Market Street and land off Exchange Street	645
HS2.072	Croft End, Stubbins	929
HS2.073	Land off Wood Lane, Edenfield	930
HS2.074	Land east of Burnley Road, Edenfield	938
HS2.075	Wavell House, Helmshore	939
HS2.076	Land at Snig Hole, Helmshore	940
HS2.077	Land off Curven Edge, Helmshore	992
HS2.078	Grane Village and land off Holcombe Road	1017
HS2.079	Rosendale Golf Club	1078
HS2.080	Land off Lea Bank	1097
HS2.082	Land adjacent Dark Lane football ground	1098
HS2.083	Hareholme	1104
HS2.084	Land behind Myrtle Grove Mill	1105
HS2.085	Land off Peel Street	1109
HS2.086	Land by St Peter's School	1109
HS2.091	Park Road Garage Site	1116
HS2.097	Isle of Man Mill and Garage	1119
HS2.100	Land opposite Baptist Church	1120
HS2.102	Barlow Bottoms and land north of King Street	1121
HS2.103	Land behind Buxton Street	1172
HS2.104	Land south of Quarry Street, Shawforth	1182
HS2.105	Albert Mill, Whitworth	1219
HS2.106	Land to the east of Tonacliffe School	1260
HS2.107	Land off Eastgate, Whitworth	1341
HS2.108	Cowm Water Treatment Works, Whitworth	1378
HS2.109	Site of Horsefield Avenue, Tonacliffe	1428
HS2.110	Irwell vale Mill	1516

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES		1518
Chapter 0: Delivering Sustainable Development		1518
SD1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	1518
SD2	Urban Boundary and Green Belt (including boundary changes)	1523

Chapter 1: Housing		1650
HS01	Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement	1650
HS02	Housing Site Allocations	1679
HS03	Edenfield	1731
HS04	Affordable Housing	1757
HS05	Housing Density	1763
HS06	Housing Standards	1767
HS07	Private Residential Garden Development	1771
HS08	Open Space Requirements in New Housing Developments	1772
HS09	Playing Pitch Requirements in New Housing Developments	1775
HS10	Private Outdoor Amenity Space	1777
HS11	House Extensions	1778
HS12	Replacement Dwellings	1778
HS13	Rural Affordable Housing - Rural Exception Sites	1779
HS14	Conversion and Re-Use of Rural Buildings in the Countryside	1780
HS15	Rural Workers Dwellings	1783
HS16	Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	1785
HS17	Specialist Housing	1785
HS18	Self Build and Custom Built Houses	1789
Chapter 2: Employment Growth and Employment		1791
EMP1	Provision for Employment	1791
EMP2	Employment Site Allocations	1792
EMP3	Employment Site and Premises	1798
EMP4	Development Criteria for Employment Generating Development	1799
EMP5	Employment Development in non -allocated employment areas	1800
EMP6	Futures Park	1801
EMP7	New Hall Hay	1802
Chapter 3: Retail		1805
R1	Retail and Other Town Centre Uses	1805
R2	Rawtenstall Town Centre Uses	1811
R3	Development and Change of Use in Ditsrict and Local Centres	1812
R4	Existing Local Shops	1813
R5	Hot Food Takeaways	1813
R6	Shopfronts	1816
Chapter 4: Environment		1817

ENV01	High Quality Development in the Borough	1817
ENV02	Heritage Assets	1823
ENV03	Local List	1832
ENV04	Landscape Character and Quality	1833
ENV05	Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks	1836
ENV06	Green Infrastructure	1841
ENV07	Environmental Protection	1844
ENV08	Wind Turbines Areas of Search	1846
ENV09	Wind Farms and Individual Turbines	1858
ENV10	Other Forms of Renewable Energy Generation	1864
ENV11	Surface Water Run-Off, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality	1868
ENV12	Trees and Hedgerows	1875
Chapter 5: Leisure and Tourism		1877
LT1	Protection of Playing Pitches, Existing Open Spaces and Sport and Recreation Facilities	1877
LT2	Community Facilities	1879
LT3	Tourism	1881
LT4	Overnight Visitor Accommodation	1881
LT5	Equestrian Development	1883
LT6	Farm Diversification	1885
Chapter 6: Transport		1886
TR1	Strategic Transport	1886
TR2	Footpaths, Cycleways and Bridleways	1894
TR3	Road Schemes and Development Access	1897
TR4	Parking	1897
OTHER COMMENTS		1901
Evidence Base	Evidence Base	1901
General	General	1924
Monitoring	Monitoring	1996
New Policy	New Policy	1997
New Site	New Site Proposed by Consultee	1998
Site not allocated	Site not allocated	2004
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement	2060
not known	unknown	2063

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 18) CONSULTATION

24 JULY 2017 - 9 OCTOBER 2017

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.02	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION SITES

Employment Site Allocations

Reference	EMP2.02	Henrietta Street						
-----------	---------	------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

1386	paul	Nolan	nolan redshaw	EMP61	Object	THE PREMISES HAVE BEEN MARKETED FOR OVER 4 YEARS. FORREST MILL IS PARTLY DEMOLISHED ,WITH THE REMAING SECTION COMPRISING OF A SINGLE STOREY WEAVING SHED WHICH IS ONLY USED AS A LOCK UP STORE .THE SITE THEREFORE DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY EMPLOYMENT EXCEPT ON A CASUAL BASIS . IT HAS BEEN PRONE TO FLOODING AND IS NO LONGER VIABLE AS AN EMPLOYMENT SITE. IT IS ALSO TO THE REAR OF THE RELATIVELY NEW MORRISONS FOODSTORE AND IS ATTRACTING SOME INTEREST FROM RETAIL OPERATORS WHICH IS WHAT BACUP NEEDS . THE EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATION WILL DELAY THE SITE BEING REDEVELOPED . IT IS AN OPPORTUNITY SITE AND SHOULD BE ALLOCATED AS SUCH.		
------	------	-------	------------------	-------	--------	--	--	--

Number of comments EMP2.02 1

Reference	EMP2.07	Kings Cloughfold						
-----------	---------	------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

1537	John	McGuinness	-		Object	Does this plan aim to build on the remaining grass area down to Victoria Way. - Basically its about filling the valley with concrete and obliterating any green areas within the urban boundary.		You seem to be trying to implement a plan where nearly all patches of green within the urban boundary are built on. The hillsides may be green (for now) but all small breathing spaces seem to be a target for building on. Sustainable; how can building more houses on any green area be sustainable? Once land is lost to development, it's lost forever.
------	------	------------	---	--	--------	--	--	---

Number of comments EMP2.07 1

Reference	EMP2.12	Extension to Mayfield Chicks						
-----------	---------	------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.12	Further comment
1807	Bob	Killelea			Object	<p>Representation regarding the emerging local plan Land at the former Mayfield chics site, Ewood Bridge Application is made for the inclusion of the above site within the emerging plan for housing. Most of the site was formerly occupied by Mayfield chics though the building burnt down in 2001. However, following the fire planning permission was granted for its rebuilding under no 2002/0420 and a legal start was made. Evidence of the start in the form of a partial structure is evident on the site. Thus, while the site is in Green Belt there is an extant approval for its commercial development. Since then the site has been advertised for sale for commercial purposes but apart form its occasional use for storage purposes no development has been forthcoming. That is not entirely unsurprising. A study by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners in 2009 concluded that the site had limitations for commercial use In such circumstances, therefore, application is made for it to be allocated for housing purposes – in the knowledge that the current applicant and owner is willing to bring it forward for such a use immediately. The site is approximately 9.5acres (3.9ha) and thus might accommodate some 130 dwellings. While peripheral areas abutting the river are within the flood zone the majority of the site is not. Its allocation and then use for housing will help to meet the identified housing need within the Borough Please see appendix.</p>		

Number of comments EMP2.12

1

Reference	EMP2.14	Large Site at Hud Hey
-----------	---------	-----------------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.14	Further comment
1478	N/A	N/A	Winfields Holdings Ltd and Winfield's Ltd		Object	The site at Hud Hey already incorporates non-employment uses such as a lawful retail use of the Britannia Mill and adjoining land (as confirmed by 2008/753), with residential development intruding into its northern boundary (as well as extending along its eastern boundary). Concerns have also been raised about access onto the surrounding road network, with no new access being allowed onto the A56. This restricts the nature of uses that may be achieved, particularly given the residential layout which adjoins much of the site and from which access is obtained to the north and east. - - The Council is aware of Winfield's intention of transferring its office and warehousing activities to its other local site, a short distance to the north in Acre, which would leave this site vacant (much of which has already been cleared). The recent Grade II listed status conferred upon Britannia Mill also means that uses which preserve this asset and protect its setting need to be allowed by policy, and whilst this could include employment it is more likely to comprise a mix of uses including residential (please see the separate representations with respect to Policy HS2). Any retail use would contribute to employment levels within the borough, and the consolidation and expansion of different functions a short distance to the north at the second Winfield site would retain employment within the local area. - - The existing mixed use of the site should be recognised and promoted by policy in order to ensure that it makes a meaningful contribution to the different aspirations of the emerging Local Plan. The long term allocation for employment purposes has not, however, seen the site come forward for such purposes even following its preparation in order to make it more attractive to the market. In accordance with the Government guidance, Paragraph 22 of the NPPF, the long term protection of sites such as this should be avoided if there is no reasonable prospect of them being used for that purpose. - - The aforementioned factors have not been recognised by the Employment Land Review undertaken earlier this year and which informed the proposed confirmation of the historic allocation. In the light of this, and the meaningful contribution that the site could make to other policy aspirations of equal or potentially greater importance (such as housing), the range of uses deemed appropriate should be expanded to specifically allow mixed-use and/or residential development, or the site potentially accorded no classification (allowing alternative uses to be considered on their own merits).		-
					Number of comments	EMP2.14	1	
					Reference	EMP2.15	Land north of Hud Hey	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
59	James	Collier	-	employment land review appendicies 1- 4, add3, add6, emp 13	Object	strong objection to redesignation of green belt and open countryside as employment land or for any other type of development. - 1. the evidence base for requirement employment land is weak: - - e.g what is the current rate of unoccupied or under utilised employment land in the borough, why are there unoccupied sites, and what options have been considered to maximise their use? - no evidence all other options have been fully considered before developing on green belt or open countryside. i.e all brownfield sites should be exhausted before considering unwarranted development on our countryside. how many existing undeveloped brownfield sites are there? - what is the genuine level of interest in new business space. i.e exactly how many businesses have indicated they are willing to invest/ pay for new business space (built on greenbelt) at current market rates (as opposed to incentivised rates) and why are they not able to use existing/ unoccupied employment space - - 2. green belt purpose is to prevent urban sprawl, there seems to be little reference to extending and moving the well defined existing urban boundaries in terms of protecting our countryside or the interests of people who live in the countryside. i.e. many people will have bought properties specifically because they are in close proximity to green belt or open countryside, - 3. what consideration is being given to rural residents, many of whom may be elderly and not have seen the poorly promoted consultation documentation online. what efforts have been made to consult with hard to reach groups? - - 4. no consideration appears to have been given to the appearance of Rossendale as people travel along the A56 through he borough, by re-developing every piece of green land within close proximity to the A56, there's a real risk Rossendale will no longer be perceived as a rural/ green valley, and this could impact the boroughs desirability as a place to live and work. our green spaces and valleys are one of the boroughs unique selling points - -		please dont rape our green spaces
71	Kathleen	Heathcote	-		Object	It was with horror I discovered the new local plan for Haslingden. The Hud Hey, Rising Bridge and Martin Croft Region is to become a large industrial estate- the northern extension of Carrs Industrial Estate. - The area earmarked consists of pristine hay meadows, fields, and a quiet residential area, with a small but 'good' thriving primary school; which will become engulfed by this development. Why would you plan for an industrial area to surround a primary school?? - There are many areas of brownfield sites which would be prime sites for development in the Haslingden area instead: dilapidated mills and former industrial sites, run down and often an eyesore, which would benefit from development. - Also, on already developed sites such as Carrs and the Rising Bridge Office development, a large number of units have been empty for years. If these are surplus to requirements why are we building more? - Why does this rural and residential area need to be destroyed by this sort of development? -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
498	John	Barnes			Not Applicable	<p>Re the plans for the future development for Rossendale Borough Council. I enclose "2" two plans of land that has been requested by three developers for future development.</p> <p>1. Land at Rising Bridge road, suggested for 24/26 no old peoples, one bedroom bungalows?</p> <p>2. Land for housing/industrial development. Please look to the inclusion of these land for the future development.</p> <p>Thanking you.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		
519	Kath	Lees	-	EMP2.15*, EMP2.23*, EMP2.38* employment allocation refs	Object	<p>I am seriously objecting to these plans, even though I don't fully understand the printouts, there is no need for more industrial units within this area. Carrs Industrial Estate is not fully occupied and neither are other industrial units locally fully occupied. In fact Rossendale is overrun with these units and most of them are empty. - - I personally moved into Rossendale because of the green hills, why on earth are you trying to blight the natural beauty? - - Regarding the duty of providing new housing as a council, I would suggest that we update the beautiful buildings that are sitting empty and being left to ruin. I would be very interested in how you can justify building more.</p>		I also have safety issues with regards to vehicles adding to the load that is already accessing via Hud Hey Road. The roads in Haslingden cannot cope with more traffic.
520	Brian	Flockton	-	EMP2.15*, EMP2.23*, EMP2.38* employment allocation refs	Object	<p>I have lived here for 50 years and the land behind our property is farmland and greenbelt as far as I am aware and I do not wish for industrial units to be put on there. - - The beauty of Rossendale is being ruined. I feel as though Rawtenstall is being protected to the detriment of the outlying districts. This is very concerning. - - I am also concerned about the access to and from the A56, how are the local people going to be affected? Is this going to cause more accidents? - - I also am concerned about chemicals being accepted in these units, how can we feel confident that they won't be.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
669	Joan	Priestley	-		Object	I fail to understand the logic in planning to extend an industrial area that is typically under-filled with vacant units, in an area with other developments that are also under-filled, such as the office development in Rising Bridge. The area marked contains hay meadows, fields and a quiet residential area. This will have a substantial effect on the quality of life of the residents of this area, there is already more than enough industrial allocation in this area without adding to the environmental load with more industry. There are many other more suitable sites for this development, there are run down mills, former industrial sites and other brownfield sites that should be used before running riot over green land. There are already enough issues with traffic on Hud Hey Road in particular large vehicles using it when they should not be in order to bypass the motorway. Parking is a severe problem, especially if the residential parking at the end of my row of houses is made into an access road for the industrial estate extension as I have heard there are plans to do. There are flooding issues in the area which need to be considered as well. This area should be protected as Greenbelt land and not developed, as is the land closely surrounding it to the north.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
1146	Ralph	Woodcock	-	EMP2.15*, EMP2.23*, EMP2.38*	Object	<p>Following the public consultation at Haslingden library, which I felt had amazing attendance due to the lack of information about the consultation. In fact the ONLY reason we were there was due to a neighbour informing us of the proposed plans, which claimed to offer public consultation (regulation 18); of which I have printed the full wording, but there is not enough space to type it. - We found the library open but no signage as to where this meeting was being held, and had to look round ourselves. Therefore first and foremost how on earth can you call this a public a participation and engagement consultation. - Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension - Why does Carrs have to be extended, there are loads of empty units as it is more than the expected 5%. I intend providing photographs to prove the vacancies we have in the area. There is also plenty of empty unused existing buildings that could be revitalized and in keeping with the period of the area. - Access to this area would also be a problem; we noted that the A56 already has access to Carrs Industrial Estate. To even consider Martin Croft Road, which is almost single tract seems absolutely ridiculous, dangerous and impossible to get two way traffic. It was also suggested that the carpark at the end of our row of houses could be converted, this I would object to passionately, as this was given by the council at least 15 years ago, and has been maintained by the lower end residents ever since, therefore we consider this our adopted land. Hud Hey Road cannot take any more traffic, this is a country road coming over the moors as Haslingden Road, into Roundhill Road and changing to 30mph Hud Hey Road, which I would like to say not a lot of drivers adhere to, unless it is the standstill traffic that we have to suffer. We have also had the issue of foreign lorries using this road as a fast track and parking up on the bridge with two wheels and the body of the lorry on the pavement leaving the remained two wheels up against the kerb, leaving no payment work walkers, never mind prams. The noise and the fumes from extra traffic would really affect the air quality in Haslingden Too. The traditional roads across the town could not take extra traffic. The field that is being considered for the extension has been used for animal grazing as long as I have lived here and we experience flooding and standing water to the bottom of the field with heavy rain. I believe there is a culvert under some properties along with the drains across the field under the right of way. It is very sad that brown field sites cannot be cleaned up and used before green field sites are considered. This should be a statutory order for development. The proposed field also has a large area of untreated Japanese Knot Weed. - Land adj Hollin Gate Farm - Has anybody been out to actually look at this land? It is surrounding a thriving local primary school. There is already an industrial estate on one side, which had been empty for months and now the council has taken over some of the units, do we really need to put these childr5en through the risk of more dangers - noise, air pollution, security and road safety? Would it not be more sensible</p>		<p>Rossendale is a beautiful area and we should be proud of what we have, not let it go to ruin and put up modern units that are not required. There is enough empty workplaces and homes that could fulfil the needs.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
						<p>to put housing on it if houses area needed? Roundhill Lane is also used by traffic avoiding the A56 traffic, via Rising Bridge Road or Hud Hey Road. - Please, please, please could the local authority plan take over and refurbish empty, boarded up properties that would keep the period and make solid homes for the requirements.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
1212	Michael	Heathcote	-		Object	<p>1 – Regulation 18 – Public Consultation - The ‘public’ generally had no knowledge of the existence of the plan until informed by a private citizen who found out by accident when looking for something else on line. With his neighbours and at their expense, information and maps were circulated to their neighbours, and the governors of the local school affected by the plan. All people contacted had no previous knowledge of the existence of a Rossendale Development Plan. There has been NO advertising, information, leaflets, posters in the town or local papers, and even on the evening when the consultation maps were on view in the Library there were no posters indicating that they were in the Library, which room, etc. It has been so poorly publicised and so little information available that I question its legality as a ‘public consultation’ - 2 - Northern Extension of Carr's Industrial Estate. EMP 2.23 - •An environmental survey is required before decisions are made as this is an increasingly rare hay meadow with valuable meadow species such as Yellow Rattle, and is equally bio – diverse as the adjoining land which is protected. See initial comments from Lancashire Wildlife Trust below :-Semi improved grassland. Moderately herb rich, especially in contrast to the intensive agriculture and horse grazing that surrounds it. A stepping stone habitat in the South Pennines Grassland network. - Crested dogstail - Ribwort plantain - Sweet vernal grass - Rough meadowgrass - Meadow buttercup - Red clover - Yellow rattle - Meadow vetchling - White clover - Common ragwort - Cocks foot - Common bistort - 3 Biological Heritage Site qualifying species. - Thanks X - South Pennines Grasslands Project Officer - The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside X - Less environmentally acceptable, but significant to development potential, there is a large patch of Japanese Knot Weed. - •Traffic on the A56 and Hud Hey Road in particular is already a concern , especially at rush hour times when Hud Hey Road has become a preferred alternative to Grane Road for many drivers, including large trucks, and development to this site would exacerbate the situation to a dangerous degree. Access to this site is problematic whether direct from the A56, via Hud Hey Road, or from the existing Carr’s estate. - •Noise levels would affect residents in Hud Hey Road and Martin Croft Road, whose gardens adjoin the designated area. - •The A56 has a drainage/standing water problem and water draining from hard surfaces in the area due to development would exacerbate this problem and create a dangerous surface in wet weather. - •A culvert/stream flows under the cellar of some houses on Martin Croft Road, which would adjoin the designated area. This currently drains into the field and has not caused any problems for the residents. However development could cause serious flooding problems in these properties. - •There are nearby brown field sites which need ‘cleaning up’ and would be much more suitable as industrial development sites. Could it be made statutory that development is phased so that ALL brown field sites have</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
						<p>to be developed before green field, environmentally sensitive sites are released for development. - • Existing developments along the A56 corridor have a lot of empty units – that have remained empty for a number of years (in some cases 7 years or more). This constitutes much more than 5% of the existing units. There does not appear to be a need or demand for more development in the foreseeable future. - • Plans show development of employment/industrial land for the Haslingden area far outweighs that for other areas of Rossendale. E.g. Rawtenstall – approx. 5 hectares, Haslingden – approx. 14 hectares. Balance is needed!! - 3 - Land adjoining Hollin Gate Farm. EMP 2.38 - • This land surrounds on 3 sides a small, but thriving local primary school. A primary school surrounded by an industrial estate raises so many health and safety issues, they are too numerous to list in this document but would include noise, air pollution, security, road safety. - • This could lead to the closure of a good, thriving and much needed primary school at a time when more school places are needed, not fewer. - • This is currently Green Belt land which should be protected from development for future generations. - • Traffic is already a safety issue on the road outside the school because of existing developments in the area end a ‘rat run’ which cuts out the busy A56 roundabout, and allows access to the M65 as an alternative to the Grane Road. Further development would make this a major problem. - • If there has to be development at this site surely with the school, post office/corner shop and bus stop with direct bus links to Accrington, Blackburn, Rossendale, and Manchester, housing would be a much more sensible option.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
1223	Alwyn	Davies	-		Object	<p>"Objection to the development of Land on Area: EMP 2.15 (Land North of Hud Hey) - - Within the local plan the council has proposed an expansion of Hud Hey Industrial Estate utilising existing Green Belt Land. If this is approved employment land consisting of general, industrial, storage and distribution buildings will encapsulate my home (39 Hud Hey Road). - - I would like to outline a case for why the Land on Area EMP 2.15 should be removed from the Local Plan developed in July 2017 and will provide the rationale using evidence from the councils own Local Plan and independent evaluations/reviews. - - Firstly the local land owner of EMP 2.15 has not been contacted or consulted with regarding the sale of their land, should the land owner not be in agreement to the sale of his and hers land then this should lead to automatic removal from the local plan. I would like to request that the council keeps me the homeowner of 39 Hud Hey Road appraised of any development in relation to the land EMP 2.15 as it occurs and in advance of the next stage of the consultation process to relieve any unnecessary anxiety to us as home owners. - - The Local Plan suggests (Page 52) that proposals will be expected to take into account of the character and appearance of the local area including but not exhaustively: -• Being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers and avoiding demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area. - •Ensuing that the amenities of the occupiers of the new development will not be adversely effected by neighbouring uses and vice versa. -• There is no adverse impact to the natural environment, biodiversity and green infrastructure unless suitable mitigation measures are proposed. - - As the land is Green Belt land which was not identified for release in the Councils Green Belt Review 2016 which was undertaken independently by LUC and the land is currently being used for grazing of Horses as part of a Riding School I would request that the council remove Land EMP 2.15 for the use of Employment Land from their draft Local Plan. The Green Belt Review 2016 states: "The relatively poor performance of the land against the Green Belt purposes is not, of itself, an exceptional circumstance that would justify release of the land from the Green Belt, we recommend that outline policy guidance or masterplans are prepared as part of the local business process. These would indicate development areas and new defensible Green Belt boundaries (existing or new features). Such approach together with specific policies for the development of the land, would help to engender public confidence and support, as well as mitigate the harm to the remaining Green Belt land." The local plan fails to address this requirement and justify why EMP 2.15 has been included in the local plan, this is in contradiction to the advice and guidance outlined in the Green Belt review 2016. Further to this the recent elimination of an Oak Tree (which further protected the Green Belt status of this land) that died has prompted local speculation of foul play and therefore I would request that the council</p>		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
						<p>investigate this as a matter of urgency. - - In 2010 the Report to Rossendale Council on the former Draft Local Plan the Planning Inspectorate disagreed with the councils plans to remove land from the Green Belt. The inspector stated: " The detailed boundaries of the Green Belt in the area were established in 1982 and, except for minor changes made in 1995, have remained fixed since that time. I have seen no evidence to persuade me that a substantial change to Green Belt boundaries would be necessary to meet the development objectives of the CS. ... I do not consider that the council's approach to identifying locations for development by weighting its choices to avoid substantial incursions into the Green belt could be argued to be inherently flawed." - - The Habitats Regulation Assessment of the Rossendale Local Plan states that: "If no suitable alternative exist, plan makers must demonstrate under the conditions of Regulations 103 of the Habitats Regulations, that there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI) to continue with the proposal. As the council has failed to demonstrate a viable case for change of why employment land is required within Rossendale or a case for why development of employment land of EMP 2.15 is in the public interest then I would ask the council to and without delay remove the land from inclusion from the Local Plan 2017. - - The Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) produced by the Forward Planning team in June 2017 states in relation to AVP6 Haslingden and Rising Bridge that New Housing and employment development will be encouraged within the urban boundary and should be primarily on previously developed land. This is in complete contradiction to the identification to Land EMP2.15 in the draft local plan produced only a month later. The Hud Hey industrial estate current has several vacant units, therefore it would suggest that demand in this area is not favourable to businesses. It is my view that the council should remove land EMP 2.15 and instead develop a proposal to increase utilisation of already developed space. - - The Sustainability Proposal of the Rossendale Local Plan produced by Lepus in May 2017 confirms that the land north of Hud Hey is located within the Green Belt and that none of these sites were highlighted for release in the Green Belt Review 2016. - - It states that development in the Hud Hey area has the potential to reduce population of European Protected Species associated with woodland such as bats. It states that where habitat corridors exist including Hud Hey that development would reduce these corridors, restricting movement of wildlife in these habitats. - - The report highlights that development on land in Hud Hey will impact on woodland and that loss of this woodland and the Green Belt may have a negative impact on biodiversity in this area. The Land EMP 2.15 is also located within the Rossendale Safeguarding Mineral Area. Development of sites which include GI such as woodland, grassland and allotments would result of loss of and damage to these features. Developments that fragment existing ecological networks performs negatively against Climate Change Adaption (SA objective</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
						<p>7). - - The report also outlines the increased flood risk and increase of waste production will impact negatively within the area. - - The Sustainability appraisal does not support the use of land EMP 2.15 in Hud Hey therefore it would suggest that it will be more difficult for the council to justify how using this land should be overridden in the interest of the public. It is not documented within the local plan why the council has chosen to ignore the independent reports both in relation to the local plan and the green belt review. I would hope that the council remove EMP 2.15 from the draft local plan without delay. - - Finally would also like to comment on the timescales of the development of the draft local plan. - - Depus Sustainability report produced in May 2017 - - Authority monitoring report produced in June 2017 - - Draft Local Plan produced in July 2017 - - Consultation into draft local plan commenced in July 2017. - - It would suggest that a large scale strategic plan has been produced in days and it could be argued that this plan has been rushed and not properly thought out; it is my view that the people of Rossendale deserve more than the local planning team have been able to provide and I hope that it is addressed as part of this consultation proess. As a home owner and council tax payer for 35 years I am disappointed by Rossendale Councils approach to the development of the local plan and the apparent disregard for the residents of Rossendale as whilst I have focused on the land EMP 2.15 it is apparent that this has been systemic across this process as a whole. - "</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
1629	S I	Bradley		Land North of Hud Hey	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic</p> <p>- This is a 'B' Road after all.</p> <p>I am disabled and have been waiting 3 months for a disabled parking bay as I am never able to park near my home.</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time?</p> <p>Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road.</p> <p>The problem is the same on Rising Bridge Road, traffic is so busy with the school and the offices at the far end of Rising Bridge road, we are in constant misery with traffic and parking</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
1630	M.A.	Turner		Land North of Hud Hey	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic - This is a 'B' Road after all</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time? Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
1631	L.C.	Turner		Land North of Hud Hey	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic</p> <p>- This is a 'B' Road after all</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time?</p> <p>Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>		
1819	Sylvia	Wrigley			Support	<p>Following receipt of your letter dated 22nd September 2017, re above land, I confirm the following ownership details.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>There is no objection to this land to be taken as a possible employment site.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.15	Further comment
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	EMP 2.15 – A new vehicular access onto Blackburn Road would require a major earth moving exercise and the removal of mature trees within the site. An LCC retaining wall bounds Blackburn Road and the required visibility splays would be a concern. Access via the existing Industrial Estate appears unachievable without the removal of an existing industrial building.		
Number of comments					EMP2.15	14		
Reference		EMP2.19	Carrs Industrial Estate					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.19	Further comment
1416	Ian	Shorrocks	Blackmores D Ltd	EMP37 (South of EMP2.19)	Object	<p>Provided in email to Local Plan team REPRESENTATIONS TO LOCAL PLAN GRANE ROAD MILL - LAND SOUTH OF GRANE ROAD, OCTOBER 2017</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1. Eden Planning is submitting representations on behalf of Blackmores D Ltd.</p> <p>1.2. The site the representations relate to is referred to as Grane Road Mill. The property lies to the south of Grane Road and is separated from the larger employment area of Carrs Industrial Estate (EMP 37 within the Rossendale Employment Land Review – 2017).</p> <p>1.3. The site measures approximately 3.3 Ha and lies adjacent to residential properties fronting Jubilee Road and Grane Road.</p> <p>2. CONTEXT</p> <p>2.1. Grane Road Mill lies to the south of Grane Road, physically and operationally separate from the adjacent Carrs Industrial Estate. The site is typical of an old industrial site, which has evolved over time in an ad hoc way.</p> <p>2.2. The site comprises a range of small spaces. Most of the buildings have low ceilings and poor/limited vehicular (access and no vehicular access between buildings. The buildings cannot easily be subdivided into smaller lets and due to the physical conditions.</p> <p>2.3. A further constraint is proximity to residential properties, as occupiers are concerned about restrictions to operations.</p> <p>2.4. In short, the site is not suited to modern industrial occupier requirements and demand for employment use is poor.</p> <p>2.5. Industrial agents (LM6) have provided initial advice, and confirmed that demand for the mill for continued industrial use is likely to be low, with occupiers preferring more modern industrial units well connected to the motorway network.</p> <p>2.6. Looking forward, the buildings need major maintenance and upgrades, with a number of abnormal costs, including asbestos roofs and at this stage the needed work are not viable. Redevelopment for employment use is further restricted by the cost associated with accommodating the stream that runs beneath the site.</p> <p>3. PROPOSED ALLOCATION AND ASSOCIATED POLICIES EMP2 AND EMP3</p> <p>3.1. Within the emerging Local Plan the site forms part of allocation EMP 2.19 and is proposed to be retained as an Employment Site with Policy EMP2 applying.</p> <p>3.2. The background document informing this allocation, the Employment Land Review 2017, considers the site as part of the wider Carrs Industrial Estate (EMP38). We disagree with the assessment and believe, due to the physical separation that Grane Road Mill should be assessed as a separate</p>		Emailed Direct to Local Plan team

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.19	Further comment
						<p>allocation.</p> <p>3.3. We have provided a revised assessment below which we consider more accurately reflects the subject site.</p> <p>Road Access *EMP38: Vgood *Grane Road Mill: Good</p> <p>Local Accessibility *EMP38: Vgood *Grane Road Mill: VGood</p> <p>Proximity to Urban Areas/services *EMP38: Vgood *Grane Road Mill: VGood</p> <p>Compatibility to adjoining uses *EMP38: Average *Grane Road Mill: VPoor</p> <p>Development and Env Constraints *EMP38: Good *Grane Road Mill: VPoor</p> <p>Market attractiveness *EMP38: Good *Grane Road Mill: VPoor</p> <p>Overall Rating *EMP38: Good *Grane Road Mill: Poor</p> <p>3.4. Furthermore, the Page 31 of the emerging Local Plan notes that much of the employment committed supply is of poor quality and unable to meet the needs of modern businesses, nor located where market demand is greatest. Hence there is a qualitative as well as a quantitative need to identify new land for employment.</p> <p>3.5. This reinforces our own assessment, that whilst there is a lot of buildings/sites in employment use, these rarely meet modern occupier requirements, and land should be allocated in alternative locations to meet the needs and support the economic growth of the Borough. The focus should be shifted to allocate larger Green Field sites for employment uses, allowing existing employing sites, that are constrained to come forward for alternative uses.</p> <p>3.6. Furthermore, the need for employment land must be balanced against the demand for land for housing. It is noted that within the emerging Local Plan, reference is made (page 12) to the need to release land from the Green Belt to meet housing needs. It is therefore essential, to make best use of brownfield land opportunities.</p> <p>3.7. In this regard, EMP 3 is too restrictive, and could result in the delay of bringing sites that are suitable for housing or alternative needs. This does not accord with the objectives of the NPPF which states clearly that planning should not be a barrier to economic growth or meeting housing needs. It could also be interpreted in a number of ways, ie many of the criteria are subjective. Whilst greater clarity will come forward in the SPD we raise concerns that the policy as drafted is overly restrictive and does not support the overall objective of supporting economic growth and meeting housing needs.</p> <p>4. ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO – ASSOCIATED POLICY HS1 AND HS2</p> <p>4.1. Should an alternative approach be taken towards the allocation of more suitable land for employment, it is likely that a larger proportion of the existing sites in employment use, that are no longer suitable for this use, could come forward for housing.</p> <p>4.2. This would enable to Council to seek a higher target than 20% of new housing to be provided on Previously Developed Sites, and we suggest that</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.19	Further comment
						<p>Policy HS1 should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>4.3. We note that the target is for a minimum of 4,000 dwellings over the plan period and that the SHLAA only identified land for c 3,600.</p> <p>4.4. We are specifically asking that the Grane Road Mill be added as a housing allocation. As acknowledged in the assessment provide in Section 3 above (and the ELR), the site is very accessible. The site is surrounded by existing residential properties and is close/adjacent to proposed location HS2.78 – Land off Holcombe Road. The principle of housing in this location is already considered acceptable.</p> <p>4.5. Measuring c3.3 ha, using the Councils calculation of 30 dph, the site has potential to provide around 100 dwellings.</p> <p>4.6. Furthermore, the redevelopment of the site for housing, removes an existing land use conflict and could deliver many amenity and environmental benefits, opening up the culverted river, of a prominent site.</p> <p>5. SUMMARY</p> <p>5.1. In summary, we are requesting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allocation EMP 2.19 be revised to remove the Grane Road Mill ▪ Grane Road Mill should be reallocated as a housing site under Policy HS2. ▪ Policy HS2 should be amended to seek a higher proportion of housing to be provided on Previously Development Sites. ▪ Policy HS3 should be revisited, as in its current form it does not provide clarity or certainty for land owners or developers, and could result in planning being a barrier to economic growth and delivery of housing. <p>5.2. These representations have been prepared in haste to meet the deadline. The developer is committed to bring the site forward for redevelopment and can provide additional information to support the submission including details of ownership and control, indicative layout plans and technical reports.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		
Number of comments		EMP2.19		1				
Reference		EMP2.23		Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
59	James	Collier	-	employment land review appendicies 1- 4, add3, add6, emp 13	Object	strong objection to redesignation of green belt and open countryside as employment land or for any other type of development. - 1. the evidence base for requirement employment land is weak: - - e.g what is the current rate of unoccupied or under utilised employment land in the borough, why are there unoccupied sites, and what options have been considered to maximise their use? - no evidence all other options have been fully considered before developing on green belt or open countryside. i.e all brownfield sites should be exhausted before considering unwarranted development on our countryside. how many existing undeveloped brownfield sites are there? - what is the genuine level of interest in new business space. i.e exactly how many businesses have indicated they are willing to invest/ pay for new business space (built on greenbelt) at current market rates (as opposed to incentivised rates) and why are they not able to use existing/ unoccupied employment space - - 2. green belt purpose is to prevent urban sprawl, there seems to be little reference to extending and moving the well defined existing urban boundaries in terms of protecting our countryside or the interests of people who live in the countryside. i.e. many people will have bought properties specifically because they are in close proximity to green belt or open countryside, - 3. what consideration is being given to rural residents, many of whom may be elderly and not have seen the poorly promoted consultation documentation online. what efforts have been made to consult with hard to reach groups? - - 4. no consideration appears to have been given to the appearance of Rossendale as people travel along the A56 through he borough, by re-developing every piece of green land within close proximity to the A56, there's a real risk Rossendale will no longer be perceived as a rural/ green valley, and this could impact the boroughs desirability as a place to live and work. our green spaces and valleys are one of the boroughs unique selling points - -		please dont rape our green spaces
71	Kathleen	Heathcote	-		Object	It was with horror I discovered the new local plan for Haslingden. The Hud Hey, Rising Bridge and Martin Croft Region is to become a large industrial estate- the northern extension of Carrs Industrial Estate. - The area earmarked consists of pristine hay meadows, fields, and a quiet residential area, with a small but 'good' thriving primary school; which will become engulfed by this development. Why would you plan for an industrial area to surround a primary school?? - There are many areas of brownfield sites which would be prime sites for development in the Haslingden area instead: dilapidated mills and former industrial sites, run down and often an eyesore, which would benefit from development. - Also, on already developed sites such as Carrs and the Rising Bridge Office development, a large number of units have been empty for years. If these are surplus to requirements why are we building more? - Why does this rural and residential area need to be destroyed by this sort of development? -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
519	Kath	Lees	-		Object	I am seriously objecting to these plans, even though I don't fully understand the printouts, there is no need for more industrial units within this area. Carrs Industrial Estate is not fully occupied and neither are other industrial units locally fully occupied. In fact Rossendale is overrun with these units and most of them are empty. - - I personally moved into Rossendale because of the green hills, why on earth are you trying to blight the natural beauty? - - Regarding the duty of providing new housing as a council, I would suggest that we update the beautiful buildings that are sitting empty and being left to ruin. I would be very interested in how you can justify building more.		I also have safety issues with regards to vehicles adding to the load that is already accessing via Hud Hey Road. The roads in Haslingden cannot cope with more traffic.
520	Brian	Flockton	-	EMP2.15*, EMP2.23*, EMP2.38* employment allocation refs	Object	I have lived here for 50 years and the land behind our property is farmland and greenbelt as far as I am aware and I do not wish for industrial units to be put on there. - - The beauty of Rossendale is being ruined. I feel as though Rawtenstall is being protected to the detriment of the outlying districts. This is very concerning. - - I am also concerned about the access to and from the A56, how are the local people going to be affected? Is this going to cause more accidents? - - I also am concerned about chemicals being accepted in these units, how can we feel confident that they won't be.		-
669	Joan	Priestley	-		Object	I fail to understand the logic in planning to extend an industrial area that is typically under-filled with vacant units, in an area with other developments that are also under-filled, such as the office development in Rising Bridge. The area marked contains hay meadows, fields and a quiet residential area. This will have a substantial effect on the quality of life of the residents of this area, there is already more than enough industrial allocation in this area without adding to the environmental load with more industry. There are many other more suitable sites for this development, there are run down mills, former industrial sites and other brownfield sites that should be used before running riot over green land. There are already enough issues with traffic on Hud Hey Road in particular large vehicles using it when they should not be in order to bypass the motorway. Parking is a severe problem, especially if the residential parking at the end of my row of houses is made into an access road for the industrial estate extension as I have heard there are plans to do. There are flooding issues in the area which need to be considered as well. This area should be protected as Greenbelt land and not developed, as is the land closely surrounding it to the north.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
684	Corinne	Collier	-	emp2.23 and emp 2.38	Object	- adequate demand for ADDITIONAL employment land has not been clearly evidenced within the local plan. the Plan must surely first seek to evidence current and predicted demand outstrips current supply , including development of land already allocated for development before consideration is given to development on green belt and open countryside - there are currently 2 very large units on Carrs industrial estate which are vacant and have been vacant for several years. - this shows a clear lack of demand for very large units, furthermore there are smaller units on Carr road currently advertised to let and an abundance of small units at rising bridge owned by LCC which they have struggled to let or sell over the past 3 years. - in addition to the above existing unoccupied units, there are already sizeable plots allocated for employment land on the opposite side of the A56 from Carr road which surely must be developed(and fully utilised/occupied) before any decisions are made to build on green belt and open countryside. - If RBC are absolutely intent on developing on increasing employment opportunities, then as an absolute minimum the plans must be phased to ensure that existing unoccupied employment land is put to good use and occupied before developing on undeveloped sites that are already allocated for development, and then only when there is sufficient evidence to support further demand, should consideration be given to developing on green belt or open countryside. As this is not yet evidenced, it would be reasonable to suggest that there is also a second phase of decision making involving local communities and councillors once there is sufficient evidence that demand outstrips supply even after existing employment land is fully utilised and existing undeveloped sites are developed and fully occupied. -		It would be interesting to understand if any developers or speculative land holding companies have been involved in discussion (Emails, meetings or otherwise) with RBC prior to the formal consultation commencing? - the main people that stand to benefit from developing on green belt and open countryside are developers and land owners, there is a real risk that the general public are likely to be left looking at a Rossendale which is significantly less green, and full of unoccupied business space and "To Let" signs as the drive along the A56

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
738	Christine	Holden		ADD6	Object	<p>Objections against the proposal to build on green field land EMP 2.23 Land Study Ref ADD6 Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in noise levels. We are already subject to excessive noise pollution due to the A56 bypass and the volume of HGVs and other vehicles, which use our road (B6236) as a short cut to and from Blackburn and the M65 at Guide. Excessive noise levels for our home have been acknowledged by Highways England. It is therefore unacceptable to introduce additional noise from industrial units (machinery, night shift workers, increased traffic etc) to the area adjacent to our home. This would disturb our sleep and reduce the quality of life for all residents in the area. • Disruption to sleep. We have lived in our house for over 32 years but in the last 5 years we have been forced to move to the much smaller, rear bedroom of our house due to increased traffic noise over this period. It is unacceptable to be faced with the possibility of additional noise and further disruption to sleep, if the farm land at the rear of our home is developed for industrial use. • Air pollution. We are concerned about air pollution from industrialisation of this area as we are situated above the proposed site and downwind from it. As the wind blows up the valley from the south fumes and toxic smells will be blown directly towards our home. • Increase in traffic. The B6236 is already very busy at peak times and parking is difficult for residents in the evenings and at weekends. The proposed development of this site and surrounding sites will only make this worse and lead to further disruption and increased potential for accidents. • Increase in litter. There is already a problem in the Hud Hey area from litter/fly tipping of predominately fast food wrapping cans and bottles. Much of this is thrown from cars and originates from the nearby McDonalds outlet. If this site is developed for industrial use this problem will only intensify. • Impact on wildlife. We have deer, a heron and many other wild birds and animals that are regularly seen on this land. • Impact on the environment and reduction in quality of life. Unlike some of the other proposed sites in Rossendale/Haslingden this site has always been farmland. It is green field land and has not previously been an industrial site. There will be an overall reduction in the quality of life in this area if this open green space is built on. Fresh air is widely acknowledged as being beneficial to general health, wellbeing and life expectancy. • Potential for anti-social behaviour. The access to the road network and the seclusion of industrial units will potentially attract anti-social behaviour to this residential area. • Lack of demand. There are currently a number of vacant units in this area. Therefore there is no logic to the plan to expand the industrialisation of the area. <p>Objections against the proposal to use the existing car park (LAN4065)</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
						<p>adjacent to our homes (next to 116 Hud Hey Road), as access to the potential industrial site EMP 2.23 Land Study Ref ADD6 Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension</p> <p>We have lived here for over 32 years and have parked on the land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road for the whole of that period, without challenge. We and a number of other neighbours campaigned for several years to secure funding to tarmac the land and fence the area. This work was completed 20 years ago and the land became ours, on the understanding that we would maintain it. This we have done, including the voluntary development of a planted area for the benefit of our neighbours and to discourage anti-social behaviour. As we have maintained and parked on this land in excess of 12 years we are able to claim adverse possession of the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking is at a premium in this area and to lose this car park, which can hold 8 to 9 cars, would impact adversely on all residents of our area, including those who currently park on Rising Bridge Road. • On the assumption that most of the traffic would originate from the A56, vehicles would only be able to reach an access point on Hud Hey Road by travelling along unsuitable routes such as the B6236, or along Rising Bridge Road to join the B6236. None of these routes are suitable as they pass through residential areas, with narrow streets and tight bends, i.e. Brook St and Worsley St. • This plan could also lead to further heavy traffic on the B6236 with HGVs etc ignoring the main trunk road to short cut from Blackburn and the M65. This road is already unsuitable for heavy vehicles and increased parking on the road due to the loss of the current car park would only make this worse. • There is an ever increasing problem with huge freight vehicles taking an unsuitable route along our road B6236 and then undertaking extremely dangerous and illegal manoeuvres when the driver realises their mistake. We witness HGVs reversing fully on the pavement over the A56 bypass bridge, reversing from the Rising Bridge Road junction on a blind bend into a main road. There are increasing instances of HGVs and huge freight transporters parking fully on our pavements, (photographic evidence can be provided), and even in the last few weeks, parking up for the night fully on the pavement. This has led to numerous phone calls to the transport managers of these businesses and it is totally unacceptable to consider allowing such vehicles access to the proposed industrial development site via our car park and in such close proximity to our homes. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
1146	Ralph	Woodcock	-	EMP2.15*, EMP2.23*, EMP2.38*	Object	<p>Following the public consultation at Haslingden library, which I felt had amazing attendance due to the lack of information about the consultation. In fact the ONLY reason we were there was due to a neighbour informing us of the proposed plans, which claimed to offer public consultation (regulation 18); of which I have printed the full wording, but there is not enough space to type it. - We found the library open but no signage as to where this meeting was being held, and had to look round ourselves. Therefore first and foremost how on earth can you call this a public a participation and engagement consultation. - Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension - Why does Carrs have to be extended, there are loads of empty units as it is more than the expected 5%. I intend providing photographs to prove the vacancies we have in the area. There is also plenty of empty unused existing buildings that could be revitalized and in keeping with the period of the area. - Access to this area would also be a problem; we noted that the A56 already has access to Carrs Industrial Estate. To even consider Martin Croft Road, which is almost single tract seems absolutely ridiculous, dangerous and impossible to get two way traffic. It was also suggested that the carpark at the end of our row of houses could be converted, this I would object to passionately, as this was given by the council at least 15 years ago, and has been maintained by the lower end residents ever since, therefore we consider this our adopted land. Hud Hey Road cannot take any more traffic, this is a country road coming over the moors as Haslingden Road, into Roundhill Road and changing to 30mph Hud Hey Road, which I would like to say not a lot of drivers adhere to, unless it is the standstill traffic that we have to suffer. We have also had the issue of foreign lorries using this road as a fast track and parking up on the bridge with two wheels and the body of the lorry on the pavement leaving the remained two wheels up against the kerb, leaving no payment work walkers, never mind prams. The noise and the fumes from extra traffic would really affect the air quality in Haslingden Too. The traditional roads across the town could not take extra traffic. The field that is being considered for the extension has been used for animal grazing as long as I have lived here and we experience flooding and standing water to the bottom of the field with heavy rain. I believe there is a culvert under some properties along with the drains across the field under the right of way. It is very sad that brown field sites cannot be cleaned up and used before green field sites are considered. This should be a statutory order for development. The proposed field also has a large area of untreated Japanese Knot Weed. - Land adj Hollin Gate Farm - Has anybody been out to actually look at this land? It is surrounding a thriving local primary school. There is already an industrial estate on one side, which had been empty for months and now the council has taken over some of the units, do we really need to put these childr5en through the risk of more dangers - noise, air pollution, security and road safety? Would it not be more sensible</p>		<p>Rossendale is a beautiful area and we should be proud of what we have, not let it go to ruin and put up modern units that are not required. There is enough empty workplaces and homes that could fulfil the needs.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
						<p>to put housing on it if houses area needed? Roundhill Lane is also used by traffic avoiding the A56 traffic, via Rising Bridge Road or Hud Hey Road. - Please, please, please could the local authority plan take over and refurbish empty, boarded up properties that would keep the period and make solid homes for the requirements.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
1212	Michael	Heathcote	-		Object	<p>1 – Regulation 18 – Public Consultation - The ‘public’ generally had no knowledge of the existence of the plan until informed by a private citizen who found out by accident when looking for something else on line. With his neighbours and at their expense, information and maps were circulated to their neighbours, and the governors of the local school affected by the plan. All people contacted had no previous knowledge of the existence of a Rossendale Development Plan. There has been NO advertising, information, leaflets, posters in the town or local papers, and even on the evening when the consultation maps were on view in the Library there were no posters indicating that they were in the Library, which room, etc. It has been so poorly publicised and so little information available that I question its legality as a ‘public consultation’ -2 - Northern Extension of Carr's Industrial Estate.</p> <p>EMP 2.23 • An environmental survey is required before decisions are made as this is an increasingly rare hay meadow with valuable meadow species such as Yellow Rattle, and is equally bio – diverse as the adjoining land which is protected. See initial comments from Lancashire Wildlife Trust below :- Semi improved grassland. Moderately herb rich, especially in contrast to the intensive agriculture and horse grazing that surrounds it. A stepping stone habitat in the South Pennines Grassland network. - Crested dogstail - Ribwort plantain - Sweet vernal grass - Rough meadowgrass - Meadow buttercup - Red clover - Yellow rattle - Meadow vetchling - White clover - Common ragwort - Cocks foot - Common bistort - - 3 Biological Heritage Site qualifying species. Thanks - X South Pennines Grasslands Project Officer - The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside - X - Less environmentally acceptable, but significant to development potential, there is a large patch of Japanese Knot Weed. • Traffic on the A56 and Hud Hey Road in particular is already a concern , especially at rush hour times when Hud Hey Road has become a preferred alternative to Grane Road for many drivers, including large trucks, and development to this site would exacerbate the situation to a dangerous degree. Access to this site is problematic whether direct from the A56, via Hud Hey Road, or from the existing Carr's estate. • Noise levels would affect residents in Hud Hey Road and Martin Croft Road, whose gardens adjoin the designated ar - • The A56 has a drainage/standing water problem and water draining from hard surfaces in the area due to development would exacerbate this problem and create a dangerous surface in wet weather. • A culvert/stream flows under the cellar of some houses on Martin Croft Road, which would adjoin the designated area. This currently drains into the field and has not caused any problems for the residents. However development could cause serious flooding problems in these properties. - - • There are nearby brown field sites which need ‘cleaning up’ and would be much more suitable as industrial development sites. Could it be made statutory that development is phased so that ALL brown field sites have</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
						<p>to be developed before green field, environmentally sensitive sites are released for development. - • Existing developments along the A56 corridor have a lot of empty units – that have remained empty for a number of years (in some cases 7 years or more). This constitutes much more than 5% of the existing units. There does not appear to be a need or demand for more development in the foreseeable future. - • Plans show development of employment/industrial land for the Haslingden area far outweighs that for other areas of Rossendale. E.g. Rawtenstall – approx. 5 hectares, Haslingden – approx. 14 hectares. Balance is needed!! - - - 3 - Land adjoining Hollin Gate Farm. EMP 2.38 - • This land surrounds on 3 sides a small, but thriving local primary school. A primary school surrounded by an industrial estate raises so many health and safety issues, they are too numerous to list in this document but would include noise, air pollution, security, road safety. - • This could lead to the closure of a good, thriving and much needed primary school at a time when more school places are needed, not fewer. - • This is currently Green Belt land which should be protected from development for future generations. - • Traffic is already a safety issue on the road outside the school because of existing developments in the area end a ‘rat run’ which cuts out the busy A56 roundabout, and allows access to the M65 as an alternative to the Grane Road. Further development would make this a major problem. - • If there has to be development at this site surely with the school, post office/corner shop and bus stop with direct bus links to Accrington, Blackburn, Rossendale, and Manchester, housing would be a much more sensible option.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
1628	Janet	Waterworth		ADD6	Object	<p>After the consultation session in Haslingden Public Library on Tuesday 19th September I wish to submit the following comments to the above plan with specific reference to the stated area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I was only made aware of the 'consultation' through the efforts of a concerned neighbour who took the trouble to inform those living in the area affected by the plan. They had only found out about it by accident whilst searching for something else on line. I think there was poor publicity about the plan and subsequent meetings. I take the Free Press each week and am a regular visitor to Haslingden Library, both of which I would have expected to publicise something so important in an obvious and clear way. 2. The proposed development would increase traffic to an already busy A56 which is often at a standstill at busy times of the day. Also Hud Hey Road is increasingly being used as an alternative to the A56 and Grane Road especially by large trucks and this would be exacerbated by any new development. 3. The noise levels of the increased traffic would further affect residents of Hud Hey Road and Martin Croft as these properties back onto the designated area. 4. There appear to be several brown field sites adjoining this area, some of which are in need of attention. Why can't this issue be addressed rather than taking away more countryside? 5. The existing Carrs site has units which are unoccupied indicating that maybe new ones aren't needed. A nearby site on Rising Bridge Road illustrates this point as well, many of the units were empty of a long time and some have never been occupied. 6. The land is currently used as valuable farmland and I am informed that there are environmental issues which need to be explored in relation to the site concerning particular species of plants. <p>I am against this proposed development of the land around Hud Hey Road and I hope the council will give due consideration to the points raised not only by myself but also by the majority of residents in this affected area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
1629	S I	Bradley		Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic - This is a 'B' Road after all.</p> <p>I am disabled and have been waiting 3 months for a disabled parking bay as I am never able to park near my home.</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time? Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road.</p> <p>The problem is the same on Rising Bridge Road, traffic is so busy with the school and the offices at the far end of Rising Bridge road, we are in constant misery with traffic and parking</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
1630	M.A.	Turner		Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic - This is a 'B' Road after all</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time? Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
1631	L.C.	Turner		Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic</p> <p>- This is a 'B' Road after all</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time?</p> <p>Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>EMP 2.23 – An access onto Commerce Street would require additional land. The existing private access road which joins Commerce Street would require widening. Access onto Hud Hey Road cannot not be achieved due to a number of highway safety related matters.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.23	Further comment
Number of comments						EMP2.23	14	
Reference		EMP2.26		Extension of New Hall Hey				
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities	EMP11	Not Applicable	EMP08, EMP11, EMP18 and EMP72 Extension of New Hall Hey to the west (New and existing allocations) United Utilities has various pieces of water and wastewater infrastructure passing through this site including significant water infrastructure with associated easements. All UU assets will need to be afforded due regard in the masterplanning process and you should be aware that complications could arise as the infrastructure passes straight through the site. United Utilities would strongly advise any future developer(s) to contact us prior to submission to explore options for addressing this as early as possible.		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	EMP 2.26 – There is no access to the highway network. Access through the parcel EMP2.31 should be secured however the recently approved employment site significant limits the opportunity for access.		
Number of comments						EMP2.26	2	
Reference		EMP2.29		Land at Robert Street				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Not Applicable	<p>THE EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATION SHOULD BE BROADENED TO ALLOW FOR ROADSIDE RETAIL USES GIVEN THE SITE'S LOCATION. SEE SUBMITTED REPRESENTATION REPORT FOR FULL DETAILS.</p> <p>Email received 11/10/2017:</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. Following the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in November 2011, RBC commenced work on its Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. However, this document was halted in favour of the preparation of a full new Local Plan which has now been issued for consultation from Monday 24 July to Monday 9 October 2017. This edition of the Local Plan comprises the Regulation 18 consultation document which sets out the Council's preferred approach to future housing, employment and leisure uses over the Plan period. Once adopted the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy (2011).</p> <p>1.2 Within the draft Local Plan, sites have been proposed for development (for housing or employment use), for environmental protection and for recreation uses, as identified on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation Areas, along with an extension to an existing Conservation Area, are being considered. 1.3 Documents included in the Draft Local Plan Consultation are the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement), the accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 1.4 The evidence base which supports the Local Plan comprises the following documents: • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017). • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017). • Employment Land Review (2017). • Green Belt Review (2016). • Environmental Network Study (2017). • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (2016). • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study (2017). • Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) (previously published). • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2016). • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing (2017). • Landscape Study (2015) (previously published). • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published). • Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites (2017). 1.5 In addition to the above documents, the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, although not strictly evidence, has informed the development of the draft policies.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the emerging Local Plan in relation to land at Robert Street (Corn Exchange), Rawtenstall.</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
						<p>The site has a proposed allocation for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses under draft Policy Reference EMP2.29.</p> <p>1.7 The Corn Exchange, otherwise known as the Kingfisher Business Centre, lies within a short walking distance of Rawtenstall town centre with vehicular access being taken directly from Burnley Road via a short road called Kenyon Street. The site comprises a large five storey mill building and a collection of smaller buildings with associated car parking spaces. The site is in existing use, being occupied by a range of employment and other uses. Rawtenstall is one of the largest of the small towns which characterise the Borough of Rossendale.</p> <p>SCOPE</p> <p>1.8 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>1.9 This document follows earlier Representations and discussions made by Mr Brian Boys as part of previous consultation stages in the Local Plan process, albeit that parts of the Local Plan were subsequently halted in favour of a complete new Local Plan.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.10 The starting point for consideration of the emerging Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Local Plan document.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The RBC Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
						<p>Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain’s demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development. These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
						<p>natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”.</p> <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
						<p>relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168).</p> <p>HOUSING</p> <p>2.21 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.22 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.25 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.26 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
					<p>and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE – LAUNCHED 6 MARCH 2014</p> <p>2.28 On 28 August 2013 the government launched its draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The draft NPPG was subject to consultation for 6 weeks and was launched on 6 March in its final form. The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.29 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Report, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms): “Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.30 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306): “WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
						<p>is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply.”</p> <p>2.31 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 of the section titled ‘Local Plans’ (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that: “HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED? To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.”</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.32 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.33 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.34 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.35 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
						<p>heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>2.36 Crucially the link between housing growth and economic activity must be recognised and therefore the current consultation is considered to be relevant to this Representation in relation to land at Corn Exchange, Rawtenstall.</p> <p>3. POLICY EMP2: EMPLOYMENT SITE ALLOCATIONS</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3.1 Draft Policy EMP2: Employment Site Allocations identifies all sites within the Borough which have been allocated for employment development. For each site allocated, site area, available area for development and proposed use class is set out.</p> <p>3.2 Land at Robert Street is identified as Employment Allocation Ref. EMP2.29 as shown below. It is classed as an 'existing employment' site and is considered suitable for B1, B2 and B8 uses.</p> <p>Fig. 1 Extract from Site Allocations Table (Policy EMP2)</p> <p>3.3 The proposed allocation is identified in purple in Figure 2.</p> <p>3. POLICY EMP2: EMPLOYMENT SITE ALLOCATIONS</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3.1 Draft Policy EMP2: Employment Site Allocations identifies all sites within the Borough which have been allocated for employment development. For each site allocated, site area, available area for development and proposed use class is set out.</p> <p>3.2 Land at Robert Street is identified as Employment Allocation Ref. EMP2.29 as shown below. It is classed as an 'existing employment' site and is considered suitable for B1, B2 and B8 uses.</p> <p>Fig. 1 Extract from Site Allocations Table (Policy EMP2)</p> <p>3.3 The proposed allocation is identified in purple in Figure 2.</p> <p>3.4 We support the aims of the Local Plan to identify key development sites which are central to the delivery of the overall strategy for new and existing employment assets and the Borough's economy. Crucial to the economy is the delivery of appropriate uses in the right locations.</p> <p>3.5 The site fronts onto Burnley Road and is located within close walking distance of Rawtenstall Town Centre. The site comprises the 'Kingfisher Business Park' and is made up from a collection of multi-storey mill buildings all of which are in good structural repair. Vehicular access is taken directly from Burnley Road, via Kenyon Street, and there is ample off-street car parking available.</p> <p>3.6 The site is located just outside the Town Centre boundary, as shown on the draft Proposals Map, with a small part of the eastern corner of the site being located within the Rawtenstall Conservation Area. The existing five storey mill building dominates the streetscape at this section of Burnley Road, and the site could easily be described as a 'gateway' site to the northern part</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
						<p>of Rawtenstall town centre. The site is in single ownership and this Representation is submitted on behalf of the land owners.</p> <p>3.7 The site is occupied by a number of businesses, covering a range of employment-generating uses. In addition, the site has a planning history which demonstrates that the Council has found alternative uses acceptable in this location, with planning permission being granted in 2012 for part of the site to change its use to Use Class D1 (non-residential institutions) to provide teaching space and ancillary spaces.</p> <p>3.8 Flexibility of acceptable Use Classes is necessary to enable the land owner to continue to market the site to a wide range of potential employment-generating occupants. In our opinion, the site is a key 'gateway' site in Rawtenstall Town Centre and it is sensible to maximise the opportunities available to ensure the site is not only occupied and making a contribution to the local economy in the Borough but also able present a prosperous image of the Town Centre when approaching from the north.</p> <p>3.9 Flexibility in the uses would enable uses such Retail, Food & Drink, Restaurant and Roadside business, thereby contributing to the economy, as well as providing a service to those using the site primarily for employment purposes. The site is located within close walking distance of Rawtenstall Town Centre and whilst the site may not fall within the boundary as shown on the draft Proposals Map, to all intents and purposes the site forms part of the town centre environs. A flexible approach to the employment allocation of the Corn Exchange would not harm the vitality and viability of the town centre, but would complement it by extending the economic role that the town centre has to play.</p> <p>3.10 Allowing a more flexible approach to employment allocation EMP2.29 would be beneficial to the immediate local economy in Rawtenstall town, as well as the Borough as a whole, by providing wider opportunities for full occupancy rates which would in turn create an attractive impression of Rawtenstall for those accessing the town from the North.</p> <p>3.11 We appreciate that additional uses introduced in this location must be complementary to the existing employment use and we consider that small scale roadside retail use would be entirely appropriate in this regard.</p> <p>PROPOSED MODIFICATION</p> <p>3.12 The Council is respectfully requested to modify the current employment allocation EMP2.29 to enable a wider mix of employment-generating uses within the site boundaries. The Council is invited to include this modification in the Local Plan document by the allocation of a new employment-led, mixed-use allocation for the site under draft Policy EMP2.29. The Council is proposing mixed-use allocations with similar profiles to the south of Rawtenstall Town Centre, which include retail uses, and we consider it appropriate to propose a similar allocation on this northern gateway site in order to facilitate the viable regeneration of the site in part or whole. Indeed,</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.29	Further comment
						<p>it could be argued that the subject site has better links to the town centre than those mixed-use allocations to the south.</p> <p>4. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>4.1 The starting point for consideration of the Council's Draft Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the Framework that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>4.2 Whilst we support in principle the proposed employment allocation of the subject site, the Council is invited to propose a new employment-led, mixed-use allocation for the site under draft Policy EMP2.29 of the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		

Number of comments EMP2.29 1

Reference EMP2.31 New Hall Hey

1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities	EMP08	Not Applicable	<p>EMP08, EMP11, EMP18 and EMP72 Extension of New Hall Hey to the west (New and existing allocations)</p> <p>United Utilities has various pieces of water and wastewater infrastructure passing through this site including significant water infrastructure with associated easements. All UU assets will need to be afforded due regard in the masterplanning process and you should be aware that complications could arise as the infrastructure passes straight through the site.</p> <p>United Utilities would strongly advise any future developer(s) to contact us prior to submission to explore options for addressing this as early as possible.</p>		
------	------	---------	------------------	-------	----------------	---	--	--

Number of comments EMP2.31 1

Reference EMP2.32 New Hall Hey Road

1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities	EMP47	Not Applicable	<p>EMP08, EMP11, EMP18 and EMP72 Extension of New Hall Hey to the west (New and existing allocations)</p> <p>United Utilities has various pieces of water and wastewater infrastructure passing through this site including significant water infrastructure with associated easements. All UU assets will need to be afforded due regard in the masterplanning process and you should be aware that complications could arise as the infrastructure passes straight through the site.</p> <p>United Utilities would strongly advise any future developer(s) to contact us prior to submission to explore options for addressing this as early as possible.</p>		
------	------	---------	------------------	-------	----------------	---	--	--

Number of comments EMP2.32 1

Reference EMP2.34 Extension to New Hall Hey

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.34	Further comment
1386	paul	Nolan	nolan redshaw	EMP72	Object	I BELIEVE THAT THIS SITE HAS GOOD POTENTIAL FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COULD BE COMBINED WITH ADJACENT LAND TO MAKE A LARGER SITE . A BRIDGE MAY BE REQUIRED TO LINK THE TWO SITES AND THIS WOULD ONLY BE FEASIBLE FOR RESIDENTIAL USE . WE ARE MARKETING THE SITE AND ALL THE ENQUIRIES HAVE BEEN FROM DEVELOPERS LOOKING AT RESIDENTIAL USE.		THE WIDER AREA MAY ALSO HAVE RESIDENTIAL POTENTIAL INCLUDING RIVERSIDE BUSINESS PARK AND THE K STEELS UNIT TO THE REAR
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities	EMP72	Not Applicable	EMP08, EMP11, EMP18 and EMP72 Extension of New Hall Hey to the west (New and existing allocations) United Utilities has various pieces of water and wastewater infrastructure passing through this site including significant water infrastructure with associated easements. All UU assets will need to be afforded due regard in the masterplanning process and you should be aware that complications could arise as the infrastructure passes straight through the site. United Utilities would strongly advise any future developer(s) to contact us prior to submission to explore options for addressing this as early as possible.		
1811	Steve	Holt			Object	It has come to my attention that land over the railway lines adjacent to Holmeswood Park, has been designated for Industrial use. As a resident of Holmeswood Park I would like to ask, why I have not been notified of your proposals. This has come as a complete surprise as nobody on the estate is aware of your proposals. My understanding is that if you are intending to build on any land adjacent to properties, you are obligated to inform us of your intentions, which you have not adhered to. It also looks like the consolation period is now over so our view will not be taken into consideration, when it will have an impact on our properties. I await you explanation with interest.		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	EMP2.34 – Access is via Holme Lane which is a concern due to the local road layout and level crossing . The junction of Bury Road and Home Lane is restricted for vehicles travelling to and from the south. Access through parcels EMP 2.26 and 2.31 should be secured		
Number of comments		EMP2.34		4				
Reference		EMP2.35		Baxenden Chemicals Ltd, Rising Bridge				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.35	Further comment
1042	John	Lord	LANXESS Urethanes UK Ltd		Object	Baxenden Chemicals has recently changed ownership. It has undergone a name change and rebanding exercise, and is now owned by LANXESS. LANXESS is committed to maintaining and growing the company on this site and is keen to ensure that the Local Plan assists in creating the conditions to allow it to do so. - - The proposed EMP2.35 Allocation includes in part, the existing chemical works owned and operated by the company, as well as green field farmland in the companies' ownership. The unallocated land to the east of Allocation EMP2.35, south of the access road is in the companies' ownership and forms a natural part of the allocated land's development potential. For this reason, and to support this future development potential, we propose that Allocation EMP2.35 be extended to the east, to include this land south of the existing access road, as far as Rising Bridge Road. Failure to extend this boundary will potentially stymie the company in its future development of this land. - - When considered alongside proposed Green Belt extension, and the tightly drawn proposed Urban Boundary, this has the potential to significantly stymie future development of EMP2.35 (as currently drawn) and adjacent unallocated land. -		
1610	M, C and J	Curran and Harrion			Object	Our objections relating to the new proposed industrial sites are: 1) Not enough parking areas for existing users and heavy road use i.e. - residential users - office block site users which is adjacent to Spice Room restaurant and Stonefold Primary School - Baxenden Chemical users and included HGV vehicles included - farming tractors and trailers - route between motorway and Blackburn Old Road. 2) Plenty of vacant units on existing i.e. Carrs Industrial Estate. It was noted that it stated on your planning information that there were only a few vacant units available on local sites, but my comments are that the few vacant sites cover a large footprint or working/storage area which is multiplied by how many floors contained within that building. 3) The heavy traffic use and parking facilities in itself creates safety for cyclists, pedestrians including children who use the adjacent school. 4) Damage to the roads and to the railway bridge, which is an integral part of the Rising Bridge road network.		
Number of comments					EMP2.35	2		
Reference					EMP2.38	Land adj Hollin Gate Farm		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
59	James	Collier	-	employment land review appendicies 1- 4, add3, add6, emp 13	Object	strong objection to redesignation of green belt and open countryside as employment land or for any other type of development. - 1. the evidence base for requirement employment land is weak: - - e.g what is the current rate of unoccupied or under utilised employment land in the borough, why are there unoccupied sites, and what options have been considered to maximise their use? - no evidence all other options have been fully considered before developing on green belt or open countryside. i.e all brownfield sites should be exhausted before considering unwarranted development on our countryside. how many existing undeveloped brownfield sites are there? - what is the genuine level of interest in new business space. i.e exactly how many businesses have indicated they are willing to invest/ pay for new business space (built on greenbelt) at current market rates (as opposed to incentivised rates) and why are they not able to use existing/ unoccupied employment space - - 2. green belt purpose is to prevent urban sprawl, there seems to be little reference to extending and moving the well defined existing urban boundaries in terms of protecting our countryside or the interests of people who live in the countryside. i.e. many people will have bought properties specifically because they are in close proximity to green belt or open countryside, - 3. what consideration is being given to rural residents, many of whom may be elderly and not have seen the poorly promoted consultation documentation online. what efforts have been made to consult with hard to reach groups? - - 4. no consideration appears to have been given to the appearance of Rossendale as people travel along the A56 through he borough, by re-developing every piece of green land within close proximity to the A56, there's a real risk Rossendale will no longer be perceived as a rural/ green valley, and this could impact the boroughs desirability as a place to live and work. our green spaces and valleys are one of the boroughs unique selling points - -		please dont rape our green spaces
71	Kathleen	Heathcote	-		Object	It was with horror I discovered the new local plan for Haslingden. The Hud Hey, Rising Bridge and Martin Croft Region is to become a large industrial estate- the northern extension of Carrs Industrial Estate. - The area earmarked consists of pristine hay meadows, fields, and a quiet residential area, with a small but 'good' thriving primary school; which will become engulfed by this development. Why would you plan for an industrial area to surround a primary school?? - There are many areas of brownfield sites which would be prime sites for development in the Haslingden area instead: dilapidated mills and former industrial sites, run down and often an eyesore, which would benefit from development. - Also, on already developed sites such as Carrs and the Rising Bridge Office development, a large number of units have been empty for years. If these are surplus to requirements why are we building more? - Why does this rural and residential area need to be destroyed by this sort of development? -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
519	Kath	Lees	-		Object	I am seriously objecting to these plans, even though I don't fully understand the printouts, there is no need for more industrial units within this area. Carrs Industrial Estate is not fully occupied and neither are other industrial units locally fully occupied. In fact Rossendale is overrun with these units and most of them are empty. - - I personally moved into Rossendale because of the green hills, why on earth are you trying to blight the natural beauty? - - Regarding the duty of providing new housing as a council, I would suggest that we update the beautiful buildings that are sitting empty and being left to ruin. I would be very interested in how you can justify building more.		I also have safety issues with regards to vehicles adding to the load that is already accessing via Hud Hey Road. The roads in Haslingden cannot cope with more traffic.
520	Brian	Flockton	-		Object	I have lived here for 50 years and the land behind our property is farmland and greenbelt as far as I am aware and I do not wish for industrial units to be put on there. - - The beauty of Rossendale is being ruined. I feel as though Rawtenstall is being protected to the detriment of the outlying districts. This is very concerning. - - I am also concerned about the access to and from the A56, how are the local people going to be affected? Is this going to cause more accidents? - - I also am concerned about chemicals being accepted in these units, how can we feel confident that they won't be.		-
684	Corinne	Collier	-	emp2.23 and emp 2.38	Object	- adequate demand for ADDITIONAL employment land has not been clearly evidenced within the local plan. the Plan must surely first seek to evidence current and predicted demand outstrips current supply , including development of land already allocated for development before consideration is given to development on green belt and open countryside - there are currently 2 very large units on Carrs industrial estate which are vacant and have been vacant for several years. - this shows a clear lack of demand for very large units, furthermore there are smaller units on Carr road currently advertised to let and an abundance of small units at rising bridge owned by LCC which they have struggled to let or sell over the past 3 years. - in addition to the above existing unoccupied units, there are already sizeable plots allocated for employment land on the opposite side of the A56 from Carr road which surely must be developed(and fully utilised/occupied) before any decisions are made to build on green belt and open countryside. - If RBC are absolutely intent on developing on increasing employment opportunities, then as an absolute minimum the plans must be phased to ensure that existing unoccupied employment land is put to good use and occupied before developing on undeveloped sites that are already allocated for development, and then only when there is sufficient evidence to support further demand, should consideration be given to developing on green belt or open countryside. As this is not yet evidenced, it would be reasonable to suggest that there is also a second phase of decision making involving local communities and councillors once there is sufficient evidence that demand outstrips supply even after existing employment land is fully utilised and existing undeveloped sites are developed and fully occupied. -		It would be interesting to understand if any developers or speculative land holding companies have been involved in discussion (Emails, meetings or otherwise) with RBC prior to the formal consultation commencing? - the main people that stand to benefit from developing on green belt and open countryside are developers and land owners, there is a real risk that the general public are likely to be left looking at a Rossendale which is significantly less green, and full of unoccupied business space and "To Let" signs as the drive along the A56

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
870	Frank	Rogers	-		Object	<p>This land is designated Green Belt land, and as such should not even be considered for development. RBC would need to demonstrate "EXCEPTIONAL" circumstances before consideration could be given to release this land from Green Belt. - - Given the narrow restrictive nature of Rising Bridge Road, and the weight limit that currently is in force for that road, access to any development on this site would have to be from and back on to the busy north-bound side of the A56 dual carriageway, at a point close to the major Rising Bridge roundabout. This would mean that vehicular traffic from the north would first have to head south down the A56 to either the Tesco roundabout and then head back up north, or alternatively come off the southbound A56 at the Station Road exit, and then travel through part of Carrs Industrial Estate in order to rejoin the northbound A56 at the Hurstwood's M66 development. - - The nearness of St John's Primary School to such a development brings with it a series of sensitivities which would have to be addressed and adequately provided for. - - The Leader of RBC, Councillor Barnes, together with Cllrs. Lamb, Oakes, Surridge, Marriott and Hughes, all publicly campaigned to "Keep our Valley Green". Therefore brownfield sites should be the target of further development, NOT Green Belt land.</p>		<p>HOW GREEN WAS MY VALLEY - - Green belt land should be protected at all costs. - Rossendale as an area really only has it's green fields and hills going for it - moving bus stations 150 yards, or filling up the Valley Square with unneeded shops, hotels, pubs, restaurants etc will deliver absolutely nothing to the standing of the area. - Fill in those green spaces with industrial units that will probably remain empty for years, and the place will become a nondescript continual blot on the landscape. - Keep our Valley GREEN.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1146	Ralph	Woodcock	-		Object	<p>Following the public consultation at Haslingden library, which I felt had amazing attendance due to the lack of information about the consultation. In fact the ONLY reason we were there was due to a neighbour informing us of the proposed plans, which claimed to offer public consultation (regulation 18); of which I have printed the full wording, but there is not enough space to type it. - We found the library open but no signage as to where this meeting was being held, and had to look round ourselves. Therefore first and foremost how on earth can you call this a public a participation and engagement consultation. - Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension - Why does Carrs have to be extended, there are loads of empty units as it is more than the expected 5%. I intend providing photographs to prove the vacancies we have in the area. There is also plenty of empty unused existing buildings that could be revitalized and in keeping with the period of the area. - Access to this area would also be a problem; we noted that the A56 already has access to Carrs Industrial Estate. To even consider Martin Croft Road, which is almost single tract seems absolutely ridiculous, dangerous and impossible to get two way traffic. It was also suggested that the carpark at the end of our row of houses could be converted, this I would object to passionately, as this was given by the council at least 15 years ago, and has been maintained by the lower end residents ever since, therefore we consider this our adopted land. Hud Hey Road cannot take any more traffic, this is a country road coming over the moors as Haslingden Road, into Roundhill Road and changing to 30mph Hud Hey Road, which I would like to say not a lot of drivers adhere to, unless it is the standstill traffic that we have to suffer. We have also had the issue of foreign lorries using this road as a fast track and parking up on the bridge with two wheels and the body of the lorry on the pavement leaving the remained two wheels up against the kerb, leaving no payment work walkers, never mind prams. The noise and the fumes from extra traffic would really affect the air quality in Haslingden Too. The traditional roads across the town could not take extra traffic. The field that is being considered for the extension has been used for animal grazing as long as I have lived here and we experience flooding and standing water to the bottom of the field with heavy rain. I believe there is a culvert under some properties along with the drains across the field under the right of way. It is very sad that brown field sites cannot be cleaned up and used before green field sites are considered. This should be a statutory order for development. The proposed field also has a large area of untreated Japanese Knot Weed. - Land adj Hollin Gate Farm - Has anybody been out to actually look at this land? It is surrounding a thriving local primary school. There is already an industrial estate on one side, which had been empty for months and now the council has taken over some of the units, do we really need to put these childr5en through the risk of more dangers - noise, air pollution, security and road safety? Would it not be more sensible</p>		<p>Rossendale is a beautiful area and we should be proud of what we have, not let it go to ruin and put up modern units that are not required. There is enough empty workplaces and homes that could fulfil the needs.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
						<p>to put housing on it if houses area needed? Roundhill Lane is also used by traffic avoiding the A56 traffic, via Rising Bridge Road or Hud Hey Road. - Please, please, please could the local authority plan take over and refurbish empty, boarded up properties that would keep the period and make solid homes for the requirements.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1203	Rosemary and Michael	Atherton	-		Object	<p>The public consultation meeting to discuss plans was illegal as all the residents were not informed, ie no letters through doors or notices on lampposts. The only public notification was in the Rossendale Free Press in July, some three months before the meeting. -This land two years ago was recommended to remain green belt The reconstituted land is infill from construction of A56, and remains a swamp, over a 30 ft deep railway cutting, not compacted under the bridge. There is a bridge (tunnel) at one end, and a manhole at the bottom of the cutting at the other, so this land is not confined. There was nothing solid, just slurry dumped in the hole. Some sort of sheets had to be laid in order to try to stabilise it so that the vehicles dumping the mud would not sink, although one of the vehicles was almost lost. The infill was so hazardous, the school had to be closed for a couple of days in 1980. Land is adjacent to primary school, meaning construction traffic would cause pollution to youngsters. Land presently used for horses, ducks, hens and goats, an ideal environment for children. Rising Bridge Business village offices are still mainly empty, some having never been in use since they were built. They should never have been built in the first place, as there was no call for them, as proven by their lack of use. They were left empty for so long that LCC rented out a couple of units to their existing staff from as far as Preston, to create an illusion. The parking then became chaotic, and complaints were numerous, resulting in a piece of land on Blackburn Road being commandeered for extra parking. Carrs industrial estate has many empty units. Neighbouring towns have empty office spaces too, so there is no great need for Rossendale to have any more units. There is NO market demand. There are still many brown field sites, far more suitable, which could be used before green belt. Rising Bridge Road had flooding problems for years due to blocked drains. Parking along Rising Bridge Road continues to be a massive problem. Plans have been submitted for this land on a number of occasions, and refused. The reasons for the refusals have not changed, but increased. Rising Bridge Road has a weight restriction on it. Empty units are a magnet for vandalism, and are a blight on the landscape. Once green belt has been built on, it has gone forever. Traffic at the northerly end of Rising Bridge Road is horrendous. Yellow lines on the road have faded or disappeared, and are largely ignored anyway, resulting in parked cars on both sides of the road, leaving difficulties for the flow of traffic, especially larger vehicles. Development ignores Hollingate Cottages, as on the plans they do not exist, a lack of care. People drawing up the plans obviously do not know the area or its history. A lot more research needs to be undertaken. The traffic at Brook Street and at Blackburn Road at the approach to Rising Bridge roundabout is already gridlocked at rush hour, and these roads could not cope with any more traffic. The traffic tailbacks stretch from the roundabout to the pedestrian crossing, up to a quarter of a mile. To add to this would be lunacy.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
						<p>For a site to be taken out of green belt, there is a need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Given the number of empty units there are throughout the valley and the number of brown field sites available for development, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify removing this land from green belt.</p>	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1212	Michael	Heathcote	-		Object	<p>1 – Regulation 18 – Public Consultation - The ‘public’ generally had no knowledge of the existence of the plan until informed by a private citizen who found out by accident when looking for something else on line. With his neighbours and at their expense, information and maps were circulated to their neighbours, and the governors of the local school affected by the plan. All people contacted had no previous knowledge of the existence of a Rossendale Development Plan. There has been NO advertising, information, leaflets, posters in the town or local papers, and even on the evening when the consultation maps were on view in the Library there were no posters indicating that they were in the Library, which room, etc. It has been so poorly publicised and so little information available that I question its legality as a ‘public consultation’ -</p> <p>2 - Northern Extension of Carr’s Industrial Estate. EMP 2.23 -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An environmental survey is required before decisions are made as this is an increasingly rare hay meadow with valuable meadow species such as Yellow Rattle, and is equally bio – diverse as the adjoining land which is protected. See initial comments from Lancashire Wildlife Trust below :- Semi improved grassland. Moderately herb rich, especially in contrast to the intensive agriculture and horse grazing that surrounds it. A stepping stone habitat in the South Pennines Grassland network. - Crested dogstail - Ribwort plantain - Sweet vernal grass - Rough meadowgrass - Meadow buttercup - Red clover - Yellow rattle - Meadow vetchling - White clover - Common ragwort - Cocks foot - Common bistort - 3 Biological Heritage Site qualifying species. - Thanks - X - South Pennines Grasslands Project Officer - The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside - Less environmentally acceptable, but significant to development potential, there is a large patch of Japanese Knot Weed. - Traffic on the A56 and Hud Hey Road in particular is already a concern , especially at rush hour times when Hud Hey Road has become a preferred alternative to Grane Road for many drivers, including large trucks, and development to this site would exacerbate the situation to a dangerous degree. Access to this site is problematic whether direct from the A56, via Hud Hey Road, or from the existing Carr’s estate. - Noise levels would affect residents in Hud Hey Road and Martin Croft Road, whose gardens adjoin the designated area The A56 has a drainage/standing water problem and water draining from hard surfaces in the area due to development would exacerbate this problem and create a dangerous surface in wet weather. A culvert/stream flows under the cellar of some houses on Martin Croft Road, which would adjoin the designated area. This currently drains into the field and has not caused any problems for the residents. However development could cause serious flooding problems in these properties. There are nearby brown field sites which need ‘cleaning up’ and would be much more suitable as industrial development sites. Could it be made statutory that development is phased so that ALL brown field sites have 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
						<p>to be developed before green field, environmentally sensitive sites are released for development. • Existing developments along the A56 corridor have a lot of empty units – that have remained empty for a number of years (in some cases 7 years or more). This constitutes much more than 5% of the existing units. There does not appear to be a need or demand for more development in the foreseeable future. • Plans show development of employment/industrial land for the Haslingden area far outweighs that for other areas of Rossendale. E.g. Rawtenstall – approx. 5 hectares, Haslingden – approx. 14 hectares. Balance is needed!! - 3 - Land adjoining Hollin Gate Farm. EMP 2.38 • This land surrounds on 3 sides a small, but thriving local primary school. A primary school surrounded by an industrial estate raises so many health and safety issues, they are too numerous to list in this document but would include noise, air pollution, security, road safety. • This could lead to the closure of a good, thriving and much needed primary school at a time when more school places are needed, not fewer. • This is currently Green Belt land which should be protected from development for future generations - • Traffic is already a safety issue on the road outside the school because of existing developments in the area end a 'rat run' which cuts out the busy A56 roundabout, and allows access to the M65 as an alternative to the Grane Road. Further development would make this a major problem. • If there has to be development at this site surely with the school, post office/corner shop and bus stop with direct bus links to Accrington, Blackburn, Rossendale, and Manchester, housing would be a much more sensible option.</p>		
1552	William and Joan	Caine and Uttley			Object	<p>Objecting against the proposed plans for building units on Rising Bridge Road. Far too much traffic on the road already. It's near a school. Parking on both sides of the road is dangerous plus HGV wagons already use Rising Bridge Road as a shortcut, even though it's a 7.50 tonne weight limit, this could damage property due to the vibrations of the vehicles and could also cause damage to children's health through excessive fumes.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1584	S M	Ticehurst			Object	<p>After looking at information put out to public consultation by the Council, who are proposing to put industrial units on the land opposite my home on Rising Bridge Road.</p> <p>I have to object to this idea, because during the years I have lived, and raised my family in this house. We have successfully fought, three times to prevent building there. It is not suitable for any form of development because the land has been filled in with what was taken out of the A56 bypass, no one knows what may be in there. It was thought to be dangerous at the times 'quicksand' was mentioned. The school was closed for a time until it was made safe.</p> <p>Our properties already have a problem with drains backing up. We had to have the drainage people come to flush them out and this seems to have increased since the office blocks were built. How bad would this be if there were more units opposite.</p> <p>The parking is already congested and I have to leave my car parked on the road Monday to Friday because I can't reverse out of my drive for fear of hitting a car parked opposite.</p> <p>It would seem that the Council have not really looked into this, as there are already a large number of empty units in the Haslingden area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1587	Derek and Jean	Sowerby			Object	<p>I am writing to lodge an objection to the above proposed development application.</p> <p>The site is currently zoned as Green Belt land with adjacent light residential use and also a Primary School and does not in any way support the planned change to Industrial Use.</p> <p>Any change to industrial use is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding community and environment.</p> <p>Inability to Cope with Traffic. I do not support the developer's assertion that the existing road and public transport networks can support such a large development. The capacity of the road network, principally Rising Bridge Road is not adequate to cope with such an increase in traffic movements.</p> <p>Compromising on Safety. The road passed Stonefold Primary School is already excessively busy and any adjacent development would only increase traffic and the associated risks to children's lives.</p> <p>The developer proposes access from Rising Bridge Roundabout! He obviously has not used this roundabout as any further increase in traffic through this would only increase the traffic dangers and backlogs that occur on a daily basis.</p> <p>Lack of Demand Current industrial/office units at Rising Bridge lay empty despite Lancashire County council renting parts of it to themselves. So how can anyone show that there is any demand for such premises? Take a brief tour around Carrs estate - there are units there - empty and falling into disrepair. So to state that the site is in an area of strong demand is simply untrue. In fact its a joke.</p> <p>Any development would also lead to :- Light Pollution, Noise Pollution and Air Pollution, and be the Destruction of habitats and the death knell for the huge array of Wildlife that abounds in this Green Belt Land.</p> <p>On these and other grounds we sincerely hope that you are able to act on our behalf and reject the progression of these developments on our greenbelt sites.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1590	David and Pat	Stevenson			Object	<p>Objections to the proposed units on this land.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GREEN BELT LAND 2. Access to and from proposed site? 3. Very near school and properties. 4. Pollution and safety? <p>Rising Bridge road now has a huge amount of problems. Vehicles speeding along and large lorries using it. Workers at Council offices on R/B Road park all day on no parking area and all other areas along road. Footpaths and edges neglected by council.</p> <p>Empty units now down Hud Hey and Carrs (why more)?</p> <p>Lots of space to extend unit area down Hud Hey on land to Haslingden Railway sidings which is completely empty.</p> <p>SO KEEP OFF OUR GREEN BELT.</p>		
1591	Tracy	Ireland			Object	<p>With reference to the above proposal, we would like to strongly object to the application, due to the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed siting of the development is totally out of character for the area, it is right in the middle of a residential area. This could cause overshadowing and a substantial loss of privacy due to the close proximity, please see attached picture.</p> <p>There will be light and noise pollution cause from the units and the increased traffic , this will cause al ot of distress to the neighbourhood. Furthermore the wildlife around the greenbelt will be effected, foxes, bats and deer are often seen on the surrounding land.</p> <p>There is already problems with traffic on Rising-Bridge road. Parents struggle to park when they drop off and collect their children attending St John's Stonefold. The employee's from the nearby Business Enterprise Village, park all along the road, cars alos parked on yellow lines, someimtes entrances blocked causing large vehicles to struggle entering and exiting Baxenden Chemicals. The proposed development will only add to the hazard with the increase of traffic and it will also cause severe traffic congestion. Rising-Bridge road is already being used as a rat run.</p> <p>The business enterprise village on rising bridge road stayed empty for over 18 months when first built and at present they still have a few vacant units. There are empty units on hud hey road and also Carrs industrial estate all within a mile away from the proposed development with easy access to the A56. Why build more undustrial units in the middle of a community causing a huge impact on all the local residents, and surrounding neighbourhood.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1593	Carol	Greenwood			Object	<p>I would like you to take notice of my views to oppose the proposal of industrial units/buildings on land facing my property of X Hollingate Cottages, Rising Bridge Road, Accrington, BB5 2SW.</p> <p>1. Why would permission be considered for building on green belt ground where there is so much brown field land in the rossendale valley and many units are already empty on the rising bridge business park and carrs industrial estate which are both within walking distance of the proposed site.</p> <p>2. There is already a problem with traffic congestion along rising bridge road due to school, the chemical factory and the business park.... Endangering the public, including children!!! Many commuters already use rising bridge road as a shortcut to other areas.</p> <p>3. the impact to the environment and wildlife would be severely damaged, we often watch the bats flying around the proposed site, seeing foxes roaming, deers are to be found in the area too, frogs, newts and amphibians are found regularly when the field is marshy and a pond creates for ducks and geese to frequent.</p> <p>I have many other points that I feel should be considered and would like the option to present these in person in a meeting with the council and other members of the community.</p>		
1594	C P	Wellock			Object	<p>We are writing to put forward and objection to the proposed industrial units on Rising Bridge Road.</p> <p>Having lived on Rising Bridge Road for 48 years, the weight of traffic now far exceeds the small road. Vehicles use the road as a short cut to avoid the queuing on the bypass and this has increased further since the new traffic system was put in place. Vehicles travel along the road at dangerous speeds. There is a high traffic volume for the school especially morning and afternoon as parents attempt to park and collect their children. Industrial units are not suitably safe next to the school.</p> <p>The units at rising bridge which were empty for some time now have work force that dot their vehicles around to park near their work. What is to say that more units will be a blot on the landscape, left empty? There are empty units on Carrs industrial estate, away from residential properties and schools. There is quite enough traffic coming to the village for the chemical works. Why should residents on Rising Bridge road be subject to look at further industrial units and the heavy delivery vehicles.</p> <p>We wish to remain living without further disturbance of heavy traffic</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1595	J	Clarke			Object	<p>We object to this development on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This land 2 years ago was recommended to remain in green belt and is used to grazing. There has to be exceptional circumstances for a sight to be taken out of green belt and as there are more than 55 of units already lying empty why do we need any more. There are also plenty of brown belt areas to build on without the need for green belt land being used. Therefore there are no exceptional circumstances. 2. This land is reconstituted and is infill from the construction of the A56 bypass which filled in the railway cutting right up to the top of the bridge. This was not solid infill leading to one dumper truck almost sinking and had to be closed for a while. The field is like a swamp when it rains as it does not drain away and can stay like that for weeks. We have problems with drainage on the road and in the sewers which have had to be "rodded" 3 times in the last 12 months. 3. This land is adjacent to a primary school and industrial units will impact on the pupils natural environment around it. It will bring noise, pollution and danger from large vehicles. 4. Parking along rising bridge road is already chaotic and dangerous with school traffic and parking from the nearby offices. We already have problems with articulated lorries, using their sat navs, trying to come along the road and also blocking it when trying to get up the lane nearby and getting stuck. Traffic at Brook Street leading on to Blackburn Road and the rising bridge roundabout are always gridlocked at certain times of the day and could not cope with any more traffic. 5. These units would not receive high levels of demand as reported by Commercial Agents (The employment Land Review Final Report) as this is what we were told when the nearby offices were built and it was years before any one move in. LCC finally rented some units and this is when parking became a problem on Rising Bridge road as people were coming from far and wide with no place to park. Therefore where are all the extra cars of the unit workers going to park. Therefore where are all the extra cars of the unit workers going to park? This will be the same scenario as it won't be Workers from nearby coming in on Public transport as per (access to labour and services ADD3 small local labour market good access to local services). 6. Units and empty Units are a magnet for vandalism and theft as was shown with the nearby offices. We were also quite disgusted that proper care was not taken when highlighting the Ordnance Survey map as it looked like Hollingate Cottages did not exist and the school looked like it was out on its own (which clearly it isn't) but right next to the proposed site. Also the criteria for site ratings (ADD3) has 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1596	D	Cunliffe			Object	<p>the school as Rising Bridge Primary School when it's name is actually St Johns Stonefold Primary School.</p> <p>We are sorry to hear the council are thinking of allowing some industrial warehouses on the old railway lines that run adjacent to rising bridge road. We live in the bungalow in between the school and the rising bridge business & enterprise office complex in the time we have live there we have had countless confrontations with some of the people that work in the enterprise office constantly bloack part of our driveway. Also when the parents are dropping off & picking up children the vehicles are parked on both sides of rising bridge road.</p> <p>The parents can't park legally because all the spaces are taken up by the office worker. This is a serious problem that occurs every working day. The officer ares only hald full at the moment but can you imagine how bad it would be when they are full. So say the council go ahead with the development where would the workers park their vehicles. What sort of transport would be coming & going to the warehouses at all times of day and night when it's already congested.</p> <p>This road cannot take the HGV articulated lorries, 7x3 tonne box wagons, transit vans and sprinter vans that would being used.</p> <p>If the rumours are true there will be noise pollution 24/7 with a courier business. This area of rising bridge is a residential area and hats the way it should stay. There are lots of Brownland sites available in the rossendale valley two that I know of are the old valley refrigeration business on henrietta street, bacup and the old inghams box works near turnpike, waterfoot. I should imagine that there are lots of other sites in rossendale that are brown land that you could develop.</p> <p>Lets hope someone with a bit of common sense will be sitting on the planning committee and stampst this application with a resounding NO.</p> <p>P.S. outside our bungalow on our garden wall is a bronze plaque that says 1861 Acre Village Boundary, Hollingworth Farm Estate. Not industrial development area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1597	Annie	Wilson			Object	<p>I write in objection to the proposed above site being developed with industrial units of B2 and B8 type for the reasons as follows:-</p> <p>All of the site is Green Belt land and has always been protected from several attempts at development, being a green belt corridor for wildlife and rare fauna. Part of this site is the old railway route that was in filled when the A56 excavation and construction was being carried out. This infill was taken from various areas of the excavation of the A56 and the deposits were not recorded or tested for contamination, but it was deemed a high risk site when a child from the primary school had to be rescued by the fire service because he was being sucked into the infill. This resulted in the school having to be closed and the site cordoned off so that no one could access it. Therefore this site would require contamination bore hole testing prior to any development being considered. Construction would require building on a platform after any contaminated ground was removed. All this would be extremely expensive and no EU Environmental Grant for clean up would be available.</p> <p>Traffic/Parking</p> <p>Currently the area surrounding this site has a huge problem with parking and volume of traffic. Worsley Street, and the whole of Rising Bridge Road not only has resident parking, Enterprise Village employee parking all along the area even on yellow lines impeding large vehicles entering and exiting Baxenden Chemicals entrance road. There are also parents dropping off and collecting children from school have students not only from the local area but Blackburn Road, Hud Hey, Stonefold part of Baxenden and all the outlying farms, making it difficult for parents not to use vehicles for the school run.</p> <p>Access</p> <p>There is a weight restriction bridge close to the school which would make any access from Rising Bridge Road to an industrial unit site, virtually impossible because of the size and weight of large vans, lorries and heavy goods vehicles. I have been led to believe that discussions are being held with highways regarding another exit from the Rising Bridge Roundabout onto Hollingate Farm. The church (not a chapel) is a listed building. The current entrance to the farm being opposite traffic, entering and exiting the garage and MacDonald's making it inappropriate for the volume and size of vehicles entering and exiting the proposed site. Therefore a revised road layout would be necessary on the roundabout resulting in more traffic control lights and a complete reconfiguration of the whole system that has only recently cost millions to input.</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>All developments will be required to consider and address flood risks from all sources before planning can be given. Rising Bridge Road is prone to flooding adjacent to this site and not only but the drains have to be flushed out on a regular basis from the manhole at 180 Rising Bridge Road, otherwise it backs</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
						<p>up into between 4 to 6 properties. How would these drains cope with all the extra waste when to date this year (2017) they have been flushed through 3 times and this is prior to the winter commencing. Looking at the United Utilities infrastructure with the next stage commencing 2020/2025 I would think that the funds and projects for this period have already been allocated and would not fall in line with your plans.</p> <p>Industrial Unit Types B2 and B8</p> <p>The type of businesses and employment would require regular scrutiny because of operational times, noise pollution, air pollution and light pollution because this site not only is in the heart of a residential community but encompasses a primary school with approximately 1500 children who would be affected in varying ways from this development.</p> <p>Current Industrial Unit Vacancies</p> <p>Having trawled the existing industrial unit sites I have discovered the following:-</p> <p>Hud Hey Bordering Brooke Street and Opposite Worsley Park owned by the Adham Group there are 4 vacant units.</p> <p>Prinny Mill Haslingden 01706 233575 Offices and storage spaces available.</p> <p>Grane Road -1,500 to 7,500 sq ft. Hurstwoods 4 vacant units</p> <p>Carrs Industrial Estate There are 9 various sized units from 2,500 sq ft to a maximum of 12,429 sq ft, some for sale and others to let. I have the names and contact numbers of the agents for the above.</p> <p>Holligate Farm has quite recently changed ownership. They did not put forward this site according to your officers and having spent a considerable amount of money putting their own stamp on the property so why would they want to have it turned into industrial units.</p> <p>From the council's point of view going down the compulsory purchase route would be far too expensive for an authority that has to save so much money. Finally despite asking, no one could tell me the possible number or sizes of units they would expect on such a site.</p> <p>I am convinced that this site is far too large to be in line with our local area. Lichfield's Professional Consultancy Report gives me the impression that they did not even visit the area or research the area. They could not even give the primary school its correct name and they could not define the difference between a chapel and a church and that it is a listed building. They also felt that the terrain was quite even and did not pick up on the fact that a large amount of the site is infill. With Holligate Farm having considerable rises and falls.</p> <p>I would like to be informed of any meetings where public may attend regarding the Draft Local Plan.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1598	K/C	Horrocks/Mac key			Object	<p>We the above named of 54 Rising Bridge road are totally against the development of this land for Industrial units.</p> <p>Apart from the site being unsuitable, there are several industrial units and offices nearby that are vacant, why not fill these first. The access would be a nightmare and would also increase traffic down our once quiet road. At the moment it is just about bearable, but we have problems with heavy Goods vehicles using this route to cut out the roundabout, if this land where to be developed it would only get worse. It isn't a pleasant place to live any more, having lived on Rising Bridge road for 38 years and have seen it decline with the rest of Rossendale.</p> <p>Parking is another major issue, with the school at the end of the road the office buildings and now the gym. At school emptying times it difficult to drive through, I don't suppose anything will be done about that until someone is killed, that is the usual approach taken by the authorities.</p> <p>Our residential areas should be kept just that, it is not a good idea to build willy nilly on any scrap of land you can get your hands on, and particularly Industrial units, it is totally unacceptable to expect residents to sit back and let you ruin the landscape. This has always been grazing land as long as I can remember, never industrial.</p> <p>Please keep our area residential.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1599	Janet and Brian	Ashworth and Quinn			Object	<p>We have never been informed officially as residents to the proposed plans for this land, either by letter or alternatively any notices put up on lampposts, which, we were aware, was a legal requirement. Had we not seen it in the Rossendale Free Press we may never have known about this totally unacceptable proposal.</p> <p>We are aware that fairly recently, in last couple of years, another proposal to build on this green belt land was refused and that it was recommended that it stay green belt and nothing has changed since then and indeed the traffic on Rising Bridge has got much, much worse. At school drop-off and pick-up times it is extremely difficult to negotiate pulling out of our drive, at times, with the amount of traffic coming up and down the road. We have lived on this road for in excess of 20 years and the sheer volume of traffic coming along it now is unrecognisable.</p> <p>Also with the new Enterprise Village there are also additional cars parked outside our house along Rising Bridge Road, which at times also causes tailbacks which is extremely dangerous when there are children going to and from the primary school which is also extremely close to this land.</p> <p>Furthermore at rush-hour there are tailbacks along Hud Hey Road up to the Brook Street traffic lights, which cause problems, as well as the Rising Bridge roundabout which is backed up, sometimes well past the pedestrian crossing. The thought of you adding to this problem with articulated lorries fills us with dread and begs the question, why?</p> <p>The land is used to graze several horses, hens and ducks which is a lovely sight for children to see on their way from school. Further traffic on this road would be a ludicrous thing to allow especially as there is a weight restriction on the road.</p> <p>The Enterprise Village units are still on the whole empty, although parking on the few that are let, causes an overspill, which has resulted in a piece of land being used on Blackburn Road to accommodate the extra cars. This is before all the units are let (not that they ever will be on present evidence).</p> <p>Additionally this makes you wonder why you would be possibly thinking of building extra commercial units when the ones that are built remain mainly empty? We list below just a few of these in the area:-</p> <p>Three Point Business Park, Charles Lane Grane Road, The Court Yard (various units) Enterprise Village, Blackburn Road, Rising Bridge (various units some never let out since being built!!) Taylor Court, Haslingden Link 665 Off A56 (various units) - New Hall Hey, Rossendale (various units) -</p> <p>Most of these units also have good motorway links but still remain primarily empty so using that reason for granting permission is obviously off the mark!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
						<p>We have listed just a few of the many empty units in the Rossendale area and as there are so many that are waiting to be let out or sold it is just inexplicable why you would be considering taking this land out of green belt to built yet more units, that will probably also remain empty. These also attract vandals and cause a blot on the landscape and in view of the number of empty units at present this does not demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances' for taking land out of green belt. Indeed there are many brown field sites that could be considered in much more suitable areas, although as mentioned above, in our view there is no requirement for the building of these units in the present economical climate.</p> <p>To summarise it is quite clear that there are no exceptional circumstances that demonstrate good enough reasons for removing this land from green belt and as such it should remain as green belt.</p>		
1600	Margaret and Kevin	Evans			Object	<p>We strongly object to the proposed Industrial units on the land adjacent to Hollingate Farm Rising Bridge Road.</p> <p>The roads around are already congested by the traffic from the roundabout, offices, McDonalds, petrol station, Spice Rooms, Cornmill, Chemical works and school.</p> <p>Units would be adding more heavy trucks and vans onto the roads making it a lot worse.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1601	Afzal	Hussain			Object	<p>1. The proposal does not respect the scale and proportion of surrounding houses and would be entirely out of character for Rising Bridge Road</p> <p>2. I cannot visualise any valuable contribution the proposal makes in meeting any identified local needs. There is already office/units around the corner on A680 that have been vacant for a number of years. Further there is already an industrial estate at the bottom of Round Hill Road.</p> <p>3. The proposal states that Rising Bridge will need upgrading -this will not widen the road and currently is already under pressure at school times. At the time of the school run and most particularly when children are leaving school the traffic increases substantially with parents parking all along Rising Bridge Road. I do not see how HGV can navigate the road when cars are parked on both sides.</p> <p>4. The bridge will probably need upgrading and widening if HGVs are going to use it regularly. Currently the bridge is too narrow as well as being to near the school. It would cause chaos through increase in traffic and possibly increase risk of accidents and incidents (particularly for the children coming out of the school). The bridge is not ideal for two vehicles to pass each other especially if one the vehicles happens to be HGV. In fact two HGVs cannot pass each at the same time.</p> <p>5. Currently Rising Bridge Road is not traffic hectic outside school run times but clearly if the proposal went ahead it would lead to substantial increase in traffic and hence noise and air pollution.</p> <p>6. The proposal acknowledges that this site is currently a Green Belt Site.</p> <p>7. The proposal will increase car use rather than increase public transport.</p> <p>8. Further points of concern;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Detrimental impact on residential amenities plus visual impact -Detrimental to current character of Rising Bridge Road -Highway safety compromised -Road capacity and parking increase -Loss of property values!!! 		
1602	David	Entwistle			Object	<p>The land alongside Rising Bridge Road was the old railway line which was filled in with earth taken from the route of the new by-pass A56. No drains were put in place as I recall, leaving this land quite like a bog. In one part it has been left open to make way for the high pressure gas pipe.</p> <p>There is only one way this land can be accessed, this would be off Rising Bridge Road.</p> <p>In turn this would pose problems for the residents of Rising Bridge road. In the case of the land adjacent to Hollin Gate Farm access would have to be via the roundabout on the A56. The A56 is already very congested and would be even more so if this project was to go ahead.</p> <p>Why do we need more industrial units when there are numerous units available on Carrs Industrial estate and also the Hud Hey and Broadway Sites.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1603	Brian and Mavis	Bell			Object	<p>We wish to protest about the site, now designated as Green Belt Area and used for grazing, being removed from such designation, and being put to B2 and B8 usage.</p> <p>Some of the units built on land between the restaurant and chapel are still VACANT. Many of the workers there DRIVE in from Preston, Blackburn, Burnley and Accrington, thus local jobs are not necessarily provided. Statements saying that new jobs will be created with B2 and B8 category, are thus inaccurate. There are still VACANT units on CARRS INDUSTRIAL ESTATE. Are these suggested plans for future units necessary?</p> <p>Some reasons for our protest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Workers at the aforementioned units on Rising Bridge Rd, use said road for overspill parking to the detriment of residents nearby, and to the detriment of parents dropping off and collecting their children from St. John's School. 2) INDUSTRIAL UNITS implies industrial traffic - trucks, wagons etc. - causing much pollution for children at the school especially when in the playground, and walking to and from school, and also affecting the health of residents in that area. Providing a poisonous pollution environment should NOT be on your agenda. 3) We have lived on Rising Bridge Road since 1974 and are privileged to see ROE DEER, FOXES and RABBITS enjoying the green fields on our road - and even coming into our garden. 4) An increase of heavy traffic on this narrow road, where residents park outside their own homes and often use both sides of the road for parking purposes, will cause much concern about the EASE with which emergency vehicles will be able to access the school and homes of residents. 5) We would be interested in receiving a lower council tax because of removal from Green Belt designation if granted. Also compensation for the decline in the value of our property. <p>All these items need careful consideration and honest consideration. We hope to have a happy outcome re this being refused and the Green Belt continuing.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1604	Andrew and Connor	Beverley			Object	<p>Proposed Industrial Units - Land adjacent to Hollingate Farm - Rising Bridge</p> <p>I OBJECT TO THE APPLICATION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:-</p> <p>1/ Value of surrounding property if such units were but in front of them. We personally would lose our privacy if such units were built in front of us as our house (as with a lot of the houses on Rising Bridge Road) are elevated.</p> <p>2/ Traffic - this road and surrounding areas are already having major problems with traffic / parking issues due to the school, Industrial units already in Rising Bridge.</p> <p>3/ Noise in the residential area - already heightened since the new roundabout lights were installed. Traffic has significantly increased on Rising Bridge Road due to people using this road to avoid the delay at these lights.</p> <p>4/ Risk of flooding - Rising Bridge Road has already had a major problem with flooding and was recently improved by the council at a very significant cost.</p> <p>5/ Industrial units would be out of keeping with the surrounding area which includes a church and an old school building.</p> <p>6/ There are still several units vacant in the other units that were built in Rising Bridge.</p> <p>7/ There is a high pressure gas line parallel to the A56.</p>		
1605	Marian	Walmsley			Object	<p>The following are my objections to industrial units being constructed on land adjacent to Rising Bridge Road, Haslingden,</p> <p>1. Rising Bridge is a residential area and there is no apparent justification for an attempt to turn it into an industrial area</p> <p>2. Rising Bridge Road and Roundhill Lane are not designed to take their already too heavy volume of traffic. Residents already have to be vigilant in attempting to keep huge vehicles at bay.</p> <p>3. All traffic therefrom has to pass before an infants' school. Its size and speed already constitute a danger to the children. More industrial traffic would intensify that danger.</p> <p>4. The C.C. offices are not yet full yet occupants have to use the adjacent Indian Restaurant car park during the day. If they are to be filled they will generate more traffic. There is no room for more traffic.</p> <p>5. Presumably access to a new industrial area would not be to and from the by-pass. That being so lorries would be unable to reach the site because there is a 7.5 tonne restriction on Rising Bridge Road - the only alternative.</p> <p>6. I have written the above despite the fact that every time a consensus of opinion has been sought in Rising Bridge it has been ignored. Are you wasting your time and mine, yet again?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1606	David	Blanchard			Object	<p>Objections to the building of industrial units at Rising Bridge:</p> <p>1) Some of the land to be used is Green Belt - it is only last year that the Leader of the Council was seen at the back of a banner saying - Keep Rossendale Green.</p> <p>2) There will be even more pressure on parking, which is currently a nightmare, especially outside the units on Rising Bridge Road, there is a time limited section which is totally ignored, and not policed, by the workers in the offices.</p> <p>3) Health and safety issues around the school, this is already congested and will only get worse putting children's safety at risk.</p> <p>4) Access, the bridge is a 7.5 ton limit, although you have said that there will be a new road, not everybody will use it.</p> <p>5) Access and exit, the new proposed road, if build, will be onto an already very busy island which will only cause further problems.</p> <p>6) Do we really need new units, there are plenty of empty units in the area which struggle to be leased.</p> <p>7) The inevitable increase in traffic will impact on surrounding roads, especially the 'rat run' this is Roundhill Lane, there are signs that indicate 'not suitable for HGVs' these are totally ignored - nobody polices this.</p> <p>Thanks</p>		
1607	D M	Blanchard			Object	<p>Objection to proposal of industrial units on land adjacent to Rising Bridge Road</p> <p>1) Why are you planning building on green belt land when there is plenty of other land available.</p> <p>2) Why units, there are empty units at Rising Bridge. Hud Hey and Car industrial estate WHY DO WE NEED MORE?</p> <p>3) Parking is a big issue on Rising Bridge Road due to the units at Rising Bridge parking there.</p> <p>4) It will be next to a Primary School St John Stonefold which has a parking problem at school time.</p> <p>5) Access on to a very busy roundabout at the moment will mean more traffic on Rising Bridge Road and Round Hill Lane. To avoid the roundabout causing a problem at school, health and safety of the children.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1608		Hammond and Hutchinson			Object	<p>We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections we have with regard to the proposed development of industrial units on the land adjacent to Hollingate Farm. As an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development, we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living. Our specific objections are as follows:</p> <p>Highways.</p> <p>Although outlined planning shows access onto the Rising Bridge roundabout it does not mention the impact on traffic at the roundabout. Currently during peak periods there can be major congestion at the roundabout, there have also been numerous accidents some of which have been near fatal. This is without an increase in volume. Also the suggested access will mean HGV s and cars will need to pull out onto a single carriage way requiring them to tum right before they can join the road approaching the roundabout. There is already a central road access by this point allowing cars and HGVs to access McDonalds and exit the garage.</p> <p>There is also no mention of the impact on Rising Bridge Road. This is already a busy road and although it is in a residential area cars frequently exceed the speed limit. Many households also park on the road. An increase of traffic will continue to affect the safety of residents.</p> <p>Water and Sewerage</p> <p>United Utilities has highlighted that the full impact of any development proposal cannot be fully determined until more details are known about the nature of the development. They have also outlined that it is particularly important to know whether foul and surface water will connect to the public sewer. Some of the cottages on Rising Bridge already experience problems with sewerage back up - the development would just add to this problem.</p> <p>Local area</p> <p>The proposed development is not sympathetic to the surrounding land uses as this is currently a residential area. The Human Rights Act, Protocol I, Article I, states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions, which includes the home and other land. In addition Article 8, of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life including their surroundings. As I have already pointed out an industrial estate in the middle of a residential area (on Green Belt Land) would not allow the residents to peacefully enjoy their possessions (home) or respect their private and family life.</p> <p>Light / Noise pollution</p> <p>The increase in light will be significant not only from buildings but also from the vehicles visiting the premises, this is also the same for noise. As the proposal is for industrial units the impact will be even greater. There could be an increase in noise due machinery and workers. As previously mentioned not</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
						<p>only will this be on the proposed site but also the surrounding streets/roads. This will impact on sleep, be harmful to wildlife and undermine the enjoyment of the countryside.</p> <p>We would be grateful if the council would take our objections into consideration when deciding this application.</p>		
1609	Carol and Shawn	James			Object	<p>We wish to raise our objections to the above inclusion of this reference in the proposed local plan.</p> <p>We have been residents of Rising Bridge Road for over 30 years and as such are familiar with the area extremely well.</p> <p>The area presently has problems with traffic and parking. The offices that were built at the end of the road did not provide sufficient parking to accommodate the number of people using the offices and as such, Rising Bridge Road and surrounding streets overflow with parked cars and traffic. At times this is so bad that it is hazardous to children at the local primary school. This road cannot accommodate further traffic or parked cars, which would be inevitable with the proposed development.</p> <p>The development would envelop the small primary school and be potentially dangerous due to extra traffic.</p> <p>The area already has lots of industrial units which presently are underused. Do we really need more in this area? Why not utilise the empty premises first.</p> <p>Rising Bridge is a small village. The infrastructure could not accommodate such a large site.</p> <p>The area is green belt land, it should remain as such. Industry here would be a blot on the landscape.</p> <p>There is no proven level of market demand in this area and would not be attractive to prospective businesses.</p> <p>Overall we strongly object to the development of this land. We feel it would be completely inappropriate to develop the land here for industrial use and the impact of the development on the area and it's residents would be detrimental.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1610	M, C and J	Curran and Harrion			Object	<p>Our objections relating to the new proposed industrial sites are:</p> <p>1) Not enough parking areas for existing users and heavy road use i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - residential users - office block site users which is adjacent to Spice Room restaurant and Stonefold Primary School - Baxenden Chemical users and included HGV vehicles included - farming tractors and trailers - route between motorway and Blackburn Old Road. <p>2) Plenty of vacant units on existing i.e. Carrs Industrial Estate. It was noted that it stated on your planning information that there were only a few vacant units available on local sites, but my comments are that the few vacant sites cover a large footprint or working/storage area which is multiplied by how many floors contained within that building.</p> <p>3) The heavy traffic use and parking facilities in itself creates safety for cyclists, pedestrians including children who use the adjacent school.</p> <p>4) Damage to the roads and to the railway bridge, which is an integral part of the Rising Bridge road network.</p>		
1611	Susan	Greenhalgh			Object	<p>With regard to the proposed development plans for land adjacent to Hollingate Farm off Rising Bridge Road.</p> <p>It is my understanding that the land is at present green belt and that to take such designated land for development requires there to be a desperate need for this particular area.</p> <p>Already in the Rossendale area there are vacant brownfield sites and numerous empty units, surely it would be more beneficial to make use of these areas first therefore showing need and interest.</p> <p>The proposed site provides habitat for flora and fauna in the valley which has already lost large area of green belt to development. There is a danger of the Rossendale Valley becoming an extension of the Greater Manchester conurbation and losing its own identity.</p> <p>I urge the council to look seriously into any decision.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1612	Stephen	Oldfield			Object	<p>As headteacher of Stonefold St John's CE school. I write on behalf of the community to express my extreme concern over the proposed developments indicated above. Not only is this a development on a greenfield site, but there are further issues which need consideration.</p> <p>Firstly, the immediate area is a haven for wildlife. There are many rare moths, and great crested newts are known to breed in lodges in Baxenden, with a dispersal area that includes the proposed development. The surrounding scrub landscape contains many small mammals, and these are hunting grounds for kestrels and tawny owls. This is one of the few green sites left in Haslingden and it would be a great loss if it were to disappear to industry when there are many nearby brown field sites.</p> <p>Secondly, the traffic implications would cause great concern for the local residents and for parents bringing their children to school. Parking is already a severe and dangerous problem. Nearby offices developed in 2009 are still not utilised fully.</p> <p>What are the implications for our school? Increased industry will mean further housing and the school is already over-subscribed, and in a dangerous situation with the local roads. Whatever the reasons for development, building on the few remaining green field sites is surely wrong and is a great concern to us all. Rising Bridge and Stonefold have always been traditional semi-rural communities with a proud heritage, and I know I speak for many in stating that this is going to be destroyed forever.</p> <p>The Haslingden by-pass is already a congested road and the roundabout is extremely dangerous, having seen many accidents. Access will surely be made to the industrial estate from the by-pass and will cause further problems.</p> <p>In short, this is not a sensible move in any way, both for the community, the environment and the long-term future. It is something that seriously needs to be re-considered for the benefit of all.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1613	George	Cropper			Object	<p>I'm writing to object against the planning to the above site. It is totally out of character for our neighbourhood. It will cause noise, air and light pollution, which will have a huge impact on our wellbeing, also not only being in the heart of a residential community but there is also a primary school situated adjacent to the development.</p> <p>The site is green belt land and has always been protected from several attempts at development and also the wildlife will be effected.</p> <p>Rising Bridge Road is prone to flooding, the drains have had to be flushed out on a regular basis how would these drains cope with all the extra waste from the units??</p> <p>The area surrounding the site has a huge problem with parking and the volume of traffic, heavy goods vehicles struggle entering and exiting at Baxenden Chemicals because of double parking and also parking on yellow lines. There are also parents dropping off and collecting their children from school. Rising Bridge Road will not be-able to cope with the extra volume of traffic this area will be hazardous also endangering pedestrians.</p> <p>There are plenty of empty units around the surrounding area, a few on the Business park on RisingBridge Road are still vacant, units on Hud Hey Road and also Carrs Industrial estate have around 9 units available. Why do we need more??? Especially in a residential area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1629	S I	Bradley		Land adj Hollin Gate Farm	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic - This is a 'B' Road after all.</p> <p>I am disabled and have been waiting 3 months for a disabled parking bay as I am never able to park near my home.</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time? Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road.</p> <p>The problem is the same on Rising Bridge Road, traffic is so busy with the school and the offices at the far end of Rising Bridge road, we are in constant misery with traffic and parking</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment	
1630	M.A.	Turner		Land adj Hollin Gate Farm	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic - This is a 'B' Road after all</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time? Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1631	L.C.	Turner		Land adj Hollin Gate Farm	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed local plan for the above areas for the following reasons-</p> <p>1 Parking and Traffic - parking in this area is already a nightmare. Traffic and wagons on Hud Hey Road, which incidentally is also coping with the displaced traffic from Grane Road due to weight restrictions, are a constant misery for all the local residents, our properties are shaken constantly, the noise is never ending, and we cannot cope with any more traffic</p> <p>- This is a 'B' Road after all</p> <p>There is a proposal to access the Carrs Industrial Estate North Extension via land adjacent to 116 Hud Hey Road, where there is currently a small car park where up to 50% of the residents have parked for nearly 30 years, they had this land surfaced with tarmac and continue to attend it, surely they must have a claim to using this car park after all this time?</p> <p>Should it be lost there will be nowhere for them to park at all, further exacerbating the already congested parking north of the motorway bridge on Hud Hey Road</p> <p>2 The fields identified within EMP2.23 belonging to the Barnes family have been traditionally farmed for over 60 Years. No pesticides, No chemicals or heavy machinery, in fact the fields have been left this year and not cut for Hay - there must therefore be a fair degree of wildlife and also the natural habitat for wildlife to flourish which we must conserve for the future</p> <p>3 Flooding - There is a culvert running under the houses on Hud Hey Road, when there is major rainfall water running down the road from all the farms on Haslingden Old Road causes this culvert to overflow and flood many cellars on the road, if we had more major concreting of greenfield areas would this issue become far worse?</p> <p>4 Is there really a need for more new warehousing within the areas identified? We need a feasibility study in order to identify within the borough as to what is actually currently available and not being used and which would benefit from being reconfigured to a more appropriate use</p> <p>In conclusion surely there must be other brownfield and existing sites within the Haslingden area that would be more suitable to this type of development. Please look again for more sustainable sites and leave what little greenfield we have well alone.</p> <p>Haslingden is blighted by fast food take a ways, bins and warehousing and now the potential decimation of the countryside, this must not be allowed to happen</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.38	Further comment
1643	Terry	Waterhouse			Object	<p>I object to the development of Industrial Units for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. As of 06 Oct 2017 there are a minimum of 71 units available for sale or rent in Rossendale, almost all offering below market rental. This demonstrates that we do not need more units that will lay empty.</p> <p>You will know that the LCC units adjacent to Stonefold School were built using EU funds (UK taxpayers) and were unoccupied for almost 5 years. Only through favourable rent free periods and below market rent have these units been able to be let. Had these been leased at market rates commensurate with the property size and condition, I suggest that they would still be empty.</p> <p>There is currently more than 120,000sq ft of commercial unit space unoccupied throughout Rossendale, more than 3 football pitches.</p> <p>No account has been taken of the availability of units in adjacent authorities. The local Plan has taken no account of developments in neighbouring authorities. Hyndburn, Bury, Burnley and Rochdale Councils have a significant amount of industrial units available and any plan to allow development should take account of the adjacent supply.</p> <p>The clamour to develop more units seems to be based on demand, which is clearly not there, and i suggest that this is about spending money (EU or should I say UK taxpayers money) that could be better invested in other infrastructure projects such as road improvements.</p> <p>2. The land adjacent to Hollingate Farm forms part of a natural boundary between the Haslingden bypass and the domestic properties on Rising Bridge Road. This area is clearly residential and can in no way be considered 'Industrial'. Rising Bridge Road is narrow and is used as a rat run for cars, HGVs and other traffic to avoid the roundabout at Rising Bridge. The road is not suitable for increased traffic and already displays weight limitations that are ignored. The 30mph limit is not adequate due to the narrowness and young children playing. Cars are always in excess of speed limits and often more than 50mph despite the school hazard lights displaying.</p> <p>3. Stonefold School backs on to the land and it is inconceivable that industrial units will be allowed to be built next to a junior school. There are considerable dangers with increased traffic, machinery, chemicals and other goods that will inevitably contribute to injury and loss of life.</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>EMP2.38 – Direct access onto Blackburn Road appears unachievable due to the proximity to the A56 roundabout and the visibility splay requirements. Major earth moving would also be required which is a concern at this location. Access onto Rising Bridge Road is available however the route to Blackburn Road is a concern with heavy on-street residential and staff parking. The increase in HGV movements would be a concern.</p>		
Number of comments					EMP2.38	40		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
Reference		EMP2.40		Toll Bar Business Park				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Object	<p>SITE SHOULD BE ALLOCATED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE WITHIN THE EMERGING LOCAL PLAN. PLEASE SEE ACCOMPANYING STATEMENT FOR DETAILS.</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. Following the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in November 2011, RBC commenced work on its Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. However, this document was halted in favour of the preparation of a full new Local Plan which has now been issued for consultation from Monday 24 July to Monday 9 October 2017. This edition of the Local Plan comprises the Regulation 18 consultation document which sets out the Council's preferred approach to future housing, employment and leisure uses over the Plan period. Once adopted the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy (2011).</p> <p>1.2 Within the draft Local Plan, sites have been proposed for development (for housing or employment use), for environmental protection and for recreation uses, as identified on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation Areas, along with an extension to an existing Conservation Area, are being considered.</p> <p>1.3 Documents included in the Draft Local Plan Consultation are the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement), the accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>1.4 The evidence base which supports the Local Plan comprises the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017). • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017). • Employment Land Review (2017). • Green Belt Review (2016). • Environmental Network Study (2017). • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (2016). • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study (2017). • Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) (previously published). • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2016). • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing (2017). • Landscape Study (2015) (previously published). • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published). • Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites (2017). <p>1.5 In addition to the above documents, the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, although not strictly</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>evidence, has informed the development of the draft policies.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed by B&E Boys Ltd to review and comment on the emerging Local Plan in relation to the site known as Toll Bar Business Park on Newchurch Road, Stacksteads. The site is allocated for employment uses under draft Policy Reference EMP2.40, and this Representation sets out why the Council should allocate the land for housing.</p> <p>1.7 A title plan is provided at Appendix 1 to indicate the location of the site and to demonstrate that the site is within a single ownership, however Figure 1.1 below is also provided for assistance to illustrate the location of the site in Stacksteads Ward:</p> <p>Figure 1.1 Location of subject site, Toll Bar Business Park, Newchurch Road (circled in red).</p> <p>1.8 The 0.8 ha site lies on the southern side of Newchurch Road, close to the junction with Booth Road, with vehicular access taken directly from this main road. The site is located approximately 1.6 km from the centre of Bacup town and comprises a large five storey mill building, smaller mill building additions, newer single and two storey industrial buildings, with large areas of hardstanding which are used for storage and car parking. The site is occupied in part by existing commercial businesses, but much of the floorspace in the upper storeys of the large mill building are unoccupied and have remained vacant for a long period of time due to the condition of the building and its suitability for modern-day commercial practices.</p> <p>1.9 The owners of the site wish to promote the site for a housing allocation in the emerging Local Plan and this Representation will demonstrate its suitability for this use as the site is located in the Urban Boundary, in a sustainable location, and on a main arterial route in the Borough.</p> <p>SCOPE</p> <p>1.10 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>1.11 This document follows earlier Representations and discussions made by Mr Brian Boys as part of previous consultation stages in the Local Plan process, albeit that parts of the Local Plan were subsequently halted in favour of a complete new Local Plan.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.12 The starting point for consideration of the emerging Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Local Plan document.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The RBC Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain's demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.</p> <p>These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”. <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168). HOUSING</p> <p>2.21 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.22 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>their area.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.25 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.26 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE – LAUNCHED 6 MARCH 2014</p> <p>2.28 On 28 August 2013 the government launched its draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The draft NPPG was subject to consultation for 6</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>weeks and was launched on 6 March in its final form. The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.29 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Report, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms): “Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.30 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306): “WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply.”</p> <p>2.31 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 of the section titled ‘Local Plans’ (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that: “HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED? To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.”</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.32 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.33 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.34 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.35 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>2.36 Crucially the link between housing growth and economic activity must be recognised and therefore the current consultation is considered to be relevant to this Representation in relation to land at Toll Bar Business Centre.</p> <p>3. POLICY EMP2: EMPLOYMENT SITE ALLOCATIONS</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3.1 Draft Policy EMP2: Employment Site Allocations identifies all sites within the Borough which have been allocated for employment development. For each site allocated, site area, available area for development and proposed use class is set out within the allocations table.</p> <p>3.2 Toll Bar Business Centre is identified as Employment Allocation Ref. EMP2.40 as shown below. It is classed as an ‘existing employment’ site and is considered suitable for B1, B2 and B8 uses.</p> <p>Fig. 3.1 Extract from Site Allocations Table (Policy EMP2)</p> <p>3.3 The proposed allocation is identified in Figure 3.2, as indicated by the red arrow.</p> <p>Fig. 3.2 Extract from Draft Proposals Map</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>3.4 We support the aims of the Local Plan to identify key development sites which are central to the delivery of the overall strategy for new and existing employment assets and the Borough's economy. Crucial to the economy is the delivery of appropriate uses in the right locations.</p> <p>3.5 The Toll Bar Business Centre site is in single land ownership, being solely within the ownership of B&E Boys Limited. The site is located on Newchurch Road, the main through-route between Rawtenstall and Bacup. The site is dominated by a five storey mill building which is positioned at the back of the pavement on Newchurch Road. There are a smaller number of car parking space located directly off Newchurch Road in front of the building. The frontage of the site extends along Newchurch Road where the mill building reduces in height to four stories to the south-east, and to two stories in the north-west corner.</p> <p>3.6 Part of the main existing mill building is a Grade II Listed Building. The Listing Entry is contained in Appendix 2. The mill, known in the Listing Entry as 'Stacksteads Mill' was listed in 1984 and was built by the brothers Robery and John Munn. The mill was originally a cotton spinning mill dating to 1833. The Listing Entry makes it clear that the main mill building, the former engine house at the west end and the extension to the mill in the north west corner form part of the Listed Building, with all other built form (i.e. the former weaving sheds, modern office block at the east end, and the extension at the south west corner) not included in the entry.</p> <p>3.7 Vehicular access is taken directly from Newchurch Road adjacent to the two storey building in the northwest corner of the site and opens up to a large area of hardstanding located to the rear of the buildings on site. Access is restrictive due to the orientation of existing buildings on site -vehicular access is a prohibitive feature to attracting prospective commercial tenants.</p> <p>3.8 Toll Bar Business Centre is only partly occupied by commercial and industrial operators and employers. In short, the site does not operate on a financially viable basis, but the land owner is committed to retaining those existing tenants for the time being.</p> <p>3.9 Given the nature of the premises and the current occupation levels at Toll Bar Business Centre, we do not consider that the proposed allocation for B1, B2 and B8 uses will secure viable use and investment in the site going forward. As referred to in the Policy Explanation, much of the committed supply of employment sites is not considered to be fit for purpose, and is often in the wrong location with sites to the west of the Borough being more attractive due to better links to the A56 and M66.</p> <p>3.10 To this end we consider that it would be more appropriate for the allocation for employment uses to be removed and for the site to be allocated for residential development. The site comprises brownfield land in a sustainable location within the urban area and is therefore considered to be entirely appropriate to contribute towards the Borough's housing need over</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>the plan period. This is considered in further detail in Sections 4 and 5 of this Representation.</p> <p>PROPOSED MODIFICATION</p> <p>3.11 The Council is respectfully requested to remove the current employment allocation EMP2.40 and allocate the site for residential development under draft Policy HS2. Residential development in this location is considered appropriate in order to facilitate the viable regeneration of the site in part or whole.</p> <p>3.12 We contend that this would properly reflect Paragraph 22 of the Framework which seeks to avoid the long term protection of employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. In such circumstances, more appropriate and viable uses, such as housing, should be acceptable.</p> <p>4. PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATION: TOLL BAR BUSINESS PARK, NEWCHURCH ROAD, STACKSTEADS SITE CONTEXT</p> <p>4.1 The site at Toll Bar Business Park represents an opportunity to deliver truly sustainable residential development. As already highlighted, the site is partly occupied by a number of commercial businesses located in the various buildings spread across the site, however the upper floors of the main, large mill building have been unoccupied for many years despite constant marketing.</p> <p>4.2 The site is in single land ownership, being solely within the ownership of B&E Boys Limited. The extent of the area we request the Council allocate for housing is edged in red on the Title Plan contained in Appendix 1. As previously identified, the site is located on Newchurch Road, the main through-route between Stacksteads and Bacup. It is dominated by a five storey mill building which is positioned at the back of the pavement on Newchurch Road. Parking is limited at the site.</p> <p>4.3 Part of the main existing mill building is a Grade II Listed Building. Access is restricted due to the orientation of existing buildings on site - vehicular access is a prohibitive feature to attracting prospective commercial tenants.</p> <p>4.4 In terms of topography, the site is relatively flat and there is a small number of low quality trees within the site boundaries. There is also a culvert which runs through the site in a north east to south-westerly direction and links into the River Irwell which is located south of the site.</p> <p>DRAFT POLICY HS1 – MEETING ROSSENDALE’S HOUSING REQUIREMENT</p> <p>4.5 Draft Policy HS1 sets out the Council’s approach to ‘Meeting Rossendale’s Housing Requirement’. It states that at least 4,000 additional dwellings will be provided over the plan period (2019-2034), in addition to addressing a prior underprovision of 425 dwellings within the first five years of the plan. The draft policy also seeks to deliver over 20% of new dwellings on previously developed land.</p> <p>4.6 In this context, land at Toll Bar Business Park could make an important</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>contribution towards meeting the Borough's residential development needs. In particular, as it is recognised within the explanatory text that brownfield sites within the urban area are limited.</p> <p>SUSTAINABLE HOUSING ALLOCATION</p> <p>4.7 The site is located in a very sustainable location, being positioned on a main bus route through the Rossendale Valley and being within close proximity to local services and amenities in Stacksteads and nearby Bacup (which is circa 1.6 km away), including, within walking distance, a Primary School. Adjacent to the site is a public house (the Rose 'N' Bowl), a bowling green, and playing fields at Stacksteads Recreation Ground. The site is adjacent to residential properties located on Commercial Street, Stuart Avenue and Miles Avenue. In this regard, the residential redevelopment of the site would be complementary to existing surrounding uses.</p> <p>4.8 Any residential redevelopment of the site could include the retention, upgrade and conversion of the Listed Building, subject to the financial viability of undertaking such works.</p> <p>4.9 However, the site may more realistically be capable of complete redevelopment.</p> <p>4.10 It has already been described how the site is only partly occupied by commercial and industrial operators and employers. In short, the site does not operate on a financially viable basis, but the land owner is committed to retaining those existing tenants for the time being. In the meanwhile, this Representation is submitted at this key stage in the Local Plan process to promote the allocation of the site for housing.</p> <p>4.11 The Representation presents an opportunity to contribute to the delivery of sustainable housing over the next 15 years, i.e. during the current Plan period, or beyond. The subject site comprises previously developed land, within the Urban Boundary, in a sustainable location and therefore would accord with the principles of sustainable development as set out in the Framework, for which there is a presumption in favour of.</p> <p>4.12 To conclude, for the reasons discussed above, in our view the site at Toll Bar Business Park should be allocated for housing in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE</p> <p>4.13 In addition to the site being promoted for a housing allocation, we wish to oppose the designation of part of the site being located within a Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>4.14 The draft Proposals Map for Stacksteads Ward shows that part of the subject site, that part which fronts onto Newchurch Road, is included in a Neighbourhood Centre. The precise boundaries of the Neighbourhood Centre are not clear on the draft Proposals Map, with no 'Inset Maps' provided which delineate the true extent of the proposed Neighbourhood Centre in relation to the site.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>4.15 Clarification is sought from the Council on this point, but in any event, we wish to oppose the proposed designation of any part of the subject site within the Neighbourhood Centre boundary, for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>4.16 According to the adopted Proposals Map (footnote: That being the saved policies from the Local Plan (1995) as shown on the Proposals Map and as amended by the adoption of the Core Strategy in November 2011) of the development Plan the site is not currently included in any Town Centre boundary. Neighbourhood Centres do not feature on the Proposals Map, but are included in the Core Strategy where Policy 11 (Retail and other Town Centre Uses) sets out the retail hierarchy in the Borough</p> <p>4.17 Paragraph 248 of Chapter 5 of the Core Strategy notes that the key town centre, district centre and local centre boundaries have been redefined in the context of PPS4 (which set out the national retail planning policy at the time the Core Strategy was adopted, but has since been superseded by the Framework). However, Paragraph 248 further states that:</p> <p>“No boundaries have been set for the smaller neighbourhood centres.”</p> <p>4.18 Chapter 3 of the Draft Local Plan relates to Retail, with draft Policy R1: Retail and Other Town Centre Uses confirming that Neighbourhood Centre boundaries are identified on the Proposals Maps for four areas, including Stacksteads. The Policy states that development proposals will be expected to maintain or strengthen the retail offer and vitality and viability of neighbourhood centres. The Policy further states that:</p> <p>“Proposals that require planning permission which would result in the loss of A1 uses in all levels of retail centre as defined in Core Strategy Policy 11 will only be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would make a positive contribution to the vitality and viability of the relevant centre; • It would not result in a significant break in retail frontage or lead to the loss of retail floorspace at a scale that would be harmful to the shopping function of the centre or which would reduce the ability of local communities to meet their day-to-day needs within the centre; • It is compatible with a retail area and would maintain an active frontage and be immediately accessible to the public from the street; and • There would be no significant adverse impacts on the character of the area, the amenity of local residents, road safety, car parking or traffic flows. <p>4.19 Some of the units within the proposed Neighbourhood Centre at the subject site are used for retail purposes serving the general public. However, the current retailers operate from dated premises which lack modern facilities, lack safe car parking areas, and are difficult to access for deliveries and other servicing purposes.</p> <p>4.20 The loss of these units from this part of the Stacksteads Neighbourhood</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						<p>Centre would not harm the objectives of Policy 11 (in the Core Strategy) or draft Policy R1 as the loss of these inadequate retail premises would not harm the shopping function of the centre, nor would it reduce the ability of the local communities to meet their day-to-day needs within the centre.</p> <p>4.21 The proposed Stacksteads Neighbourhood Centre designation extends along Newchurch Road beyond the subject site boundaries, with a natural break in this linear form at the subject site - to the west adjacent to the Rose 'N' Bowl public house (where the Toll Bar building gable end meets the public right of way between the subject site and the public house), and to the east at Commercial Street.</p> <p>4.22 To that end, the Neighbourhood Centre designation should not extend into the boundaries of the subject site to enable the full and proper redevelopment of the subject site for alternative uses other than retail.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL STUDIES</p> <p>4.23 Studies are ongoing in relation to the listed building, flood risk and marketing of the existing premises and we reserve the right to submit these at a later stage of the Local Plan preparation process.</p> <p>5. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>5.1 The starting point for consideration of the Council's Local Plan is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the Framework that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>5.2 The Framework is clear at Paragraph 22 that planning policies should avoid the long-term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Paragraph 160 outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>5.3 It has been highlighted in this Representation that the Toll Bar Business Centre site is no longer appealing to modern businesses. As a result, and in order to future-proof the site, removal of the proposed employment allocation is recommended, and a residential allocation should be considered in order to promote sustainable residential development. Land at Toll Bar Business Centre has an opportunity to contribute to the delivery of housing over the Plan period on a site which comprises previously developed land within the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>5.4 In conclusion, Local Plan Policy EMP2 should be modified to remove reference to the Forest Mill site to allow a more flexible approach for redevelopment of the site over the plan period. Further, the site should be considered for allocation under draft Policy HS2 for residential development.</p> <p>Appendix 1</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.40	Further comment
						Appendix 2 Please see appendix for the attachements and appendices		
Number of comments		EMP2.40				1		
Reference		EMP2.50		Riverside Business Park				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Not Applicable	<p>THIS ALLOCATION SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE LAND WITHIN THE GREEN BELT. SEE SUBMITTED REPRESENTATION REPORT FOR FULL DETAILS.</p> <p>Email received 11/10/2017:</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>BRIEF</p> <p>1.1 Hourigan Connolly is instructed by B&E Boys Ltd in respect of its land interests at Townsend Fold, Rawtenstall – also known as Riverside Business Park. The land in question is identified in Figure 1.1 below and is hereafter referred to as “the site”.</p> <p>Figure 1.1 – Land at Townsend Fold, Rawtenstall – not to scale.</p> <p>1.2 A full Title Plan is included at Appendix 1. The Riverside Business Park site (the former Mill site) falls within the urban boundary with the remainder of the site falling within the Green Belt. The latest iteration of the Council’s Green Belt Assessment refers to that part of the site within the Green Belt as Parcel Ref. 19.</p> <p>1.3 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. Following the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in November 2011, RBC commenced work on its Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. However, this document was halted in favour of the preparation of a full new Local Plan which has now been issued for consultation from Monday 24 July to Monday 9 October 2017. This edition of the Local Plan comprises the Regulation 18 consultation document which sets out the Council’s preferred approach to future housing, employment and leisure uses over the Plan period. Once adopted the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy (2011).</p> <p>1.4 Within the draft Local Plan, sites have been proposed for development (for housing or employment use), for environmental protection and for recreation uses, as identified on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>Also, four additional Conservation Areas, along with an extension to an existing Conservation Area, are being considered.</p> <p>1.5 Documents included in the Draft Local Plan Consultation are the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement), the accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>1.6 The evidence base which supports the Local Plan comprises the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017). • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017). • Employment Land Review (2017). • Green Belt Review (2016). • Environmental Network Study (2017). 	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (2016). • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study (2017). • Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) (previously published). • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2016). • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing (2017). • Landscape Study (2015) (previously published). • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published). • Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites (2017). <p>1.7 In addition to the above documents, the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, although not strictly evidence, has informed the development of the draft policies.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.8 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the emerging Local Plan in relation to the site known as Townsend Fold, Holme Lane in Rawtenstall. Part of the site is allocated for employment uses under draft Policy Reference EMP2.50 (Riverside Business Park) with the remainder of the site falling within the Green Belt, and this Representation sets out why the Council should consider amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in order to accommodate an expanding and successful employment site.</p> <p>1.9 B&E Boys supports the allocation of the Riverside Business Park site for employment uses as identified in the draft Local Plan. The remainder of this Representation therefore focuses on that part of the site which is currently in the Green Belt.</p> <p>SCOPE</p> <p>1.10 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>1.11 This document follows earlier Representations and discussions made by Mr Brian Boys as part of previous consultation stages in the Local Plan process, albeit that parts of the Local Plan were subsequently halted in favour of a complete new Local Plan.</p> <p>1.12 This representation is structured as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative and Policy Context. • The Site. • Green Belt Review. • Proposed Extended Employment Allocation. • Conclusions. <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Local Plan document.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The RBC Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain's demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”. <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168). GREEN BELT</p> <p>2.21 In respect of Green Belt Paragraph 80 of the Framework lists the five national purposes of the Green Belt as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; • To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and, • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>2.22 Paragraph 83 goes on to state that Local Planning Authorities (LPA’s) with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 84 states when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 85 sets out that when defining new Green Belt boundaries LPA's should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development; • not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open; • where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; • make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development; • satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and 2.25 define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.26 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>HOUSING</p> <p>2.28 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.29 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>meet this demand”.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.30 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.31 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.32 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE – LAUNCHED 6 MARCH 2014</p> <p>2.33 On 28 August 2013 the government launched its draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The draft NPPG was subject to consultation for 6 weeks and was launched on 6 March in its final form. The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.34 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Report, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030- 20140306 confirms):</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>“Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.35 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031- 20140306):</p> <p>“WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY?</p> <p>Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years.</p> <p>However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe.</p> <p>The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply.”</p> <p>2.36 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 of the section titled ‘Local Plans’ (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that:</p> <p>“HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED?</p> <p>To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.”</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.37 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.38 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.39 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.40 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>2.41 Crucially the link between housing growth and economic activity must be recognised and therefore the current consultation is considered to be relevant to this Representation in relation to land at Townsend Fold.</p> <p>3. THE SITE</p> <p>SITE LOCATION</p> <p>3.1 The site's general location is identified below in Figure 3.1.</p> <p>3.2 The existing business park is located to the south of Holme Lane, with the remaining Green Belt land located to the west. Bury Road is located a short distance to the east, providing links into Rawtenstall to the north and to Edenfield, and beyond, to the south.</p> <p>3.3 As is evident from the aerial image above, land to the west of Riverside Business Park has a close physical relationship with the existing built up part of the settlement, which is further reinforced by the A56 and A682 which both provide a physical boundary to the west.</p> <p>SITE DESCRIPTION</p> <p>3.4 The site extends to 3.6 hectares and comprises vacant greenfield land, a reservoir and an area of previously developed land used for industrial and storage purposes.</p> <p>3.5 The site which is the subject of this representation is located within the Green Belt. It is bordered by the existing business park and associated employment units to the east and Holme Lane to the north. There are fields to the north west and north of the site, although beyond this is the A682 and buildings at Holme Farm/Holme Manor. There is further greenfield land to the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>south of the site. The River Irwell runs along the eastern boundary of the Green Belt parcel, separating it from the existing Riverside Business Park.</p> <p>CURRENT OCCUPIERS</p> <p>3.6 The existing employment site is fully occupied by a range of businesses. Most notably the site is home to Lucite International which produces chemical solutions for sports pitch markings (amongst other things). The firm has seen rapid growth over recent years and requires larger premises to accommodate the growing business. Their preference is to remain at the current site, however, if premises are not forthcoming on this site they will be forced to look elsewhere and, given the lack of modern and accessible premises in Rossendale, this inevitably means relocating to outside the Borough. The land owner is keen to meet Lucite's requirements, however, it can only do so with some expansion into the Green Belt.</p> <p>SURROUNDING AREA</p> <p>3.7 The subject site is located adjacent to Riverside Business Park which is currently utilised for various employment uses, by a variety of occupiers. Further to the east, is an established residential area in this southern part of Rawtenstall. Importantly, the site is separated from the main residential area by the business park.</p> <p>3.8 Holme Manor Retirement Centre lies to the north west of the site, though there is an area of separation between the site boundary and the retirement centre.</p> <p>3.9 To the south of the site is open countryside, though this is sandwiched between the A56 and Bury Road in this location.</p> <p>3.10 Rawtenstall town centre lies to the north east, offering a range of services and facilities.</p> <p>3.11 This unremarkable site has a close physical relationship with the existing settlement and it does not relate to the wider countryside which is largely located to the south.</p> <p>FLOOD RISK</p> <p>3.12 According to the Flood Map for Planning provided by the Environment Agency, the majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1. Parts of the existing employment site fall in Flood Zone 2 and a narrow channel following the course of the River Irwell is within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p> <p>3.13 The Council commissioned a Landscape Character Assessment in 2015. The document separates areas of the Borough into various landscape character types. The subject site which is located on the edge of the urban area of Rawtenstall broadly falls into an area identified as 'Settled Valley', on the edge of an area identified as 'Industrial Age' and in close proximity to an area of 'Suburban' landscape. The area is not identified as one which is of particular value.</p> <p>3.14 The Landscape Character Assessment goes on to assess specific sites in</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>relation to their development potential, although land at Townsend Fold is not considered in detail in this regard.</p> <p>An area close to the site to the east was, however, assessed – land at Haslam Farm. It was concluded that parts of this site were suitable for development and this would have a negligible impact upon the surrounding landscape with mitigation measures in place.</p> <p>PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY</p> <p>3.15 Footpath number 14-4-FP309 runs through part of the business park as shown in Figure 3.4 below (albeit this is marked on the key as a temporary closure), but there are no public right of way running through the Green Belt land.</p> <p>AGRICULTURAL LAND QUALITY</p> <p>3.16 According to the agricultural land quality database, land in this area is considered to be of poor or very poor value. This is identified in Figure 3.5 below.</p> <p>ECOLOGY</p> <p>3.17 The site is not a statutory Ecological or Heritage asset neither is it within 1 km of a National Nature Reserve, Ramsar Site, Site of Special Scientific Interest or Special Protected Area.</p> <p>HERITAGE</p> <p>3.18 Holme Bridge which is located to the north of the site on Holme Lane is Grade II Listed (Listing ID: 185784 Holme Bridge). The listing text states the following: Bridge, probably late C18. Coursed simply-dressed sandstone. Vernacular materials used in formal style: 2 segmental arches with rusticated voussoirs, a pilaster at each end and another to the pier, which has a cutwater; band, and slab-walled parapet (part replaced by rubble).</p> <p>SUMMARY</p> <p>3.19 In summary, none of the statutory or other designations identified would preclude development of the site.</p> <p>4. GREEN BELT REVIEW</p> <p>4.1 As part of the evidence base to inform the emerging Local Plan, a Green Belt Review was carried out by LUC with the final report being published in November 2016. The purpose of the review was to carry out an independent and comprehensive assessment of Green Belt within the Borough to inform the preparation of the new Local Plan. One of the key aims of the review was to provide clear conclusions on the relative performance of Green Belt which will enable Rossendale Borough Council to consider whether there are ‘exceptional circumstances’ (as per Paragraph 83 of the Framework) to justify altering Green Belt boundaries through the Local Plan process to meet development needs.</p> <p>4.2 As previously identified, the Framework sets out five purposes of the Green Belt as follows:</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; • To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and, • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>4.3 In common with other studies we have reviewed, the LUC Green Belt Assessment firstly establishes Green Belt parcels – in this instance there are 80 parcels included within five broad areas of Green Belt. In that respect the subject site falls within Parcel 19, as identified below.</p> <p>4.4 Parcels were formed through the identification of land that contains the same or very similar land uses or character bounded by recognisable features. These features are described as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural features i.e. substantial watercourses; and • Manmade features i.e. motorways A and B roads, railways. <p>4.5 Less prominent features such as walls, woodland, hedges, tree lines, streams and ditches were also considered where other more permanent boundaries were not present.</p> <p>4.6 Two types of parcel were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas adjacent to built up areas (relatively small parcels); and • Broad areas of Green Belt that may be more remote from settlement. <p>4.7 The boundary of Parcel 19 is identified in further detail in Figure 4.2 below.</p> <p>4.8 An assessment has then been made by LUC as to the ratings of the Green Belt parcels in Rossendale against the first four objectives of including land within the Green Belt as set out in Paragraph 80 of the Framework.</p> <p>Figure 4.3 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) – Overall Assessment Table Figure 4.4 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) – Parcel Ratings</p> <p>4.9 It can be seen in Figure 4.3 that the Council’s Green Belt Assessment for Parcel 19 concluded that the parcel has a ‘strong’ role in relation to Purpose 2, a ‘moderate’ role in relation to Purpose 3 and ‘no contribution’ in relation to Purpose 4. Purpose 1 was considered to be ‘not applicable’ given the nature of the urban area of Rawtenstall. Purpose 5 is not detailed within the table given that all sites have been considered as equal in this regard.</p> <p>4.10 Our response is detailed below.</p> <p>PARCEL 19</p> <p>4.11 The assessment for Parcel 19 states that it lies on the edge of Rawtenstall within the green gap between Rawtenstall and Haslingden.</p> <p>4.12 In our view Parcel 19 is far too broad a study area which has led to skewed conclusions being reached by LUC. In our opinion there is a clear distinction between the northern most part of Parcel 19 to that in the south. In that respect we comment on the conclusions reached by LUC below.</p> <p>PURPOSE 1: TO CHECK THE UNRESTRICTED SPRAWL OF LARGE BUILT UP AREA</p> <p>4.13 As identified within the assessment of the subject site, the land lies on</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>the edge of Rawtenstall which is not considered as a 'large built up area' and so the checking of unrestricted sprawl of such a built up area is not relevant in this instance. In any event, even if this purpose were considered appropriate, the physical barrier of the A56 and A682 to the west of the site ensures that development of the subject site would not result in unrestricted sprawl.</p> <p>4.14 Result: No contribution.</p> <p>PURPOSE 2: TO PREVENT NEIGHBOURING TOWNS MERGING INTO ONE ANOTHER</p> <p>4.15 Clearly development of the subject site would not result in the merging of towns as a matter of fact as the site is physically well contained by the A56 and A682. Within the Council's assessment, it is stated that the parcel has an important role in maintaining a gap between Rawtenstall and Haslingden, however we consider that this gap would be maintained in any case due to the existing road infrastructure. It should also be considered that the subject site, that within our client's ownership, does not extend to the area shown in Figure 4.1 above and so development will not be as far as the road (please refer to Title Plan in Appendix 1).</p> <p>4.16 Result: No contribution.</p> <p>PURPOSE 3: TO ASSIST IN SAFEGUARDING THE COUNTRYSIDE FROM ENCROACHMENT</p> <p>4.17 In our view the site does not assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Due to the site's proximity to the Mill and its various employment uses, the nearby roads and indeed residential development in close proximity, the character of the subject site does not have a strong rural character. There is no basis for the Council considering that this site has a moderate role in this regard.</p> <p>4.18 The site is enclosed and has strong defensible boundaries which would safeguard the countryside from encroachment. This is particularly the case for the northern part of Parcel 19 to which this representation relates and this highlights the issues that can occur when too large a Green Belt parcel is considered together, resulting in inaccurate conclusions.</p> <p>4.19 Result: No contribution.</p> <p>TOWNS</p> <p>4.20 The analysis in the Green Belt Review considers our client's site to make no contribution to this purpose. We agree with this conclusion.</p> <p>4.21 Result: No contribution.</p> <p>PURPOSE 5: TO ASSIST IN URBAN REGENERATION BY ENCOURAGING THE RECYCLING OF DERELICT & OTHER URBAN LAND</p> <p>4.22 It is noted that in line with the methodology all sites have been considered as having an equal contribution to this purpose, though it is not stated what this is.</p> <p>4.23 Result: Equal contribution.</p> <p>COMPARISON SITES</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>4.24 Figure 4.3 below identifies other Green Belt sites in and around Rawtenstall and Haslingden which have been assessed as part of the Green Belt Review. The plan also goes further to identify those sites which are considered potentially suitable for Green Belt release and subsequently for development (these sites are identified in blue).</p> <p>Figure 4.5 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) – Sites Considered to be suitable for Green Belt Release</p> <p>4.25 Given the specific nature and characteristics of the subject site, in particular as a successful employment site with occupiers seeking to expand their existing premises, it is difficult to consider other sites which may serve these needs. Indeed, if forced to move from one site in Rawtenstall (or its vicinity) to another, there is the possibility that businesses could be attracted to other areas outside of the Borough.</p> <p>4.26 Having regard to Figure 4.3 however, we note that the only two sites in this southern part of Rawtenstall, and to the east of the A56, which are identified as potentially suitable for development are Parcel 21 and Parcel 17. We consider these sites briefly below.</p> <p>PARCEL 21</p> <p>4.27 Parcel 21 is the closest site to the subject site which is put forward as potentially suitable for development. The site is immediately adjacent to Riverside Business Park, on the opposite side of the railway line. In terms of its assessment, Parcel 21 was scored as follows:</p> <p>Figure 4.6 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) Sites Summary Table – Parcel 21</p> <p>4.28 Having reviewed the individual site assessment for this parcel, it is identified that the parcel is on the settlement edge of Rawtenstall and forms a small part of the gap between Rawtenstall and Haslingden. Under the assessment for Purpose 2 it is stated that the parcel plays an important role in providing separation between the settlement area of Wood Top and the Riverside Business Park, but as both of these urban areas form part of Rawtenstall this has not been taken into account with regard to Purpose 2.</p> <p>4.29 In relation to Purpose 3, it is concluded that the site lacks a strong rural character which we concur is the case in this location more generally.</p> <p>PARCEL 17</p> <p>4.30 Parcel 17 is also considered to have a relatively weak role in terms of its Green Belt designation. This parcel is closer to the Rawtenstall Town Centre and therefore is of less relevance to the subject site.</p> <p>Figure 4.7 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) Sites Summary Table – Parcel 17</p> <p>4.31 Notably, it is concluded in the assessment that this parcel is not considered critical in terms of its role maintaining the separation between Rawtenstall and Haslingden as this role is carried out by Parcels 14,15 and 16 further to the west.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>4.32 The subject site (Parcel 19) is further to the south of these key parcels, with its boundaries clearly defined by road structures, again highlighting the parcel's suitability for Green Belt release and the minimal impact this would have on the surrounding area.</p> <p>OVERALL ASSESSMENT</p> <p>4.33 We consider the assessment which has been carried out for the subject site, which comprises part of the land included within Parcel 19 to be flawed as it overestimates the value of the Green Belt in this location. In addition, there are distinct differences between the land included in the northern part of the parcel and that in the south.</p> <p>4.34 We advocate that our client's land makes no contribution to four of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt and the remaining purpose 5 cannot be used for assessment purposes as all of the sites in the Borough are given equal weighting.</p> <p>4.35 In line with the Council's methodology the overall assessment for our client's site should therefore be weak.</p> <p>4.36 We consider the subject site as an appropriate site for release from the Green Belt as it is adjacent to the settlement boundary and is controlled by defensible boundaries and has existing development on 3 sides. The site would form a logical extension to the south of Rawtenstall and in particular to the established employment site at Townsend Fold.</p> <p>4.37 We reserve the right to make further representations in support of the release of the subject site from the Green Belt.</p> <p>5. PROPOSED EXTENDED EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATION</p> <p>SITE CONTEXT</p> <p>5.1 The subject site at Townsend Fold represents an opportunity to deliver truly sustainable employment development. As already highlighted, the Riverside Business Park site is occupied by a number of commercial businesses located in the various buildings spread across the site, however there is demand for further employment space on the site.</p> <p>5.2 Riverside Business Park's success is based upon its location. It is situated off Bury Road, Rawtenstall and offers easy access to the town centre facilities including banks, post offices, shops and cafes. It is also within easy reach of the motorway networks, with the A56 providing good links to both the M65 and M66. As a result, the site is within easy reach of Manchester, Bolton, Blackburn, Bury, Rochdale, Burnley and beyond.</p> <p>5.3 Units at Riverside Business Park are reasonably modern with good access for goods vehicles and ample parking. Current tenants range from shoe manufacturers, furniture makers and a line marking company (Lucite International) who received a Queens Award for Innovation. As previously detailed, Lucite International is seeking to extend its operations at the site. Unfortunately, if their requirements cannot be met within the existing site they will inevitably be looking for alternative premises outside of the Borough.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>Given the rapid decline in industry in the Borough of Rossendale, the retention of successful businesses such as this one is key to the Borough's future prosperity.</p> <p>5.4 Whilst the existing employment site is allocated within the draft plan under draft Policy EMP2.50, we consider that the adjoining Green Belt land, which is also in the same ownership, could provide an appropriate extension which will allow the employment site to retain its valued occupiers and remain competitive over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>5.5 Both the existing employment site and the adjoining Green Belt land is in single land ownership, being solely within the ownership of B&E Boys Limited.</p> <p>DRAFT POLICY EMP1 – PROVISION FOR EMPLOYMENT</p> <p>5.6 Draft Policy EMP1 sets out the Council's approach to 'Provision for Employment'. It states that the Council will seek to provide sufficient land to meet the Borough's requirement of 27 hectares for business, general industrial or storage and distribution (Use Classes B1, B2, B8) for the period up to 2034.</p> <p>5.7 Within the explanatory text it is identified that, as evidenced by the Employment Land Review (2017), there is a lack of good quality small to medium sized industrial premises (B2 and B8 uses) which is in turn suppressing demand. It is further identified that the need for industrial premises is greatest in the west of the Borough where sites benefit from good access to the A56 and M66.</p> <p>5.8 It is generally recognised that Rossendale has seen a significant decline in employment levels since 1997, however it still has an active industrial market and suitable and sufficient premises need to be provided in order for the Borough to remain competitive.</p> <p>DRAFT POLICY EMP2 – EMPLOYMENT SITE ALLOCATIONS</p> <p>5.9 Draft policy EMP2 allocates sites for employment use over the plan period, including both existing sites and new allocations. The existing employment site at Townsend Fold is referred to under draft Policy reference EMP2.50 'Riverside Business Park'. It is stated that the site is suitable for B1, B2 and B8 uses and the total site area is 6.04ha.</p> <p>Figure 5.1 Extract from draft Policy EMP2 Allocations Table</p> <p>5.10 The site is identified on the draft Proposals Map as shown below.</p> <p>Figure 5.2 Extract from Draft Proposals Map</p> <p>5.11 We support the continued allocation of this site for employment uses, as recommended in the Employment Land Review (2017). It enjoys high levels of occupation and indeed requires expansion in order to meet the demands of current occupiers. The site has good links to A56 and the M66 beyond this and therefore demand from occupiers has remained high in comparison to other more limited parts of the Borough.</p> <p>5.12 The long-term prospects of the business park are however, dependent upon the ability for expansion.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>A SUSTAINABLE EXTENDED EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATION</p> <p>5.13 The existing Riverside Business Park represents a prime opportunity for expanding an existing successful employment location for the benefit of the Borough as a whole.</p> <p>5.14 The site is located in a very sustainable location, in close proximity to Rawtenstall Town Centre and with good road and motorway links to destinations further afield. Despite being within the urban boundary of Rawtenstall, the employment site sits well with nearby residential uses and is separated by the physical presence of the railway line to the east of the site.</p> <p>5.15 The proposed expansion site, whilst currently in the Green Belt, does not perform well against the established Green Belt purposes. The site is well contained by existing road infrastructure and provides an opportunity for sensitive expansion of the existing business park, without being detrimental to the Green Belt or other surrounding uses.</p> <p>5.16 The expansion of the existing business park would not only provide more space and better quality employment units, but any capital generated would also help to improve the existing units making them more attractive to occupiers and further securing the long term future of Riverside Business Park.</p> <p>5.17 This proposal presents an opportunity to ensure the continued delivery of a sustainable and successful employment site over the next 15 years, which will in turn make a significant contribution to Rossendale Borough's economy and attract further investment. The subject site and the case made for development therefore presents the exceptional circumstances as set out in the Framework which would allow an amendment to the Green Belt boundary through the preparation of a new Local Plan.</p> <p>5.18 To conclude, for the reasons discussed above, in our view the site at Riverside Business Park should be extended to allow for a more substantial employment allocation in this area.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL STUDIES</p> <p>5.19 Studies are ongoing in relation to this site and we reserve the right to submit these at a later stage of the Local Plan preparation process.</p> <p>PROPOSED MODIFICATION</p> <p>5.20 The Council is respectfully requested to extend the current employment allocation EMP2.50 to include the remainder of land within the ownership of B&E Boys Ltd and amend the Green Belt boundary accordingly. The extension of this existing employment site is considered entirely appropriate in order to secure the long-term future of the site and ensure that Rawtenstall (and the Borough more widely) is able to retain important local employers.</p> <p>5.21 We contend that this would properly reflect the provisions of Paragraph 83 of the Framework which sets out that amendments to Green Belt boundaries can only be made in exceptional circumstances and through the local plan process. In additional, the amendment to the Green Belt boundary in this instance would be fully in accordance with Paragraph 84 of the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.50	Further comment
						<p>Framework which sets out that such amendments should only be made to facilitate sustainable development patterns.</p> <p>6. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>6.1 The starting point for consideration of the Council’s Local Plan is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the Framework that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>6.2 The Framework is clear at Paragraph 83 that Green Belt boundaries can be amended in exceptional circumstances, through the local plan process. Paragraph 84 further states that this can only be done in order to facilitate sustainable development.</p> <p>6.3 It has been highlighted in this Representation that the land adjacent to the existing Riverside Business Park does not meet the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in Paragraph 80. As a result, and in order to future-proof the site, an extension to the existing employment site is recommended following the land ownership boundary of B&E Boys. Through implementing this sustainable extension, land at Riverside Business Park has an opportunity to be a significant contributor to the local economy in Rawtenstall, and the Borough of Rossendale more widely.</p> <p>6.4 In conclusion, Local Plan Policy EMP2.50 should be modified to include land to the west of Riverside Business Park and this land should be removed from the Green Belt accordingly.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		
<p>Number of comments EMP2.50</p>						1		
Reference			EMP2.51		Forest Mill			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Object	<p>THE SITE SHOULD NOT BE ALLOCATED FOR EMPLOYMENT USE DUE TO ITS LOCATION AND IMMIDENT VOIDS. PLEASE SEE SUBMITTED REPORT FOR FULL REPRESENTATION DETAILS.</p> <p>Email received 10/11/17:</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. Following the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in November 2011, RBC commenced work on its Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. However, this document was halted in favour of the preparation of a full new Local Plan which has now been issued for consultation from Monday 24 July to Monday 9 October 2017. This edition of the Local Plan comprises the Regulation 18 consultation document which sets out the Council's preferred approach to future housing, employment and leisure uses over the Plan period. Once adopted the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy (2011).</p> <p>1.2 Within the draft Local Plan, sites have been proposed for development (for housing or employment use), for environmental protection and for recreation uses, as identified on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation Areas, along with an extension to an existing Conservation Area, are being considered. 1.3 Documents included in the Draft Local Plan Consultation are the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement), the accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 1.4 The evidence base which supports the Local Plan comprises the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017). • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017). • Employment Land Review (2017). • Green Belt Review (2016). • Environmental Network Study (2017). • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (2016). • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study (2017). • Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) (previously published). • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2016). • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing (2017). • Landscape Study (2015) (previously published). • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published). • Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites (2017). <p>1.5 In addition to the above documents, the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, although not strictly evidence, has informed the development of the draft</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
						<p>policies.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed by Brother Investments Ltd to review and comment on the emerging Local Plan in relation to the Forest Mill site in Water. The site is allocated for employment uses under draft Policy Reference EMP2.51.</p> <p>1.7 The site lies on the western side of Burnley Road East in the area of Water, approximately 3 km north of Waterfoot and approximately 5 km north east of Rawtenstall. The site is located on a main arterial route through Rosendale borough and is in an existing employment use.</p> <p>SCOPE</p> <p>1.8 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>1.9 This document follows earlier Representations and discussions made by Mr Brian Boys as part of previous consultation stages in the Local Plan process, albeit that parts of the Local Plan were subsequently halted in favour of a complete new Local Plan.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.10 The starting point for consideration of the emerging Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Local Plan document.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The RBC Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
						<p>Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain’s demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development. These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
						<p>natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”.</p> <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
						<p>relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168).</p> <p>HOUSING</p> <p>2.21 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.22 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.25 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.26 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
					<p>and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE – LAUNCHED 6 MARCH 2014</p> <p>2.28 On 28 August 2013 the government launched its draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The draft NPPG was subject to consultation for 6 weeks and was launched on 6 March in its final form. The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.29 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Report, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms): “Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.30 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306): “WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
						<p>is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply.”</p> <p>2.31 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 of the section titled ‘Local Plans’ (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that: “HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED? To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.”</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.32 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.33 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.34 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.35 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
						<p>heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>2.36 Crucially the link between housing growth and economic activity must be recognised and therefore the current consultation is considered to be relevant to this Representation in relation to land at Forest Mill.</p> <p>3. POLICY EMP2: EMPLOYMENT SITE ALLOCATIONS</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3.1 Draft Policy EMP2: Employment Site Allocations identifies all sites within the Borough which have been allocated for employment development. For each site allocated, site area, available area for development and proposed use class is set out within the allocations table.</p> <p>3.2 The Forest Mill site is identified as Employment Allocation Ref. EMP2.51 as shown below. It is classed as an 'existing employment' site and is considered suitable for B1, B2 and B8 uses.</p> <p>Fig. 1 Extract from Site Allocations Table (Policy EMP2)</p> <p>3.3 The proposed allocation is identified in Figure 2.</p> <p>Fig. 2 Extract from Draft Proposals Map (with red arrow indicating the site)</p> <p>3.4 We support the aims of the Local Plan to identify key development sites which are central to the delivery of the overall strategy for new and existing employment assets and the Borough's economy. Crucial to the economy is the delivery of appropriate uses in the right locations.</p> <p>3.5 The Forest Mill site fronts onto Burnley Road East, located near Lower House Green in Water. The site is in single land ownership, being solely within the ownership of Brother Investments Ltd, and comprises a mixture of single and multi-storey mill buildings with limited vehicle access to the front and rear single storey section. The owner has experienced an upturn in the number of leases ending without renewal in recent months, owing to occupiers closing down or seeking more modern and adaptable premises.</p> <p>3.6 Given the nature of the premises and the recent loss of tenants at Forest Mill, we do not consider that the proposed allocation for B1, B2 and B8 uses will secure viable use and investment in the site going forward. As referred to in the Policy Explanation, much of the committed supply of employment sites is not considered to be fit for purpose, and is often in the wrong location with sites to the west of the Borough being more attractive due to better links to the A56 and M66.</p> <p>3.7 To this end we consider that it would be more appropriate for the allocation for employment uses to be removed and for the site to be allocated for residential development. The site comprises brownfield land in a sustainable location within the urban area and is therefore considered to be entirely appropriate to contribute towards the Borough's housing need over the plan period.</p> <p>PROPOSED MODIFICATION</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.51	Further comment
						<p>3.8 The Council is respectfully requested to remove the current employment allocation EMP2.51 and allocate the site for residential development under draft Policy HS2. Residential development in this location is considered appropriate in order to facilitate the viable regeneration of the site in part or whole.</p> <p>3.9 We contend that this would properly reflect Paragraph 22 of the Framework which seeks to avoid the long term protection of employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. In such circumstances, more appropriate and viable uses, such as housing, should be acceptable.</p> <p>4. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>4.1 The starting point for consideration of the Council’s Local Plan is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the Framework that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>4.2 The Framework is clear at Paragraph 22 that planning policies should avoid the long-term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Paragraph 160 outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>4.3 It has been highlighted in this Representation that the site at Forest Mill on Burnley Road East is no longer appealing to modern businesses and indeed there has been a notable loss of tenants in the building in recent months. As a result, and in order to future-proof the site, removal of the proposed employment allocation is recommended, along with consideration of the site for sustainable residential development. Land at Forest Mill has an opportunity to contribute to the delivery of housing over the Plan period on a site which comprises previously developed land within the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>4.4 In conclusion, Local Plan Policy EMP2 should be modified to remove reference to the Forest Mill site to allow a more flexible approach for redevelopment of the site over the plan period. Further, the site should be considered for allocation under draft Policy HS2 for residential development. Please see appendix</p>		
<p>Number of comments EMP2.51</p>						1		
Reference			EMP2.52		Isle of Man Mill			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.52	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Support	<p>WE SUPPORT THE PROPOSED MIXED USE ALLOCATION FOR THIS SITE. PLEASE SEE REPRESENTATION LETTER FOR MORE DETAILS.</p> <p>Email received 10/11/2017: ISLE OF MAN MILL, WATER</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. This consultation is the first public consultation stage in the production of the Local Plan (Regulation 18) and includes the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement) and its accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Hourigan Connolly is instructed by B and E Boys Limited to submit and provide comment on the above site in support of its future development for mixed uses. We have previously submitted representations in response to consultation relating to the Local Plan Part 2 in 2015 and subsequently the 'Call for Sites' exercise relating to the preparation of the new Local Plan in 2016.</p> <p>Along with this letter, we have also submitted an electronic consultation form via the Council's website and this letter should be read in conjunction with the submitted form. A site plan is also enclosed for information.</p> <p>Submissions</p> <p>We note that within the draft Local Plan, Isle of Man Mill in Water has a proposed allocation for mixed uses under draft policy references HS2.97 and EMP2.52. Our client supports the proposed allocation of this site for mixed uses – the mill building is currently in employment use and is suitable to be retained as such whereas the greenfield land adjacent to the mill building is more suitable for residential development. The location of the site is such that it lends itself to a mix of uses to ensure that the vitality of the area is maintained.</p> <p>We reserve the right to provide further supporting statements and evidence during the preparation of the Plan process and ask that we continue to be informed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		
Number of comments						EMP2.52	1	
Reference			EMP2.53	Waterfoot Mills				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Not Applicable	<p>THE DRAFT ALLOCATION SHOULD BE AMENDED TO FACILITATE MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT TO INCLUDE RESIDENTIAL USE. SEE SUBMITTED REPRESENTATION REPORT FOR FULL DETAILS.</p> <p>Email received 11/10/2017:</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. Following the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in November 2011, RBC commenced work on its Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. However, this document was halted in favour of the preparation of a full new Local Plan which has now been issued for consultation from Monday 24 July to Monday 9 October 2017. This edition of the Local Plan comprises the Regulation 18 consultation document which sets out the Council's preferred approach to future housing, employment and leisure uses over the Plan period. Once adopted the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy (2011).</p> <p>1.2 Within the draft Local Plan, sites have been proposed for development (for housing or employment use), for environmental protection and for recreation uses, as identified on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation Areas, along with an extension to an existing Conservation Area, are being considered.</p> <p>1.3 Documents included in the Draft Local Plan Consultation are the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement), the accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>1.4 The evidence base which supports the Local Plan comprises the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017). • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017). • Employment Land Review (2017). • Green Belt Review (2016). • Environmental Network Study (2017). • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (2016). • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study (2017). • Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) (previously published). • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2016). • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing (2017). • Landscape Study (2015) (previously published). • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published). • Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites (2017). 	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>1.5 In addition to the above documents, the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, although not strictly evidence, has informed the development of the draft policies.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the emerging Local Plan in relation to the Waterfoot Mills site, Waterfoot. Part of the site has a proposed allocation for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses under draft Policy Reference EMP2.53.</p> <p>1.7 The site comprises a collection of mill buildings and other commercial / industrial premises in single ownership which extend along the eastern side of Burnley Road East for circa 430m. The site has four distinct areas currently comprising of Dale Mill, Waterfoot Business Centre, Globe Mill and Albion Mill, but collectively the entire site is known as 'Waterfoot Mills'. There are a number of vehicular access points off Burnley Road East which provide access to the various businesses located across the site. The site is located in the area known as Waterfoot between Rawtenstall (which is 2.5 km away), and Bacup (which is 3 km). Whitewell Brook runs through the centre of the site running parallel to Burnley Road East.</p> <p>1.8 The site is proposed to be designated as an Existing Employment Area. However to recognise the full potential that the entire site has to offer to the future growth of the Borough of Rossendale, on behalf of the landowner, this Representation seeks to promote the site as an employment-led, mixed-use allocation. This Representation will set out how the site should be included in the Council's proposed list of Mixed Use Allocations listed under Policy EMP2.</p> <p>SCOPE</p> <p>1.9 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>1.10 This document follows earlier Representations and discussions made by Mr Brian Boys as part of previous consultation stages in the Local Plan process, albeit that parts of the Local Plan were subsequently halted in favour of a complete new Local Plan.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.11 The starting point for consideration of the emerging Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the emerging Local Plan in relation to the Waterfoot Mills site, Waterfoot. Part of the site has a proposed allocation for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses under draft Policy Reference EMP2.53.</p> <p>1.7 The site comprises a collection of mill buildings and other commercial / industrial premises in single ownership which extend along the eastern side of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>Burnley Road East for circa 430m. The site has four distinct areas currently comprising of Dale Mill, Waterfoot Business Centre, Globe Mill and Albion Mill, but collectively the entire site is known as 'Waterfoot Mills'. There are a number of vehicular access points off Burnley Road East which provide access to the various businesses located across the site. The site is located in the area known as Waterfoot between Rawtenstall (which is 2.5 km away), and Bacup (which is 3 km). Whitewell Brook runs through the centre of the site running parallel to Burnely Road East.</p> <p>1.8 The site is proposed to be designated as an Existing Employment Area. However to recognise the full potential that the entire site has to offer to the future growth of the Borough of Rossendale, on behalf of the landowner, this Representation seeks to promote the site as an employment-led, mixed-use allocation. This Representation will set out how the site should be included in the Council's proposed list of Mixed Use Allocations listed under Policy EMP2.</p> <p>SCOPE</p> <p>1.9 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>1.10 This document follows earlier Representations and discussions made by Mr Brian Boys as part of previous consultation stages in the Local Plan process, albeit that parts of the Local Plan were subsequently halted in favour of a complete new Local Plan.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.11 The starting point for consideration of the emerging Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Local Plan document.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The RBC Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain’s demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development. These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”. <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168).</p> <p>HOUSING</p> <p>2.21 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.22 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.25 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.26 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE – LAUNCHED 6 MARCH 2014</p> <p>2.28 On 28 August 2013 the government launched its draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The draft NPPG was subject to consultation for 6 weeks and was launched on 6 March in its final form. The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.29 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Report, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms):</p> <p>“Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.30 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306):</p> <p>“WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply.”</p> <p>2.31 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 of the section titled ‘Local Plans’ (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that:</p> <p>“HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED? To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.”</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.32 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.33 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.34 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.35 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>2.36 Crucially the link between housing growth and economic activity must be recognised, along with the importance of directing such uses to viable locations.</p> <p>3. POLICY EMP2: EMPLOYMENT SITE ALLOCATIONS INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3.1 Draft Policy EMP2: Employment Site Allocations identifies all sites within the Borough which have been allocated for employment development. For each site allocated, site area, available area for development and proposed use class is set out.</p> <p>3.2 The Waterfoot Mills site is identified as Employment Allocation Ref. EMP2.53 as shown below. It is classed as an 'existing employment' site and is considered suitable for B1, B2 and B8 uses.</p> <p>Fig. 1 Extract from Site Allocations Table (Policy EMP2)</p> <p>3.3 The proposed allocation is identified in purple in Figure 2.</p> <p>Fig. 2 Extract from Draft Proposals Map</p> <p>3.4 We support the aims of the Local Plan to identify key development sites which are central to the delivery of the overall strategy for new and existing employment assets and the Borough's economy. Crucial to the economy is the delivery of appropriate uses in the right locations.</p> <p>3.5 Given the nature of the site and premises at Waterfoot Mills, we do not consider that the proposed allocation for B1, B2 and B8 uses will secure viable use and investment in the site going forward.</p> <p>As referred to in the Policy Explanation, much of the committed supply of employment sites is not considered to be fit for purpose, and is often in the wrong location with sites to the west of the Borough being more attractive due to better links to the A56 and M66.</p> <p>3.6 We provide greater details of the site and its current use in Section 4 of this Representation, however we consider that flexibility of acceptable Use Classes is necessary to enable the land owner to continue to market the site to a wide range of potential employment-generating occupants, whilst also diversifying from the existing employment uses to allow some residential development on the site.</p> <p>3.7 To this end we consider that it would be more appropriate for the site to be listed as a 'Mixed-Use Allocation' under the provisions of draft Policy EMP2.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>PROPOSED MODIFICATION</p> <p>3.8 The Council is respectfully requested to modify the current employment allocation EMP2.53 to allow for mixed-use development including both employment and residential development. The Council is invited to include this modification in the Local Plan document by the allocation of a mixed-use allocation for the site under draft Policy EMP2. Mixed-use development in this location is considered appropriate in order to facilitate the viable regeneration of the site in part or whole.</p> <p>3.9 We contend that this would properly reflect Paragraph 22 of the Framework which seeks to avoid the long term protection of employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. In such circumstances, more appropriate and viable uses, such as housing, should be acceptable.</p> <p>4. WATERFOOT MILLS – A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT SITE</p> <p>SITE CONTEXT</p> <p>4.1 The site at Waterfoot Mills fronts onto Burnley Road East, located in Waterfoot. Waterfoot Mills comprises four separate areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Dale Mill. ii. Waterfoot Business Centre iii. Globe Mill. iv. Albion Mill. <p>4.2 Contained in Appendix 1 is a masterplan strategy document which illustrates the distinct mill areas.</p> <p>DALE MILL</p> <p>4.3 Dale Mill is located in the far north of the Waterfoot Mills area. Dale Mill comprises a collection of mainly single storey buildings and maintains high levels of occupancy due to good vehicular access; currently 65% of this mill is occupied, sustaining 33 jobs.</p> <p>4.4 It is intended that Dale Mill would continue in employment use with areas of the existing buildings being subject to a strategy of upgrade and refurbishment, with relocated self-storage units positioned on site (relocated from the existing site at Gaghills Lane). As part of the upgrade strategy, new employment floorspace could be generated through selective demolition and the creation of up to an additional 1,400 sqm workshop floorspace.</p> <p>WATERFOOT BUSINESS CENTRE</p> <p>4.5 Moving southwards along Burnley Road East, the next section of the site is known as Waterfoot Business Centre. This element of the site currently only has 21% of its total space occupied, which equates to only 18 jobs on site. This section comprises a collection of buildings of varying heights and construction, with a mill building being located at the front of the site immediately adjacent to the main road. The buildings at the rear of the site are built into the banking of the brook and pose structural challenges for any redevelopment,</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>but they have reasonable access for vehicles. Vehicular access is limited to the remainder of the site for heavy goods vehicles due to the orientation of the existing buildings; this is a prohibitive factor to attracting potential commercial occupants.</p> <p>4.6 Accordingly it is submitted that owing to technical constraints therefore, the retention and / or redevelopment of large parts of the Business Centre are unviable for continued / new employment use. The Business Centre offers no reasonable prospect of being retained as a whole in viable employment use across the Plan period.</p> <p>4.7 The Waterfoot Business Centre site is considered suitable for residential redevelopment. Whilst an element of employment may be retained in more viable, suitable, and accessible areas, our clients believe there to be an opportunity to positively redevelop a previously developed site within the Urban Boundary for a more viable residential use.</p> <p>GLOBE MILL</p> <p>4.8 Globe Mill has only 2% of its 3,000 sqm of available floorspace occupied; this results in only 5 people being in employment at Globe Mill. The site comprises another large mill building where the upper floors are impossible to let for current employment space needs due to the nature of the construction and layout of the mill building and the fact that the goods lift can only provide access to limited space in the building. Due to the age of the mill building, the floors of the mill are constructed mainly in timber and present a fire risk.</p> <p>4.9 Globe Mill had once been wholly occupied by a single user, but since that business closed down the building has remained empty. There are issues with access for vehicles and goods, and problems with the fabric of the construction of the building. The resultant position is that this element of the Waterfoot Mills site is unattractive to new tenants and is financially unviable for retention in employment use either as existing or as a redevelopment employment proposal.</p> <p>4.10 Accordingly, the site should not be retained for employment purposes. Globe Mill is considered more suitable for residential redevelopment.</p> <p>ALBION MILL</p> <p>4.11 Albion Mill is sandwiched between the main road (Burnley Road East), the adjoining Wales Road, and an area of existing woodland. Albion Mill recently had its road frontage demolished as a consequence of structural obsolescence, and as such only 20% of the site is now occupied, providing jobs for 5 people. Following the demolition of the mill this element of the site is more suited to a residential use which would complement the existing residential properties which surround the site. The site should not be retained for employment purposes for the duration of the Plan period.</p> <p>4.12 An indicative proposed layout is shown on the masterplan contained in Appendix 1 which illustrates how the Albion Mill section of the site could potentially be redeveloped for residential purposes.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>POTENTIAL FOR SUSTAINABLE MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>4.13 Allocating the Waterfoot Mills for Mixed Use Development rather than restricting it to an Existing Employment Area presents a very positive opportunity to redevelop the whole of the site in a holistic and strategic manner.</p> <p>4.14 The Framework makes it very clear that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose (Paragraph 22). It has been demonstrated in this Representation that the site should not be retained solely for employment purposes. The Council should recognise the potential for the site to be brought back into beneficial use through a mix of complementary uses including retained and new employment and new residential proposals. A mixed use allocation would facilitate the delivery of sustainable development within the Borough.</p> <p>4.15 Not only could the site contribute to the local economy through the retention and creation of employment-generating uses, but the site presents the opportunity to contribute to the delivery of housing over the Plan period.</p> <p>4.16 Policy HS1 within the Draft Local Plan relates to 'Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement' and identifies a net housing requirement for the period 2019 to 2034 of at least 4,000 additional dwellings, equating to 265 dwellings a year. In addition, it is stated that a prior underprovision of 25 dwellings is to be met in the first five years.</p> <p>4.17 We support the aims of the Local Plan to identify key development sites which are central to the delivery of the overall strategy for new housing and this subject site could make a positive contribution to the delivery of housing in the Borough; a mixed use development would embody the aims of the Framework to meet the development needs of the area for both housing and employment.</p> <p>4.18 Importantly, the site is in a single ownership, and the land owners are willing to have open discussions with the Council to deliver a really exciting project across the whole site which could make a key contribution to the sustainable growth of the Borough. The site in its current state is not financially viable, and as the existing buildings remain vacant and continue to fall into disrepair, the situation is only going to be exacerbated. The flexibility of a Mixed Use Allocation would enable a more sustainable approach to the future protection and development of the site at Waterfoot Mills.</p> <p>4.19 There is potential for a Development Brief to be drafted for the redevelopment of the site to encourage key stakeholders, the land owner and the Council to work together for the benefit of the site itself, the immediate environs in Waterfoot, and to the benefit of the local economy in Rossendale Borough. Additional work is forthcoming in this regard.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>4.20 It has already been described how each of the distinct areas which form</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						<p>the 'Waterfoot Mills' site are only partly occupied by commercial and industrial operators and employers. The site does not operate on a financially viable basis, but the land owner is committed to retaining existing tenants where possible and attracting new employers through the creation of additional floorspace. However, there are deficiencies with many of the existing buildings and the associated environs which prohibit the site being fully occupied for solely employment use.</p> <p>4.21 This Representation has set out how there is an exciting opportunity for the site to make a contribution to the continued retention of existing employment floorspace, the creation of new employment floorspace, and the delivery of new housing over the Plan period and beyond.</p> <p>4.22 This subject site comprises previously developed land, within the Urban Boundary, in a sustainable location and therefore would accord with the principles of sustainable development as set out in the Framework.</p> <p>5. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>5.1 The starting point for consideration of the Council's Local Plan is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the Framework that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>5.2 The Framework is clear at Paragraph 22 that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Paragraph 160 outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>5.3 It has been shown in this Representation that the site at 'Waterfoot Mills' on Burnley Road East presents an exciting opportunity to make a sustainable contribution to the local economy through employment and housing redevelopment. The site is currently proposed to be designated as an Existing Employment Area, however it has been demonstrated that the site should be allocated for Mixed Use. Some parts of the site are occupied by commercial businesses, however many of the existing buildings are in limited use, some buildings have remained long-term vacant, and some buildings are not in a suitable condition to meet the needs of modern-day employers. The site as a whole does not present an attractive employment environment and it is for these reasons that the site should not be protected for sole-employment uses only.</p> <p>5.4 The site would be more suitable as a Mixed Use allocation. This would enable the necessary flexibility in planning policy for the site to attract other employment-generating uses, as well as providing the opportunity to develop parts of the site for housing. The site has an opportunity to contribute to the delivery of housing over the Plan period on a site which comprises previously</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2.53	Further comment
						developed land within the Urban Boundary. 5.5 In conclusion, Local Plan Policy EMP2 should be modified to include the site at Waterfoot Mills as a Mixed Use Development site. The site presents an exciting opportunity to plan properly for the holistic redevelopment and regeneration of a major site within the Urban Boundary in sustainable location. Please see appendix for figures.		

Number of comments EMP2.53 1

Reference	EMP2.54	Warth Mill
-----------	---------	------------

1386	paul	Nolan	nolan redshaw	EMP51	Object	Waterfoot police station is soon to be vacated . it has good main road frontage and prior to being a police station it was a car showroom and workshop i.e. sui generis . i believe it would be a missed opportunity to allocate it in employment use .In particular it is unlikely to attract an office occupier which is its current use . the site may have retail or residential potential .
------	------	-------	------------------	-------	--------	--

Number of comments EMP2.54 1

Gypsies and Travellers Transit Site Allocation

Reference	HS16.1	Little Tooter Quarry, Sharneyford
-----------	--------	-----------------------------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
57	Barbara	Ashworth	Elected member RBC	SHLAA16405	Object	<p>I wish to raise the following points in relation to the above proposal for a transit gypsy site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overwhelming public objection - approximately 80 residents attended a public meeting last night at Sharneyford school and there was no support whatsoever for the proposal. People were angry and dismayed. 2. The site is right on the boundary between Lancashire and Calderdale. This raises the issue of it being a gateway not only to Bacup, but also Rossendale and Lancashire with implications for visitors we want to encourage for leisure and tourism. What a welcome! 3. The distance from Police Stations - Waterfoot and Burnley - is of great concern to residents who are aware that criminal activity can increase where gypsies camp. 4. The site would be directly opposite a listed property. Tree screening has been mentioned but the land is so high above sea level with extreme winters that it would be unlikely trees would grow or be sustainable. 5. Ecologically there are many concerns which have rightly been highlighted in the SHLAA assessment. 6. I have walked up to the quarry and around the adjoining land and it is very boggy. There are concerns that work done to construct an appropriate site for caravans would disperse water lower down to Bacup which already has flooding issues. <p>In general terms, it is very disappointing that this is the only site now in the draft plan. Residents feel they have been unfairly selected and that this a fait accompli. Nevertheless, in my opinion this site is totally unsuitable for the reasons stated above and should not go ahead.</p>		
138	Andy	Ross	-		Object	<p>I notice that there are proposals to develop a Gypsy and Traveller's Site at Tooter Quarry, at the top of Todmorden Rd. HS16.1 on the local map , i wish to object to this plan,the site is outside the settlement or " Urban boundary" there is no demonstrable need for the site to be in a countryside setting, such as the old quarry area which has over the years turned into an area of high wildlife interest , most other councils would be proud of aiding in the recovery to nature of places such as this, this development will not enhance the rural character of the area of BACUP. your objective is to "CONSERVE" and "ENHANCE" the historic environment,and "THEIR SETTINGS" a Traveller's site would not "enhance" this rural setting. no attempt has been made by the council to ensure that no local wldlife will be affected by this proposal, under Biodiversity and Geodiversity your objective is to "PROTECT" and "ENHANCE" you are failing to uphold your own objectives just as you are in other areas of BACUP under this local plan proposal another example of an uncaring unsympathetic council hell bent on destroying what is left of the countryside feel of this area, by building more and more unnecessary and unwanted structures -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
346	Moira	Mitchell	-		Object	Transit site at Little Tooter Hill quarry for travelling people, the proposal says minimum of 4 pitches no maximum is stated . - As travellers congregate in large groups a maximum no should be stated. - Little Tooter quarry is currently fenced and gated as due to safety aspects there are steep sided drops and large areas of flooded land. - - There will be difficulty in making the area safe for use by the travellers and to stop its misuse when travellers are present. - - The draft plan says there should be access to the road network, this would have to be provided and hard standing created at an area where currently drainage is natural and no concrete areas exist. - - The draft plan says there should be access to schools and services. - The nearest school Sharneyford Primary is currently oversubscribed. - Most of these children are brought by car as there is only one bus per day on Todmorden Road. - Travellers would not have access to a bus service and nearest shops and services are 1.4 miles away in Bacup centre. - - The draft plan says there should be availability of water and infrastructure services , currently there is no drinking water or sewerage provision at the Quarry and at 1400 feet this would be expensive to commence installation. - - There are ribbon developments in the area of housing all to the left hand side of Todmorden Road as it ascends the hill at Sharneyford.This development proposed for the right hand side at the top of the hill above Sharneyford would be incongruous and give artificial lighting into an area which is relatively dark at night and has unlit roads above it (A671) . - - Noise would be an issue in an area which is currently only populated by sheep, cattle and some deer and other wildlife . - - The area is currently closed in for the safety of people not to enter a disused quarry . - - Adding a gypsies encampment would cause dangerous access to the old quarry and commence new traffic exiting onto a major A road at a point which is dangerous in winter due to ice and snow, used as a racetrack in many hours by high powered cars and with many HGVs passing heavily laden going to the Anaerobic digestion plant on the Todmorden side of the hill. - - The gypsies would be appalled at the smell of these wagons which are a current blight to the residents of Rossendale as they drive through our Valley.		
560	Hilary	Fairclough	-		Object	I object to the loss of green space.		I object to loss of green space been lost due to the housing development proposed.
577	John	Purdy	-		Object	This proposal will increase the crime rate in the area. I speak from having knowledge of similar sites in Lancashire.		
579	Joanne	Hartley	Na		Object	Please accept this as official objection to the proposed Gypsy/traveller site at Sharneyford.		
616	Tracy	Keir	N/A	Not known	Object	Disagree against the proposed siting for gypsy/ traveller site within the area.		N/A

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
617	Susan	Grindrod	-		Object	I place my objection to this proposed site full stop. We have had many dealings with this community of people with theft, uncleanliness and noise. Futures Park offices should know this too well as they have often camped at Lee Bank quarry and left it in an utter disgusting mess of which I know first hand having worked there myself when you've had the expense of clearing it all up. How this can even be considered is unbelievable in such a small historic town as ours. Just because it's at the top of Todmorden Road on the border of Calderdale you must think it's out of the way, well it's not for the any of the residents so I implore you to think twice and not give this proposal the green light		No, but for the planners to put this proposal in file 13.....the bin.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
628	Dionne	Kennedy	-		Object	<p>Submitted via online survey 24/09/17: Can I first say that as a resident in sharneyford we have had no official notification of this proposal - - I object to this plan for various reasons: - The plan only states the site will have a minimum without stating the maximum numbers - - This will considerably change the area consistently and impact on the nature and environmental ethos of the - - I am concerned about the financial consequences to the small hamlet which is already oppressed by the wagons coming down Todmorden road at all - - point SD2 is fundamentally flawed . There is no need to build this proposal in this area as this plan DOES NOT NEED to be located within a countryside . The site is as indicated outside the urban boundary and as such should not be developed. There is no analysis as to why this site merits a requirement and a change in your own policy - - Sharneyford residents are frequently the poor neighbours and this is another pointer to make plans without any consideration of the residents. - - The plan is a contradiction to the policy ENV4 which you have identified within the proposals. - - -</p> <p>Received by email 05/10/17: As a resident, I would like to object to the proposal to develop a Gypsy and Traveller's Site at Tooter Quarry, Todmorden Rd. HS16.1 I am sending this alongside the objection notice that I have already provided Firstly my concern is about the proposed location of the site. The quarry in question has regenerated itself over 25 years to a nature area of high importance to the people locally. Goodness knows what wildlife is inhabiting the water and the surrounding area whereby there is a vast amount of wildlife . To disturb this would be morally wrong But secondly and more importantly, this plan is unrealistic and unsafe more so for any person living there regardless of their cultural identity:- Issues of risk:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The travellers will be socially isolated •The quarry and nearby road becomes impassable in extreme weather conditions leaving them isolated and vulnerable to the community and elements •There is no direct bus route to either Bacup or Todmorden bar one bus for school am and pm. The result being woman and children would not be able to access essential services such as health education and community based services (due to the adult male members who would be out working during the day) •The conditions of the quarry are the extreme to say the least . Winds Rain, It is prone to constant flooding. These would result in serious health issues and impact on the welfare of any child living there <p>Based on your own research in your assessment plan and the number of</p>		I think this plan should be rejected as per the reasons identified

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						<p>unauthorised stays by the local community, it is apparent the traveller DO NOT venture towards Sharneyford ... I attach the said Research to evidence this.</p> <p>Furthermore, policy demands that you ASK and CONSULT with the travelling community whether they wish to reside in the proposed site (which I note that there is no formal agreement to this land being used in any event). Your own evidence based research indicates that Sharneyford is not an area that this community wish to reside.</p> <p>In any event. The character of the area will change significantly and impact on the heritage of the hamlet of Sharneyford. As identified in para 3.14.17 of your May 2017 Sustainability report of the Rossendale plan I bring this to your attention:-</p> <p>Sharneyford residents feel that they are the poor relations of Rossendale. The wagons speed up and down the road day and night from the recycling centre clearly more than the alleged 30 a day. The bus route bar the school run has ceased and now this unsafe proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •We have the wind turbines which have damaged the moors, moors which we(in this household) walk frequently. •We have ongoing issues with fly tipping and wagons to contend with which Rossendale council appear not to care about •We have the unsightly view of the illegally dumped waste at Heald Top Farm which this household has personally complained about early on this year to no avail <p>As a tax payer and voter of Rossendale, I strongly object to this proposal regarding the traveller and gypsy site for the reasons identified</p>		
629	Julie	Mooney	-		Object	<p>This development will potentially impact on the character of sharneyford and impact on the everyday lives of residents. There are no details as to the size of the site as it is suggested that there are a minimum of 4 pitches which is very vague. The house prices in this area are depressed enough and there is a real risk that such a development will depress the prices further. - - A travellers site will not be in keeping with the local housing stock. - - The site is outside the urban boundary and should not be developed. - sd2 urban boundary and greenbelt - A travellers site would not be sympathetic / in keeping local architecture and the countryside. - Developing this site would be contrary to plans policy ENV4 - The residents of Sharneyford should not be further disregarded. We have to out up with the inconvenience of the recycling lorries wind farm traffic and now this proposal. - - I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE PLAN -</p>		STRONGLY OBJECT AS DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
649	Veronica	Norris	-		Object	A gypsy site placed in this vicinity would not be in keeping with the views and landscape. - - It is too near to farmland, footpaths and bike trails and grazing livestock. It would spoil the area completely. - There would be an increase in traffic. There are already enough articulated lorries flying up and down Todmorden Road through Sharneyford going to the Waste Disposal site opposite Tooter Quarry. - - There would be an increase in pollution and noise particularly for residents living close to Tooter Quarry. - Where would waste and sewage be disposed? - - There is already a gypsy site further along Todmorden Road near Cloughfoot so why another one? - - Why do we have to provide sites for these people at taxpayers expense? It is their chosen lifestyle which is why they class themselves as Travellers. - - Last time Bacup housed gypsies/travellers there were inundated thefts to local properties and businesses. - What about their livestock? What is the plan for this? Is their livestock going to desecrate the surrounding land? - - I am absolutely against this Plan. I have forked out a lot of hard earned money on my property to improve it. I purposely chose to live in Sharneyford because it offers amazing scenery and I have fantastic neighbours. The area is lovely and natural and scenic and up to now I haven't experienced any anti-social behaviour or crime related incidents. I would very much like it to stay that way. - - -		Yes. - I have lived very close to gypsy/traveller sites in the past in Oswaldtwistle so my comments are from first hand experience. - - One site's gypsies continually fly tipped onto the lane adjoining the nature reserve regularly blocking residents' access to their properties further along the lane. - This site also backed onto a local car garage and the gypsies dogs roamed free and quite frequently attacked customers from the car garage. - - The other site tipped their rubbish onto the grass banking along Blackburn Road and those gypsies also let their dogs roam around. My dog and a neighbour's dog were attacked by their dogs more than once. They also put their horses into the field at the front of the local residents' properties without permission and tethered them and neglected them. - - Also, they destroyed the padlocks and barriers along the lane leading to the residents' properties so they could put their horses on that same field. - - We had 8 years of hell living near gypsies in Oswaldtwistle so when I moved here I got away from it and now the Council want to provide them with a site here! - No I do not want this again! -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
666	Lisa	Greenwood	-		Object	I feel this will change the character of the area and that it will have a detrimental impact on the lives of the residents in the Sharneyford area. It doesn't state on the plans how big the site would be. My concern is the loss of countryside currently the site is outside the settlement or urban boundary and as such should not be developed. I feel that if travellers wish to settle then it should be within the urban or settlement boundary. The boundary is there for a reason and should be respected. - My other concern is that the site could be used for commercial enterprises which would again have a detrimental impact on the area. - A traveller site is not in keeping with the local housing and would have a negative impact on the aesthetics of the countryside. any site built would not blend in with the local housing some of which are over 200 years old. -		-
675	Diane	Dungworth	-		Object	Do not want this proposal to go ahead, worried about the impact on the quiet village. Last time travellers were around, cars were broken into, milk taken off doorsteps, children running wild, horses up and down the road, leaving fly tipping, household rubbish ie food causing vermin.. All their vehicles are un taxed so why do we pay car tax		No
676	paula	Pilling	-	13918	Object	us as residents are not happy about this, they do not tax there vehicles, there will be a lot of things stolen, they fly tip there will be a lot of vehicles up and down mainly vans to which they run there so called business's from, children running wild.		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment	
741	Chris	Howarth			Object	<p>For myself, as a resident, I would like to object to the proposal to develop a Gypsy and Traveller's Site at Tooter Quarry, Todmorden Rd. HS16.1</p> <p>My main concern is the loss of countryside and urban sprawl. Hinterland villages such as Sharneyford should be protected from such irresponsible proposals. Currently, the site is outside the settlement or "Urban boundary" and, as such, should not be developed. Your Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt States;</p> <p>"All new development in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundaries, defined on the Policies map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area"</p> <p>I believe the Planning Dep't could not provide evidence that there is a demonstrable need for the site to be in a countryside setting, outside the urban boundary, and that this development could not enhance the rural character of the area.</p> <p>I fear the character of the area will change significantly and I feel a site of this nature will have a detrimental impact on the lives of the residents in the Sharneyford area. We don't know how big the site will be as the Plan states there will be;</p> <p>"A Transit site accommodating a minimum of four pitches will be provided on a site at Little Tooter Quarry, Sharneyford shown on the Policies Map as HS16.1."</p> <p>This means there will be two caravans per pitch, resulting in eight Caravans and eight vehicles, sufficient in size to pull large caravans. Plus a potentially unknown number of additional plant and machinery that many travellers use in many of their lines of business. This, potentially overbearing number of vehicles and vans, is in direct conflict with Policy ENV4: Landscape Character and Quality which states;</p> <p>"In order to protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape, development proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond positively to the visual inter-relationship between the settlements and the surrounding hillsides and follow the contours of the site; • Retain and, where possible, enhance key views. • Be built to a density which respects the character of the surrounding area with only low density development likely to be acceptable in areas abutting the Enclosed Upland or Moorland Fringe Landscape Character Areas; • Retain existing watercourses, trees and green infrastructure features that make a positive contribution to the character of the area and retain and, where possible, enhance key views. <p>In my opinion, the proposed site could not meet the criteria set out in the four points above, from your planning policy document. Nor could the proposed development;</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						<p>“Respect the character and distinctiveness of the local landscape.”</p> <p>I have additional worries as many travellers sites mix domestic living with commercial enterprise and this again could have a detrimental impact on the area. I feel any Traveller’s site would not be in keeping with local housing stock and would have a detrimental impact on the aesthetics of the local countryside. The site wouldn’t be built in a traditional manner and would not blend in sympathetically with the surrounding houses some of which are over two hundred years old, including a listed house and a listed milestone within yards of the entrance to the proposed site. My points are in line with your Policy ENV1: High Quality Development in the Borough, which states;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All proposals for new development in the Borough will be expected to take account of the character and appearance of the local area, including the following: Siting, layout, massing, scale, design, materials, lighting, building to plot ratio and landscaping. • Safeguarding and enhancing the built and historic environment. Being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers, and avoiding demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area. • The scheme will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring development by virtue of it being over-bearing or oppressive. <p>How could a transient Traveller’s site comply with any of the points above? It couldn’t and is another example why I have strong objections to this proposal. I have forwarded to you recently, some images of the Quarry in an attempt to show just how much is at stake with the loss of Tooter Quarry to development of any kind. As you can see through the pictures, the quarry has had an amazing recovery back to moorland and has amazing Biodiversity, of which, most other Councils and Boroughs would be proud of, in fact, thousands are spent on former quarries, to encourage what has happened naturally in the quarry.</p> <p>To allow a transient Traveller’s site at the quarry could potentially disturb the Bio-diversity that’s taken place since the quarry closed. I believe there is a significant wildlife interest at the quarry and any development would not adhere to your planning Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks which advises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals should avoid harm and where possible enhance biodiversity, and where necessary appropriate mitigation and on and off-site compensatory measures to offset the impact of development. • Development proposals should protect areas of biodiversity and ecological networks and where possible enhance sites and linkages. Any unavoidable adverse effects should be minimised and mitigated against, and where this cannot be achieved, compensated for with a net gain for biodiversity demonstrated. • The design and layout of new development should retain and enhance existing features of biodiversity value within and immediately adjacent to the 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						<p>site. Ecological networks should be conserved, enhanced and expanded. Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how ecological networks are incorporated within the scheme.</p> <p>The majority of travellers are law abiding and respect the countryside but, there are a small minority that carry out illegal activities, in fact DCLG have produced advice to local councils with issues such as this in mind including, fly tipping, illegal burning, and other anti-social behaviour trends associated with traveller sites. It may only be a minority of travellers that do that but, I don't believe we can take a risk at this site due do the green, biodiversity environment which is at risk in the quarry if such tipping and illegal burning occurs. And I don't believe a transient traveller's site could;</p> <p>"Where appropriate, development should incorporate habitat features of value to wildlife within the development (including within building design)."</p> <p>Some travellers do use plant and machinery and with that comes oils and diesels. The majority would manage these pollutants safely however, there are some who would not use these potential pollutants responsibly. Policy ENV7: Environmental Protection says;</p> <p>Development which has the potential, either individually or cumulatively, to result in pollution that has an unacceptable impact on health, amenity, biodiversity including designated sites, will only be permitted if the risk of pollution is effectively prevented or reduced and mitigated to an acceptable level by:</p> <p>Undertaking assessments and/or detailed site investigations of land which is or may be affected by contamination and implementing appropriate remediation measures to ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use and that there is no unacceptable risk of pollution within the site or in the surrounding area.</p> <p>I believe, policing the control of such substances would be very hard with a transient community and on these grounds , I would strongly object to the site as there is too much at stake with the potential pollution and loss of habitat for wildlife at the quarry.</p> <p>We have pylons, wind turbines, fly tipping and smelly wagons to contend with. In addition, behind us we have 8 hundred tonnes of illegally dumped waste at Heald Top Farm, which it appears that no one can do anything about other than to let it rot! What would happen if we have a similar incident in the quarry?</p> <p>The quarry has benefitted due to it being a basin the holds water, hence the biodiversity that has regenerated there. It has a clay, stone and shale base which holds water. This assists in the intercepting of rainwater and holds this water, releasing it slowly. The site is inappropriate for a travelling community site due to this. Draining it or putting surface water drains in for the travellers could exacerbate the flooding problems Bacup struggles with in spate conditions. Policy ENV11: Surface Water Run-Off, Flood Risk, Sustainable</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						<p>Drainage and Water Quality states;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Development proposals will be required to consider and address flood risk from all sources. Planning permission will only be granted for proposals which would not be subject to unacceptable flood risk or materially increase the risks elsewhere. This should be informed by consideration of the most up to date information on Flood Risk available from the Environment Agency, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and from the Lead Local Flood Risk Authority. • All development proposals will be required to manage surface water as part of the development and should seek to maximise the use of permeable surfaces/areas of soft landscaping, and the use of Green Infrastructure as potential sources of storage for surface water run-off. New development should not increase on-site or off-site surface water run-off rates and, where practicable, should seek to reduce surface water run-off <p>Clearly, any interference with the site would not comply with the policies above. Policy NV6: Green Infrastructure states;</p> <p>Development proposals should seek first to avoid or, if not feasible, mitigate biodiversity impacts on-site. Schemes which would result in a net loss of green infrastructure on-site will only be permitted if:</p> <p>The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision elsewhere (achieving an overall net gain of 20% in biodiversity offsite compared to that lost including long-term management proposals); and</p> <p>The proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on amenity, surface water run-off, nature conservation or the integrity of the green infrastructure network.</p> <p>How and where would any developer achieve an overall net gain of 20% in biodiversity offsite compared to that lost including long-term management proposals? They couldn't and this is another reason why I would object to this development.</p> <p>I have worries with regard to Anti-social behaviour and criminal behaviour that has been associated with some traveller's sites. Sharneyford has many isolated properties and I feel, should there be any inappropriate behaviour, especially of a criminal or violent nature, how long would it take for our overstretched constabulary to respond with the nearest Police Station at Waterfoot.</p> <p>There are no amenities for the travellers at Sharneyford, there is only a very limited bus service. We have no shops and, historically, the travellers like to be closer to such amenities as supermarkets, doctors etc. Sharneyford School is always oversubscribed and would struggle to accommodate more children from the travelling community.</p> <p>Currently the site has no running water, no foul drains and no electric. Putting porta-loos in the quarry and having generators running all the time would not</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						<p>be fair to local residents. There would be noise pollution and potentially light pollution. Who would pay for the loos to be emptied, if it is left to the travellers, some may tip toilet waste on to the land which has happened before. There is no hard standing and providing hard standing could only interfere with the bio-diversity again.</p> <p>I would suggest the Council looks at sites were the travellers have been evicted from as appropriate locations such as Futures Park, Valley View or off John Street Whitworth where they are closer to local amenities and where the living conditions are much easier for them. Tooter Quarry sits over a thousand foot high, the winters are harsh and living in a caravan could not be pleasant up there for most of the year.</p> <p>Please take my concerns into consideration and look at more suitable sites across Rossendale for the travellers.</p>		
758	Matthew + Rebecca	Saxon + Crampton	-		Object	<p>We wish to object to the proposed plans for the Sharneyford Traveller's site for the below reasons: - - We are a very close knit community, friendly and small and we believe that the Travellers site will disrupt this. - - The Travellers site is not in keeping with any of the houses or the country side in the area. - - We believe that the travellers will have a detrimental effect on the area and community. - - The Travellers will also cause traffic congestion on our local roads due to horse and carriages. - - The quarry may end up turning into an illegal tipping/dumping site (e.i. waste from their commercial enterprises). - - The proposed site is located on a Green Belt area where construction should not take place unless it enhances the rural character of the area. - - The site will also disrupt the nature and animals living in this area. - - The site will be visually unattractive within the beautiful countryside/hillside and landscape. - - We believe this site will have a detrimental affect on the house pricing within this area. - - We are also concerned about an increase of crime, if the proposed site is approved.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
768	Sandra	Navesey	-		Object	I object to this proposal as it is completely inappropriate to consider development of a Gypsy and traveller's site at Tooter Quarry. Such a development would be a blight on the landscape! This site has recovered from a quarry to an area of national beauty over the past 20 years and this would be ruined by placing hard standing pitches for a minimum of 8 caravans, with all the problems caused by travellers moving on. How will the site be monitored? How can the tipping of tarmac waste and rubbish, diesel from the trucks, not to mention horses tearing up the ground! This is to be a transit camp with a maximum of three month's stay. How will this be monitored? Inevitably there will be some travellers who will break the law or cause other trouble but as they are in transit, they could not be given an asbo. There will need to be a water supply provided as well as sewage system and power. The travellers will certainly not be contributing by way of council tax or rent. Regardless of these concerns, the location is not suitable for purpose, families would need to be nearer to amenities such as shops etc, and there is a very limited bus service. Also this would put pressure on schools and medical services. Sharneyford has already been inconvenienced by wind turbines etc. not to mention the absolutely foul smelling trucks going up and down every day. Snow and ice in winter often make the road unpassable and this wouldn't be ideal for travellers trying to drag their caravans and horses up and down. There must be a better site in Rosendale!		
833	Carl	Davey	-		Object	Travelers are not welcome in Bacup . They bring nothing to the community and will only bring the area down and impact on an already struggling economy in the town. Bacup is trying to attract tourists via adrenaline gateway etc . This would be totally wasted		Why does Bacup appear to be the barren wasteland of the rossendale valley .poor transport. Poor schools . High unemployment and social issues . I know let's park a load of travellers in the mix
858	Deborah	Hernon	-		Object	The site at Sharneyford is inappropriate for a number of reasons. Firstly there is no adequate infrastructure in that area and it would cost a substantial amount to put it in. In these days of austerity we are having budgets cut from services provided to our town so why would you spend such a high proportion of the budget on such a small minority. Secondly the local school is very small and to capacity so how would you support their education and ensure that other local children can access education? Thirdly crime in the area is already out of control with a very poor response from Police with no presence of a front desk in the borough. Finally this area is one of the great things about the Borough and after all the money being invested in the THI bid in the Centre we should be celebrating what Bacup could become for the economy of the Borough. - I can see why this site has been chosen its because you think they will be tucked away and nobody will bother. This is however not a fair area for the people you will be putting there, they need to have proper access to the services they require, schools with capacity, doctors, Police etc.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
862	Sue	McCafferty	-		Object	I live opposite Little Tooter Hill Quarry and would object to this proposed site due to several factors. Firstly, we are very high above sea level being on the moors and the climate is not conducive to living comfortably! We live where we do because we have animals and land is cheaper up here for obvious reasons! There is no mains water for a start so the travellers would need to have some source of water as we own the spring that supplies the current residences up here and it is not capable of sustaining any further demand on it. Secondly, the road is an A road with national speed limit and I do not want to see young children being knocked down, travellers do tend to let their children and animals play unsupervised and it would not be a safe site. We have over 60 HGV's daily from 5am going to the composting factory on Todmorden Moor and back to Warrington continuously plus the other traffic.		I find it incredible that you would think of offering people such a bleak place to abide. No drains, no water, bad climate, no services!! No hardstanding or possibility of without a lot of work.
865	Geoff	Smith		13918 SHAA16396	Object	To whom it may concern; Re Site Assessment document SHLAA16396 file 13918 - My Name Is Geoff Smith , I have been a resident of Sharneyford for 28 years and have endured some harsh winters. I feel the proposal to allow a travellers site to be built here would cause unnecessary suffering to families living there. This site is also liable to flooding as it is a clay quarry; - This quarry has slowly recovered from the devastating condition it was left in many years ago, the wonders of nature have finally restored some beauty into the space. - I have also endured several illegal travelling communities in this area who have moved on eventually due to the weather and left a massive trail of domestic and commercial waste. - I have also had break ins and items removed from around our property; this stopped when the individuals moved on. - I totally oppose this proposal and suggest the travellers would be better facilitated on a town centre site such as opposite futures park and surrounding areas where more amenities are available. This seems to be a prefer site by choice from the travellers. - - I hope this is of help with your decision . - - Regards Geoff Smith		The facilities at this site are not in place and would be very costly, it is located near to the wind farm at sharneyford and the worry that a caravan may blow over in the extreme conditions also the quarry fills in with snow which makes this a hazard for travelers.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
896	David	Mitchell	-		Object	The proposal is outside the urban boundary. - It is in an area of open and rural countryside. - Caravans and associated commercial enterprises carried out by these travellers is out of keeping with the area. - This is the gateway into Rossendale and into Lancashire and should not be blighted by any more eyesores. - We already have the anerobic digestive site, wind turbines and pylons and enough is enough. - We need to improve our countryside not add to the negative aspects of what is essentially open and splendid countryside. - Currently the quarry acts as a flood basin, alleviating short term overflow into the brook. Covering a significant area with hardstanding will increase flash flooding further down the valley and in particular Bacup centre itself. - This facility would be better placed more centrally, on established public transport routes and closer to schools with available places. - One such site would be Futures Business Park where it could easily be overseen by council staff and more easily policed. - Another would be adjacent to Hardman Mill in Rawtenstall where appropriate screening by trees would be more practical and is local to supermarkets and other services. - Tooter Quarry is not suitable for this type of settlement. - -		Please rethink this proposal.
953	Philip	Taylor	-		Object	Dear Planning Department, - As a resident of Sharneyford for over 33 years I would like to strongly object to the above section of the local plan. - The quarry has not been mined for many years and has naturally regenerated into a beautiful area. - If the plan was to put in picnic tables or a bird watching hide, that would make sense and could be used by the local school and tourists alike. - In my view the siting of at least eight caravans on the site would be: - Expensive (there are no services there whatsoever) - Out of keeping with the local housing stock - Completely set back this natural regeneration that has occurred - Lead to more illegally dumped conifers and waste material on Flower Scar Road - In a document produced by one of the local councillors who attended the meeting held at Sharneyford School on Tuesday night, even the planning department itself had highlighted in red and orange, serious concerns about the suitability of this site for this proposed use. - The travellers themselves, who years ago used to stay at the top of Sharneyford seem to have voted with their feet (or wheels) and now prefer Whitworth and the area adjacent to the Kingfisher building in Stacksteads. - Sharneyford, because of its location at the edge of the Rossendale and Caldedale boundaries seems to be a convenient place for both councils to allow Turbines, Waste recycling (previously a maggot farm), illegal dumping of a considerable amount of waste (800 tonnes?) and now this site is planned. Perhaps out of sight (of most people) is out of mind for the council planners. - Quite frankly, from the meeting on Tuesday night the people of Sharneyford have had enough and deserve better. - I hope that you will see fit to reassess Tooter Quarry as the Rossendale site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. - Yours faithfully		- The people of Sharneyford DO NOT WANT this site. - - Please reconsider this proposal.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
972	Christopher	Rich	-		Object	As local residents we have many concerns about this proposed development that we have only found out about on facebook yesterday ! - We feel that this site is totally unsuitable because of the following reasons :- - 1.It is far too remote for purpose, there are no shops , services , very limited bus service which only runs during term time . - 2. We travel this area for work and in winter the road becomes impassable due to snow and ice. The winds can be very strong and caravans have been blown over in the past. - 3.The only school in the immediate area is Sharneyford Primary which is always fully subscribed and would not be able to take the children from the site without local children being affected. - 4.This site being on the border with Calderdale and Rossendale councils means there are very few Police resources to attend any possible crimes or disturbances resulting in delayed attendance and the inability to deal effectively. This would have an adverse effect on the local residents. Although the majority of travellers are law abiding, from personal experience through work I am fully aware of what effect a Travellers site can have on an area and community. I therefore - feel this location is far too remote to be able to deal with these issues. - 5.There has been issues with flooding in Bacup in recent years and creating hardstandings on moorland above Bacup is only going to make matters worse and I do not see how the council can justify this when there are much more suitable locations within the valley. - 6.This area has already been badly effected by Pylons , Windturbines and a smelly waste disposal site as well as having tonnes of illegally dumped waste at Heald Top Farm and fly tipping on a regular basis. - - We feel the council should look at sites within the valley where travellers have been evicted from in the past as appropriate locations such as Futures Park where weather conditions are better and amenities closer to		Please consider looking at more suitable locations. - As Calderdale residents we were totally unaware of this planning application and feel very upset that we have been given limited time to voice our concerns and also feel very worried there be will lots of calderdale residents who live nearby who will be totally unaware of this application and totally against it but unable to have their say due to it not being widely publicised by Rossendale Council.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
974	Jean	Howarth	-	Travellers Site	Object	<p>The site has no running water or foul and surface drains or electricity. It will not blend in to the local countryside and will not be sympathetic to the local housing stock, including my grade 2 listed house.. The site has a significant wildlife interest and it's biodiversity could be under threat from draining the land or potential pollution of the water from accidental spillages of diesels and oils. The site would be hard to manage and the number of caravans and support vehicles would be overbearing in its size. The site floods and would present difficult living conditions for the travellers. The site would be at risk of fly tipping once opened up from both the travellers and persons taking part in criminal activity. There are no local amenities up in Sharneyford and only a limited bus service. The site is Greenfield and is outside the urban boundary and your planning policies state any development should be within the settlement boundary. They couldn't prove any need to be in the country to live, in fact, in Rossendale, they traditionally seek hard standing and like to be close to amenities. There are brownfield sites that would better suit their needs. (Futures Park.) Some travellers sites have had criminal activities taking place, including violence, we are isolated up in Sharneyford and I feel we could be at risk. The site has seen a great recovery since the quarry closed and is full of ponds and waterfowl and aquatic life could lose habitat. Essentially, the site deserves protecting, not violating. There could be noise from the travellers generators and light pollution from portable lighting units that could not be controlled or be sympathetic to local housing like the positioning of traditional street lights. Due to the site being transient, there is the potential for a lack of ownership and this could prove catastrophic for the biodiversity of the site. The residential area would be ruined due to the site having both domestic and commercial interests, which would not be appropriate for the setting.</p>		<p>Residents could overstay their permitted time at the site and this would prove hard to police. I fear there would be more than the eight permitted caravans and again, would be hard to police. We could be under threat f the travellers feel we were responsible for reporting both over stayers and over occupancy. I would feel threatened alone at night with my daughter because there is no way of knowing who is travelling through the borough and staying on our doorstep. I appreciate the vast majority of travellers are genuine people but, I also acknowledge that, historically, there have been anti-social behaviour issues on some sites and being up there would petrify me if there was violent travellers passing through. Thanks for taking time to read my objections. - - Jean Howarth - 278 Todmorden Rd, - Sharneyford. Bacup</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1007	Rachel	OLeary	-		Object	Dear Sir/Madam, - I would like to object to the proposal of a Gypsy Travellers site at Tooter Quarry Todmorden Road Bacup. - Instead of this inhospitable site, I would like to suggest Futures Park, Valley View or off John Street Whitworth where the travellers already park up as they are closer to local amenities, street lighting, they are in the valley so they are away from the open elements on the moor and where the living conditions are much easier for them. Let's be honest, they wouldn't utilise this site unless they had to move from Futures Park, Valley View or John St Whitworth anyway. Then they would simply use this Todmorden site temporarily to then return to the others which they prefer! This will cause more problems and costs to tax payers in the long term. - I am sad to have to object to this proposal, as the site should not have been chosen in the first place. I suggest that this plan has been rushed, no travellers surveys or thought or experience what so ever has gone into this. It is very worrying that we place our trust in the Planning team for them to make the best decisions for our borough when instead they are choosing the easy option with minimal objections. I intend to take this further in the hope that whoever decided that this was a suitable place to house a caravan site be re trained in their field of planning. - I can only think of one reason why this site has been chosen and that is because there are not many residents living up here to be able to complain! So there will not be many objections as there are not many to object! The plan has been buried in a huge document draft so that the residents of Rossendale will instead focus on the housing developments near to where they and their families live and not the overall impact on our borough or the impression it has on visitors to the valley. So the objections will be low due to this and will not demonstrate public opinion at all. - - The site is over 1000 ft high, with gale force winds, driving rain, no street lighting, they will not use this site except maybe in the summer months which due to the surrounding open area will then be open for dozens of vehicles if not possibly hundreds of travelling people congregating for parties. - We have proof that a number of years ago when some new age travellers did pass through, caravans blew away and sunk on the site. It is inhospitable for a tin home of a caravan. The school is always over subscribed and there is no bus service to other schools, so are tax payers to subsidise travel for the children on the site to go to school? Also there is already a serious regular fly tipping problem in this area of geological interest and as we already are aware, travellers are renowned for leaving waste when they leave their sites. After using their fuel to hoard their caravans, horses and vans up to the site, what happens if it is already full? They have a selection of places to choose from and would obviously use farmer's fields, lanes, the entrance to the windmills, RS Motorcycles, the parking at the top where the fly tipping is done and the geological site of flower scar instead, is this view we want on the welcome to Rossendale and Lancashire border? The journey		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						<p>which is a fantastic viewpoint and aesthetically pleasing entrance to our county. Surely planners know and have researched that the best places for a travellers site is close to where the travellers already use, or they just will not use it will they! This way next to the main road with buildings bordering the site, if the site is full they have no choice but to move on to a site allocated in the next town, which would be the natural flow. This would then be easier to manage by the council and police, local residents can report any anti social behaviour instead of individual cottages on the moor having to lock down their properties feeling isolated and threatened and not protected by our police because they are 20 minutes away. - The site is inhospitable no running water, no drains and no electric. Having generators running all the time on a permanent basis is not in keeping with the moor and would impact local residents with noise pollution and light pollution. Who would pay for the toilets to be emptied and site maintained? If it is left to the travellers, some chemical toilet waste may be left on to the land which has happened before, and having compiled the pollution reporting for United Utilities and Yorkshire Water I am aware that this pollution could affect the water table as it is at the top of the hill. - There is no hard standing and providing hard standings would interfere with the bio-diversity and cause flooding, as we are only too aware removing the mosses and covering years of deep natural draining causes flooding, and our moorland must be protected from this as it captures the water naturally. - The site cannot be shielded/covered with native trees as no trees will grow or have grown on the site as it is shale and if they were going to grow they would have already grown in over 20 years and have not. So how can any hard standing "Respect the character and distinctiveness of the local landscape." let alone a number of caravans which cannot be shielded sufficiently in line with the moorland landscape? - I hope that Rossendale planning will do what most other planning departments do in most other counties and designate this spot as a place for nature to flourish as it is already doing, allowing access, benches and schools to conduct biology lessons etc instead of trying to cover it in concrete. - I hope that planners will use their skills to consider Futures Park, Valley View or off John Street Whitworth. If these other sites cannot be utilised, I suggest that local businesses should be contacted like B E Boys who have dozens of brownfield sites on the main road which can be used for this temporary purpose and already have utilities and foundations. - Please take my concerns into consideration and look at more suitable sites across Rossendale for the travellers. I have also forwarded my concerns to Calderdale Council as they will be affected by this plan. - -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1048	Ailis	Ni Riain	-	HS16.1 Proposed 'Transit' Site	Object	I understand there is a marked boundary and that this site is outside the "Urban Boundary" - and therefore should not be used for housing gypsy of traveller communities. There are already wind turbines put up around the area of Sharneyford and it's approach much to the detriment of the landscape. 'Key views' are already jeopardized and the character of the area will suffer - - A traveller and gypsy site - and all that that normally entails - is certainly not a desirable proposition in an area where we should encouraging walkers and tourism if at all possible therefore contributing to your own aims for Landscape Character and Quality (Policy ENV4). It will not be in keeping with the rural environment and I suspect will, as ever, lead to abuse of the landscape and character of the area. - -	-	-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1056	Nicola	Howorth	-		Object	<p>To Whom it may concern, - - I am writing to voice my utter objection to the plans put forward by Rossendale borough council to transform Little Tooter Quarry into a transient travellers site. - - I am a former resident of a farm local to the area in question, however I now live down the road in Stacksteads. When hearing of the plans I was initially shocked at the thought of anybody trying to sustain life in a caravan or living wagon at the top of Sharneyford. It sees some of Rossendale's worst weather. I feel the travelling community will find it laughable to think they are expected to remain 'up there' and will voice this through their actions i.e. by continuing to reside in their usual spots - Futures Business Park in Bacup, Valley View in Whitworth etc. If you examine the most commonly used roads by the travelling community, you will find that Todmorden Road is not one of them, and is actually a very isolated area which serves no use to a community of women, children and the elderly who need access to local amenities such as supermarkets, healthcare services etc. - The proposed land which you have suggested is suitable for residing on is known by anyone who has visited the area all year round to be almost a wetland and a huge 'soak-away' for a lot of the surrounding land. This means that in its current state it is entirely unsuitable for driving onto, never mind trying to pitch a caravan etc. If works are carried out to correct this issue (of which I would like to question; who will be funding such ventures? I suspect it will be you and I - the taxpayers!) I fear the water would have no choice but to travel downhill, further impacting on the horrendous and ever-increasing flooding we have seen through Bacup in recent years. Can you please inform me of any measures you will be taking to reassure residents this would not be the case? Dredging the rivers to make way for such a volume of water would be my suggestion however I suspect this would come at a high cost. - I feel much thought has gone into finding an area which is very much 'out of sight' to both council officials and the majority of the population of Rossendale, but not a single thought has been given to the needs of those the site is intended for, the travellers themselves. - I feel if you consulted the travelling community, you might find that they would prefer very much to be welcomed onto Futures Business Park instead of being evicted every time they set up their homes in this area. This is clearly the most convenient site for them as they keep returning despite countless eviction orders. What makes it 'unsuitable' to transform this site (which I assume is already council-owned?) into a resting place for our travelling community? - - An alternative place that springs to mind is the old waste site at the top of Blackwood road in Stacksteads which I believe is currently owned by the council and will have lighting etc. already installed. I believe this site has been considered in previous plans, could you advise me on what makes either of my suggested locations unsuitable for a travelling site and why you haven't even considered them in your 2019-2034 plans? - - The two sites I have suggested are just been plucked from the top</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----------------

of my head, I am sure given more time I could find at least a dozen suggestions, the fact you seem to have only found one 'suitable' site tells me that you either have not given it any real consideration or that you have given extremely careful consideration to choose a spot where you can see there are fewer residents in the area and therefore fewer appeals will be made to the plans. If the latter is true then I have to inform you that you have your priorities very wrong. If you must, by law, make a traveller site in Rossendale, then I beg you to place it in a position in which it will be valued and used by the community it is designed to serve. - - Thankyou for taking the time to read my letter. I look forward to hearing your response to the questions I have highlighted. - - Yours Faithfully, - Nicola Howorth

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1057	Karen	Taylor	-		Object	<p>I have lived in Sharneyford for 33 years and am a regular walker/fell runner on the moors around my home. Near our doorstep, runs a part of the Rossendale Way, over the open, somewhat desolate moorland but all the more wonderful. - To live in such a beautiful area of the country is a delight and I am always inspired by what I am so fortunate to experience. - To learn that Little Tooter Hill Quarry has been proposed for a Traveller's Site came with sadness. Over the many years, Little Tooter Quarry has rejuvenated itself into an area of great environmental wealth; ponds, marshes and moorland, restoring some of the wildlife and plants that it had 'homed' before the quarrymen came! - As I have commented, I have included quotes from your policy to support my objections. (I did highlight specific phrases but unfortunately they have not shown on your page.) - Instead of proposing the site be dug up, drained (if indeed it can be- as the area collects and holds water from the surrounding moors and is a nature's way of preventing flooding of the area), - Policy ENV11: Surface Water Run-Off, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality - Rossendale has large areas of flood risk. *There are high surface water runoff rates coming off the hillsides especially after sustained periods of heavy rain. High surface water runoff also contributes to temporary poor water quality.* - concreted.... and turned into a caravan site with the loss of these habitats, shouldn't it be made into an area of natural beauty? Why couldn't the Little Tooter Hill Quarry site be left to complement The Rossendale Way, The Mary Towneley Loop and historical Lee Quarry and provide an educational site for the schools: Sharneyford, Thorn, St. Mary's, Northern... or just leave it alone for the enjoyment of all. - Policy SD1 - At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of *sustainable development*, this is a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. The definition of * is: development that is conducted without depletion of natural resources. - Policy SD1 - The Council will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development *that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.* How will the traveller's site at Little Tooter Hill improve this? - - Continued over... - - - - - Thank you.</p>		<p>Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt - All new development in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundaries, defined on the Policies map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the *development enhances the rural character of the area.* Sharneyford has maintained its rural character over the years that I have lived here; we have a strong relationship with the environment around us, a small community living in farms, cottages and stone built houses, close families, some who have lived here all their lives as did their parents...How can a traveller's site enhance this? - - Policy HS14: Conversion and Re-Use of Rural Buildings in the Countryside - The proposal does not have a materially greater impact on the openness of the area and the proposal will *not harm the character of the countryside* In my opinion, the site will harm the character of Sharneyford. - The conversion works and facing materials to be introduced would be *in keeping with the original building, and important architectural and historical features would be retained.* How will the caravan site do this? - The proposals would serve to *preserve or enhance the setting of any nearby Listed Building* . The Old Toll House is a listed building and it almost directly faces the entrance to the quarry site. - The development does not *require the removal of, or damage to, significant or prominent trees,</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
								<p>hedges, watercourses, ponds or any other natural landscape features*</p> <p>The development of the traveller's site will do exactly this! - The development *would not have an unacceptable impact on nature conservation interests or any protected species present* The development of the traveller's site will do exactly this! - Policy HS16: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - Developments need to function well and add to the overall quality of the area. They should optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development and respond to* Rossendale's local character, history and topography. In Rossendale the relationship of town and countryside, hill and valley, stone and other materials are particularly important.* Won't a caravan site in spoil the local character of Sharneyford? Yes! - - Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks - Development proposals should *protect areas of biodiversity and ecological networks and where possible enhance sites and linkages.* The biodiversity and ecological aspect of the rejuvenated Little Tooter Hill Quarry site will be destroyed not enhanced! - - May I draw your attention to some worries of mine: I have had personal contact with travellers in the area: I left my car at the bottom of Lee Quarry (near Kingfisher) to go for a run- when I returned a group of travellers were parking their caravans in the lanes where I was parked. It was quite hectic with more caravans arriving at the time I returned. I and others</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
								<p>(bikers) were boxed in. Politely, I asked if I could get my car out- two females were extremely aggressive towards me and brought over some men from their group. It was my fault that I had parked there and they then ignored me and continued to park up. Another time, when the travellers were already parked up, I went for a run and some dogs that were roaming about their camp, set upon me. It was really frightening. , In both instances, I was lucky because I had some bikers to support me. What I am concerned about is that as I have mentioned above, run and walk over Sharneyford, which is quiet with few people about- the Police Station is at Waterfoot, no community police.... am I now to lose the freedom to enjoy the moors because I feel unsafe? - Another worry, again that I have witnessed at travellers' camps set up The Kingfisher and near Flower Scar Road, is the fly tipping and rubbish the travellers leave. An absolute, foul disgrace! This will destroy the habitats and we will lose the wildlife that at the moment live there. Who will be responsible for monitoring this at the Little Tooter Hill Quarry site? - Policy HS16 Basic facilities such as toilets, water and waste bins would be provided. - Waste bins will not be inadequate for the fly tipping of the travellers, I feel. Who will pay for the toilets and water to be provided? The houses near the site use spring water. - Hopefully, there may be further opportunities for me to comment further if it is necessary. - Thank you.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1064	April	Ormerod	-		Object	<p>- The site would not be visually respectful to the surrounding properties and would not blend in with the moorland landscape. There would be no opportunity to screen the site naturally as indigenous trees would take years to grow and, due to the high winds experienced up at Sharneyford, the growth would be dramatically stunted. It is a moorland landscape and, should stay as a moorland landscape. The site would dominate the local views and would pose a potential disaster if hydrocarbons were released at the site through irresponsible travellers accidentally spilling or deliberately releasing old fuels into the flooded quarry or the gully running from the site. The local Primary school is full and further children could not be accommodated easily. The area around the Tooter Quarry suffers from fly tipping and, opening up the quarry could see tipping on an industrial scale due to the hidden nature of the majority of the site. How could this be managed? Fly tipping has happened every time travellers visit the valley. There is no sanitation at the quarry, there is no drinking water at the quarry. what would happen to the site if travellers chose not to use toilets in the caravans, as I believe they chose not to, then defecate in and around the quarry, which has happened at some travellers sites? There are no shops etc, the nearest one is in Bacup or Todmorden, at best that's a mile or more to access local amenities. Why would Gypsies want to live up on the moor? I believe there could be potential health issues due to the cold and damp environment if people stay up there. Who would clear there waste? Many sites see illegal burning and that could result in pollution and could affect the wildlife; plant life and pond life inside the quarry. Who says the gypsies want to live there or travel through there? Surely there are more suitable sites in Rossendale, closer to main A roads and the motorway network. There is no logical route over Todmorden/Bacup Rd in my mind. -</p>		<p>Please consider my opinions carefully. Please protect this corner of Bacup from development. Please understand that this area is important and has seen many inappropriate additions such as the turbines. Please understand that this site and area is used by many visitors and walkers, it is the entrance to our County, our Borough and our Town. Bacup has so many areas not to be proud of the old Bingo Hall, the burnt out Waterside Mill, and the former Health Centre site to mention a few. Why would we destroy this former quarry that has recovered from its previous industrial past and blight the moorland landscape with both caravans and pickups and other commercial type vehicles? Please think again about the proposal. Regards April.</p>
1067	Ajay	Gilbert	-		Object	<p>Having only just moved to this lovely village I was shocked to receive news of the proposed travellers site just up the road from us. It will spoil the beauty and peacefulness of the area and devalue our homes. I am not prejudiced against these people - I quite like 'outsiders' and admire their independent spirits but they are either part of our society/community or they are not, and I don't see why the council has to accommodate them in this manner. - Typically such sites contribute to an increase in crime rate and feature unsightly mess. - I appreciate the council is in a difficult position, and I guess there are very few communities who would welcome such a proposal with open arms, but I consider your first duty to be towards the tax-paying families whose more conventional lifestyles will be adversely affected by such a proposal at that location.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1139	Andy	Stephenson	ASA Micros Ltd		Object	Unsuitable location away from amenities - isolated location. - A more suitable, central location, would be Kingfisher Park. - No evidence that this site is on the route to Appleby. - No evidence that this site is wanted by the traveller community. - Poor bus service. - Damage to established wildlife in the area that took 25 plus years to re-establish. - More suited to a nature reserve. - Lack of information as to how the site will be monitored, funded, maintained. - Area is already subject to fly tipping. How will this be monitored and managed? - Local police and emergency services will not be able to respond to incidents in a timely fashion. - Isolated rural location. - Tree line screening not suitable in this area. - Outside of Urban Boundary. - Not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. - Cause damage to existing water courses. - D		Why is there only 1 proposed site for HS16.1? - If you are to provide such a facility, then it need to be more central. -
1173	Glynis	Jones	-		Object	The proposed site is totally inappropriate in this rural location, particularly in relation to the site itself. The former quarry has been transformed into one of ecological diversity as flora and fauna have populated the area. This site is important to an area which is recovering from its industrial past. This would be destroyed by the necessary clearance and work on the services required to support a traveller's' site. - - The traveller's appear to prefer sites which are more central and close to amenities, hence their presence near the Kingfisher Centre. In addition, the severe winter weather that would be experienced by residents here would make the site unsuitable. - - There are concerns about potential tipping activity in an area which is already suffering from this blight on the environment. - - The site is close to a major bend in the road in a 60 mph zone where drivers are already likely to speed and could therefore present a danger to caravans turning and slowing. A large number of heavy goods vehicles use this road, and particularly those going to the compositing plant adding to that danger. - - Over the years residents have been subjected to the maggot plant, constant traffic to the compost plant with foul smells emanating from the vehicles, as well as from the plant itself. Pylons and wind turbines clutter the landscape, and associated roadworks have left the road in an appalling condition. Please do not now subject us to yet another assault on this recovering rural landscape. Why can't the site that the traveller's already chosen to use be made a permanent one?		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1184	William Victor	Morrell	-		Object	Dangerous location close to a bend, slow vehicles could cause accidents on this busy road with 60 mph speed limit. High usage by HVGs already causing a problem - The site is in an area of natural interest. Tree planting has already improved the area, but this site would have a detrimental effect plants and wildlife now colonising this site. Important water course in relation to flooding lower down, potential danger of this being blocked. Potential tipping problems given type of work often carried out by travellers. Impact on houses opposite the site and site not in keeping with local residences which are stone built with listed buildings in the area. Concerns about how the site will be monitored and managed in terms of length of stay, condition of the site etc.		No
1204	Samantha	Bradford	TA		Object	I would like to raise my concerns as follows: - - Who will be responsible for the removal of waste/cleaning and upkeep of the site - - Who will police the site, while in use by the transient community and when not in use, this will become a place where non-travellers could hangout - - What is the footfall of travellers – do you have statistics that underpinned your reasoning to proposal of the site in Sharenford - - Alternative sites - there are many disused areas within 'urban boundary' that can be used – is it a case of 'out of site, out of mind?' - - Concern with the integration of the transient community with the local community - - The isolation and vulnerability of the residents in the area, there are many older members of the community that are already isolated due to the lack of facilities and services in the area. - - The destruction of a recovering bio-diverse site. - - Contradiction of your own policies in relation to urban housing - - Pollution created by the site, rubbish, waste disposal. - - Pressure on oversubscribed facilities/amenities in the area. - - Cost implications- I contribute to the maintenance of the borough through my taxes. What contribution will the community that use this site be making - - There is no public transport in the area, leaving us and the transient community without links. - - Already have to put up with smelly/loud/speeding HGVs that pass through all hours. The transient community have been known to have many vehicles that they use for personal business use. This will overcrowd the site and make it eyesore.		I think you should reconsider this proposal, we do not need an 'out of site out of mind' transit site in Sharneyford. That will then be 'signposted' for use by a non contributing group of people. Given this is within meters of the edge of the Rossendale boundary that is already neglected and overlooked by the council and other services, and is not considered when allocating the area as a pylon/wind turbine/refuse disposal vicinity. - - This is an aging population of vulnerable people and you are putting them and myself at unnecessary risk.
1206	Jennifer	Hardman	-		Object	This is not the right place for a traveller community. I have lived in this neighborhood for over 40 years and I cannot see the need for the site to be located in this area. I live on the road from Bacup to the proposed site and I feel that I and others within the local vicinity could be a risk with the encouragement of a traveller site in the area.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1252	paul	ross	-		Object	<p>Dear sir /madam - I am writing in objection to the proposed travellers site at tooter hill Quarry todmorden road sharney ford HS16.1,one of my concerns is the proposed development at the said site is out of the urban boundary, there is no evidence from the planning department that the development would benefit or enhance the site and surrounding area, there fore such a development should be kept within the urban boundary. Also there would be a loss of country side which doesn't keep up with the outlook and wouldn't blend in with the surrounding houses and I firmly say hinterland villages like sharneyford should be protected from such developments and proposal's. - I am also concerned that the planning states it will be a transient site which means the travellers will come and go without anybody really knowing who,s who and how many other travellers and visitors are on the site , it would be extremely difficult to police, 8 caravans are proposed, my concerns also is the amount of machinery that they use for there work , wagons horse boxes etc that they would fetch, 16 acres is a large area so I feel there would be a lot more than eight vehicles on the proposed site and would look out of place with the look of the surrounding area and would be a eyesore to what is a beautiful area with outstanding views, there would be massive changes to the current look of the current site as it is now, as its very high up it takes a long time for anything to grow, the temperatures are cold at best , the trees that was planted many years ago have struggled to grow, therefore any new planting to potentially shield the site wouldn't work as it would take to long for new trees to grow and we would be left with a view that doesn't complement the surrounding area and views, there would be absolutely no chance of retaining existing water courses and trees on the proposed site. - I also believe that the site would be built in such a way that would not blend in with local housing that is in this area as a lot of the houses are nearly two hundred years old and older in some cases therefore I believe the traveller's site wouldn't be built using traditional materials etc ,also there is a listed house facing the proposed site, again there would be no chance of the proposels blending in with the current character of the surrounding areas. I feel strongly about the amount of commercial rubbish that could be potentially left which is essentially a 16 acre hole, who is going to police this?. - I have concerns of pollution regards diesel ,oils etc that would come hand in hand with vans wagons and machinery , what would happen when spillages makes its way into the water ways which will in my opinion is certain to happen and we have polluted rivers and streams polluted and lots of dead wildlife , in my opinion there is lots of wild life on the current site, lots of birds and lots of other things living in the spongy type of nature reserve it has turned it self into as I remember it just being a quarry hole that has transformed into something that no one could have imagined , who knows what is living in there , Badgers have been reported to sometimes be living in a</p>		I have put my points across in my letter.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						<p>nook that slides under a little rock face on one of the banks on the right hand side of the quarry so I take all these points would be taken into consideration as these animals and wild creatures that are living within the site and marshes deserve to be left in pieces rather than die through excavation. - The quarry holds a lot of water as people that have seen the quarry develop from a large hole to almost a flat spongy marsh can vouch for therefore it is also retaining a lot of water and slow releasing in to the water ways which acts as a great flood plain, I would have massive concerns if the site was developed as to where and how the water that collects there would affect the local todmorden road streams and drains which heads straight to bacup adding to the problems bacup already has with flooding, - The site would need regular checks for pollution , rubbish, over population , with a transient community I think this would be very hard to police and would object as the risk to existing wild life and pollution would be a big risk and one that shouldn't be taken. - Adding this to the current wind farms we have and the composting wagons which stink us out as well as fly tipping like at heald top farm which is a absolute eyesore , what would happen if tooter quarry ends up the same , its a risk I think shouldn't be taken. - As I am led to believe there is no existing drains , no electric and running water, so as I see it we would have to look at put up with make shift toilets , noisy generators running day and night , this again polluting the area with antisocial noise and is something that we should not have to put up with in a village like ours.who would pay the for make shift toilets to be emptied , I fear that if it is left to the travellers as it would be a transient site no one would pay and the toilets would be tipped on the site or on surrounding fields or simply just left full and would be a health and safety hazard along with the smell, , Again this would also have a impact on the current wildlife and habitants of the quarry, Anti social behaviour and crime would soar , we have a crime free area compared to most - Having lived on todmorden road for a long time I also know the travellers don't want to be up here , they can access lots of spare land and never do, they don't want to be here, its to out the way we have no shops and amenities and would not survive a winter up there in a caravan . why would they want to be up here when they can camp in the urban area of the town, fact tells me that, they like being at futures park, its in the town, there children are safe from freezing in winter its close to the shops supermarkets and is more livable that the quarry on todmorden road. - As the ride-on biking plans have fell through and the land is being fly tipped on etc why propose this land as there is space for a transient site, they clearly like it there and would be easier to monitor and easier to build as that area is urban and not country side. - I would like it if you would consider other sites across Rossendale that would suit the travellers and there needs.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1274	joan	heap	-		Object	<p>This site as gone from a disused quarry to what some would class as an area of natural beauty. - This will affect local wildlife and wild flowers/shrubs. - Will there be a survey for nesting birds, bats, badgers and the wild deer in this area? - As we cannot predict the future and know what type of Gypsy/travellers will arrive on site.(good and bad in all walks of life). Can you guarantee that the site will be kept clean and tidy. Who pays for the clean up operation? As you keep saying this is not a permanent site, so Gypsy/travellers will not have to pay anything towards this venture, but we will as taxpayers and we will not benefit from this. - The stream running down sharneyford will not be contaminated and no illegal dumping of waste (trees and tarmac). - Who will be monitoring this site, or are sharneyford residents left to paddle there own canoe, now that the council have made cutbacks in all areas also if there is a problem with our safety or belongings the local police will not be available, due to cut backs again. - The affect on house prices will not be in our favour. The affect on local businesses will suffer, self catering accommodation, local farmers who have sheep and cows in adjacent fields. A lot of Travellers have dogs and sheep worrying would is a very cruel way for sheep and lambs to die. Again who will take responsibility and cover the cost? - A good number of years ago travellers arrived in sharneyford at the bus turnaround area.they were removed and the area made inaccessible. A while after that travellers arrived again at the top of sharneyford left a terrible mess and the process was repeated. The travellers have not been back since. Now you want to put back them up sharneyford. - Given the choice were would the travellers want to be? On the top of a hill on their own were the weather can be cold and wet. The area is prone to water which will make it boggy. There is no street lighting, now no bus route. Will they want to be on a tarmacked hard standing with street lighting and access to local amenities? Were they can be monitored for there well being and ours. The area we suggest is futures park. This is the area THEY keep choosing!</p>		<p>Has anyone sat down with the Gypsy/travellers and asked them where they would like to be situated? - You are telling us that you are proposing Tooter Hill Quarry and asking us whether we object. We do - You the council are just as bad you are telling them were they have to go. Your are Not listening either. ASK THEM !</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1275	Nic	Greenwood	-		Object	<p>I have lived in Sharneyford for 41 years my family also live here. I wish to object to the planned traveller site for a number of reasons. - We have pylons, wind turbines, fly tipping and smelly wagons to contend with. In addition, behind us we have 8 hundred tonnes of illegally dumped waste at Heald Top Farm, which it appears that no one can do anything about other than to let it rot! What would happen if we have a similar incident in the quarry? - Some travellers do use plant and machinery and with that comes oils and diesels. The majority would manage these pollutants safely however, there are some who would not use these potential pollutants responsibly. Policy ENV7: Environmental Protection says; - Development which has the potential, either individually or cumulatively, to result in pollution that has an unacceptable impact on health, amenity, biodiversity including designated sites, will only be permitted if the risk of pollution is effectively prevented or reduced and mitigated to an acceptable level by: - Undertaking assessments and/or detailed site investigations of land which is or may be affected by contamination and implementing appropriate remediation measures to ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use and that there is no unacceptable risk of pollution within the site or in the surrounding area. - I believe, policing the control of such substances would be very hard with a transient community and on these grounds , I would strongly object to the site as there is too much at stake with the potential pollution and loss of habitat for wildlife at the quarry. - The majority of travellers are law abiding and respect the countryside but, there are a small minority that carry out illegal activities, in fact DCLG have produced advice to local councils with issues such as this in mind including, fly tipping, illegal burning, and other anti-social behaviour trends associated with traveller sites. It may only be a minority of travellers that do that but, I don't believe we can take a risk at this site due do the green, biodiversity environment which is at risk in the quarry if such tipping and illegal burning occurs. And I don't believe a transient traveller's site could; - - "Where appropriate, development should incorporate habitat features of value to wildlife within the development (including within building design)."</p>		<p>I don't believe that a traveller site is appropriate for the area or community I feel that it would be detrimental to the natural beauty and eco system with the quarry. Traveller have never stayed at the quarry probably due to the remoteness of it from local services and the exposed nature of the site</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1278	Lucy	Ross	-		Object	As a resident of Sharneyford I am strongly objecting against the proposal of a traveller site in our small village, if this happens it will be built outside the urban boundary and therefore should be enhancing to the area! How I question is a transient traveller site going to enhance the area? For one it is not going to blend in to a village setting with some very old houses and if im correct in thinking a listed building! There are no amenities up here for them, no electric, plumbing, waste disposal etc who is to pay for all this? If left up to the travellers I fear they would just leave all their waste it or fly tip it on the moorland if they aren't to return would they really care! I think not! Not to mention the threat of antisocial behaviour, which yes is a minority of travellers but with them changing over repeatedly how do you know what sort of people are staying there, how will this be policed with an already stretched and cut force! Sharneyford primary is a small already oversubscribed school which simply cannot and should not have to accommodate an influx of travelling children. The quarry site is a basin which holds water and slowly releases it, if this was interfered with and built on then what would happen to the excess water? this will present a flood risk! we only need a heavy downpour up here and the road becomes a river so add to that all the water the basin holds and you create an unnecessary flood problem! Not to mention all the wildlife that resides in the quarry, surely that should be a focus and enhanced as an area of natural beauty for the children and residents of the village to enjoy and not sticking a load of unsightly caravans and vehicles up there, its a disgusting waste of a beautiful landscape, I believe badgers may even live in the quarry! are they not a protected species? Common sense tells me that these travellers don't even want to be up here, there are no amenities, limited bus service and never do they set up here despite being able to access land. The one place I have seen them repeatedly set up is on the land next to futures park in stacksteads which is unoccupied so why not have it there? I would urge you to consider my points and have this site at futures park		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1301	Andrea	Kay	Homeowner		Object	<p>Dear Sir / Madame - - I am a Sharneyford resident, I am writing to object to the proposal to develop a Gypsy and Travellers Sight at Tooter Quarry, Todmorden Road, Sharneyford. HS16.1 - I have significant concerns in relation to the location of the choses sight. - It is well known that the gypsy and travelling communities are one of the most marginalised and oppressed communities within society. They face a high-level of poverty and discrimination and concerns are regularly recorded in relation to their unmet needs, poor physical and mental health, inappropriate housing conditions, poor sanitation and lack of educational opportunities. - The Local Area Safeguarding Children's board express concerns in relation to the high-levels of child neglect, poverty, domestic abuse and substance misuse. Due to the transient life style, it harder to provide the appropriate education and support, therefore the key is to integrate these communities into society and not to segregate and isolate. It is imperative that the women and children within this community are seen and heard and have appropriate access to community resources and services. - Central government has proposed to take measures to address these inequalities and provided better outcomes in relation to social isolation, poverty, education, health, housing and hate crime etc. This will mean that each local council had a duty to promote equality and challenge discrimination. - - The proposed site will significantly isolate this community from society, the council could not have choses a more remote isolative sight. Without transport there is no access to shops, health care, available educational facilities. Currently there is no bus service. Due to the rural location very few people are physically fit enough or able to walk up from the doctors, schools, shops or town centre to the quarry sight. This will further isolate the women and children within this community. - As a Sharneyford Resident, over eight months of the years we are subject to extreme weather conditions. Temperatures plummet below zero on a regular basis, the wind, rain, fog and snow provide a harsh environment in which to reside. Our homes are required to be maintained to a high standard, all have stone roofs, most have additional insulation and all have heating bills above the national average. - - The quarry sight which is proposed fills with water acting as a flood plain for both Bacup and Todmorden, as the council are well aware the flooding has worsened over recent years, and of concern is that interference with this quarry will only exacerbate the flood issues. - - Snow drifts have been known to cover the back of my house for over a period of a month during the winter, I would be extremely concern about the safety and welfare of any individual living in a caravan, relaying on hook up electricity in such extreme weather conditions. The quarry its self, also fills with water and snow, being exposes to such conditions could have fatal consequences for the most vulnerable members of our society, the children and elderly. - - Therefore, in conclusion I express concern that the Council Members</p>		I am of the view that the plan should be rejected for the reasons stated above. That the council identified a alternative more appropriate sight.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						<p>proposing this sight are significantly discriminating against the Travelling and Gypsy community, by failing to take their needs fully in to account. Furthermore, they would be isolating them from society, restricting their access to community resources and facilities also placing their health and welfare at significant risk of harm, due to social isolation and the extreme adverse weather conditions we experienced here in Sharneyford. - - I am of the view that the local council would be failing in their duties to address the government recommendations to challenging these social inequalities of the gypsy travelling communities and to implement the recommended local strategies in relation to flooding. - - Out of the whole of the Rossendale Valley, I fail to see that this proposal is the only option available. The sight at New Hall Hey Road in Rawtenstall, has recently failed as a retail sight, its central to all amenities which would meet the needs of gypsy and traveller's community, it already has hard standing, water and electricity and is close to the motorway network. It is currently housing the travelling fair. - - The gypsy travelling community have identified sights appropriate for themselves such as Futures Park, I request that the council reconsider these sights, the needs and basic human rights of this community. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1305	Fiona	Knapper	-		Object	<p>I was extremely alarmed to discover that this site has been proposed as a transient travellers' site. It is entirely unsuitable for a number of reasons, something which the planners ought to already know as they have red rated most of the key considerations in the local plan. - It is a remote location, outside of the urban boundary. An ongoing series of caravans and mobile homes will do nothing to 'enhance the rural character', which any development outside the urban boundary is required to do. - It is also distant from any local amenities. Sharneyford is a very small hamlet, consisting only of houses and a primary school. There are no shops, no doctors and, crucially, no public transport is available to transport people to these amenities. The only bus service that ran has now been stopped, making Sharneyford a place completely unsuited to anyone who may be vulnerable and in need of support services. - The site itself is recognised as an area of important bio-diversity, something that will certainly be negatively impacted by development of any kind. It is also prone to flooding, and this is likely to worsen if hardstanding is laid, increasing the amount of water run off in wet conditions. - The site has no basic amenities in place, such as water and sewage, which means a considerable amount of expense and disruption would be necessary to provide these. - The site is unlikely to meet with approval from traveller communities, due to the above practical considerations. When traveller communities arrive in the Bacup end of Rossendale, they choose to settle at the Lee Quarry/Kingfisher building, or at Valley View in Whitworth. These locations are already paved, and would be easily connected to basic facilities, such as water and sewage, as well as being much more practically located for local amenities. I believe that either of these locations would be much more suitable for a traveller site than Tooter Quarry in Sharneyford. - In conclusion, I strongly object to the proposed development at Tooter Quarry.</p>		Please look more closely into developing the brown field sites proposed, and leave our green spaces alone.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1327	Ebony	Ross	-		Object	As a resident I would like to object to the proposal to develop a Gypsy and traveller's site at Tooter quarry, Todmorden road HS16.1 - One of my main concerns is the loss of countryside and the destruction of natural habitats. As it stands, the site is outside of the 'urban boundary' and therefore should not be developed on. I do not believe that the planning department provided sufficient evidence into why the site should be in a countryside setting, which is outside of the urban boundary. Another concern is that this site will not blend in with our local housing. The site wouldn't be built in a manner that would blend into the surrounding houses, some of which are over two hundred years old. This includes a listed milestone and a listed house, both of which would be within yards of the entrance to this proposed site. Tooter Quarry has had a brilliant recovery back to moorland and has created itself a amazing biodiversity which surrounding councils and boroughs would be proud of. I understand that the majority of travellers are law abiding and will respect the countryside, but there is a minority that carry out illegal activities. Even though this may be a minority I do not believe that putting the natural biodiversity and environment at risk is a risk worth taking. Whenever Travellers are in the area they always choose to stay on the spare land at futures park which they evidently like. If they wanted to stay at tooters quarry they have had many chances to do so. The spare land is close to shops etc and is clearly a more suitable site for them to stay on.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1330	laura	davies	-		Object	<p>To whom this may concern, I am a resident on Todmorden Road, Sharneyford, Bacup and live very close to the proposed site to build a gypsy/traveller site. I live with my husband and 3 year old. - - The loss of countryside and urban sprawl is a huge concern to me. I feel that Hinterland villages such as Sharneyford should be protected from proposals such as the suggested. Currently, the site is outside the settlement or "Urban boundary" and therefore should not be developed. Your Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt States; - - "All new development in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundaries, defined on the Policies map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area" - - I feel that the Planning Department could not provide evidence that there is a demonstrable need for the site to be in a countryside setting, outside the urban boundary, and that this development could not enhance the rural character of the area. - - I am concerned that the character of the area will change, and I feel a site of this nature will have a detrimental impact on the lives of the residents in the Sharneyford area including myself when I am walking/driving past on a daily basis to work. - - To build a gypsy/traveller site would almost definitely disturb the Bio-diversity that's taken place since the quarry closed. I believe there is a significant wildlife interest at the quarry and any development would not adhere to your planning Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks which advises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals should avoid harm and where possible enhance biodiversity, and where necessary appropriate mitigation and on and off-site compensatory measures to offset the impact of development • Development proposals should protect areas of biodiversity and ecological networks and where possible enhance sites and linkages. Any unavoidable adverse effects should be minimised and mitigated against, and where this cannot be achieved, compensated for with a net gain for biodiversity demonstrated. • The design and layout of new development should retain and enhance existing features of biodiversity value within and immediately adjacent to the site. Ecological networks should be conserved, enhanced and expanded. Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how ecological networks are incorporated within the scheme. My suggestion is that the Council looks at other sites where the travellers have been evicted from as appropriate locations such; as Futures Park, Valley View or off John Street Whitworth. These locations are closer to local amenities such as shops, bus routes, schools and where the living conditions are much easier for them. - - Yours 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1331	craig	davies	-		Object	I am a resident and business owner and I live very close to the plot that has been earmarked to be turned into a gypsy/traveller site at Tooter Hill Quarry, Sharneyford. - - I do not feel this is a suitable site and i feel you should consider somewhere with better amenities and transport links such as Futures Park.		-
1354	Ivor	Vaughan	-		Object	I don't want a gypsy site on my doorstep. - It is not a suitable site. there are plenty of other places in Rossendale where they could be accommodated. maybe Whitworth where they have lived happily for decades. maybe Futures Park where you could keep an eye on them from your offices, maybe Helmshore after you shut down the textile museum.		-
1360	Catherine	Whitehead	-		Object	I object to this proposed site due to the fact that the site is not suitable for this purpose. - We already have to put up with excessive amounts of huge stinking wagons and roads ruined by wind turbine ducting as well as two wind turbine sites to look at and hear. As a resident of Todmorden road I feel that we have more than enough to put up with and a gypsy site with all it's issues is not acceptable. Other sites can be found where residents are not as affected.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1378	Tia	Howarth	-		Object	<p>Tooter Quarry should be designated as Geen belt and should not developed into a Travellers Site. The quarry has a vast array of moorland plant species and could be put and risk if travellers abuse the site. Most won't but, some may carry out commercial interests that could pollute the quarry. The South Pennine Moors are not considered with enough importance if you ask me and, they should be protected as is the North Yorkshire moors. The site would not match the building style of the houses in this area. Most are made out of natural materials in a style going back as far as the Georgian period and modern caravans would look totally out of place. There would be no effective way of screening the site as quick growing Conifer type trees and shrubs would not blend in with the moorland landscape. The inclement, normal, weather patterns we experience up here would put the health and well being of the visitors at risk . There is a reason why our houses have walls two foot thick up here. There is nothing in terms of amenities in the area that the travellers need. The quarry floods and any attempt to drain it or any pollution could harm the wildlife interest at the quarry. I don't want to see a caravan site that would be oppressive in scale in comparison to the few scattered stone built properties in the area. I worry that the site will go ahead just because there are fewer people to object up here and the Council will put the site up here to keep the Travellers away from more heavily populated areas where the travellers want to be. Many travellers fly tip, it's more than fair to say, the Council and other Councils face huge clean up bills where ever they go and I fear that this site would provide opportunity for those who take part in such activities to dump rubbish on a commercial scale. I worry about crime that is associated with some sites. This is an isolated and potentially vulnerable area to live. How long would it take for a police response if there were safety critical criminal activities taking place up here?</p>		<p>The site is wholly inappropriate for travellers. The site has multiple owners, there are no utilities, no running water or foul drains, not even electricity. Putting these in place or substituting them with water butts or porta-loos would only add to the unsightly nature of the site in this location. Not forgetting loud diesel generators akin to the fair ground. Put the site where the travellers want to be. Look at the sites in Rossendale where they have been visiting. You have the records and know where they want to be. Not half way up a mountain over a thousand foot up. - - Cleaning up this site would be the responsibility of the owner of the site and, with waste costing a thousand pound per tonne to put into landfill, the site could potentially end up as one of the biggest unlicensed tips in the North of England and the Council would be powerless to do anything about it, as with Heald Top Farm's eight hundred tonne of illegally dumped waste. Apparently, the polluters are known but the rubbish has been there now for nearly two years. - - Please let common sense prevail and consider a more suitable site in Rossendale. - - Thank you Tia Howarth.</p>
1441	Catherine	Hunter	-		Object	<p>I am very concerned about this site and having people live there who are sadly known to cause disturbances in an area where they live. I am so fearful that the value of my house will drop. I was looking to put my property on the market in a few years. I strongly strongly feel that with this site so close to my home no body will want to buy it. I worry about walking my dog around the moors in the future. I WILL NOT feel safe anymore.</p>		<p>I am saddened with this proposal, not only do you take our bus service away but you move a potential opportunity to crime in to our little neighbourhood.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1471	Jean	Carter	-		Object	<p>I believe the proposed site is outside the settlement or "Urban boundary" and will not enhance the rural character of the area which is against SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt. I also believe that the proposed site would contradict/contravene the following polices of the Local Plan: - - Policy ENV4: Landscape Character and Quality; - Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geo-diversity and Ecological Networks; - Policy ENV11: Surface Water Run-off, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality; - Policy NV6: Green Infrastructure. - - As stated in the conclusion of the Summer 2015 Consultation ref SHLAA16405, page 62 of 990, the site is not suitable for a permanent residential scheme but can be suitable for a transit site for gypsies and travellers. I believe that if the site is unsuitable for 'residential' then it is also unsuitable for visiting gypsies/travellers as they will be residents whilst occupying the site, for the same reasons. - - This proposed site is isolated, there is presently no bus service (apart from a school service), the nearest local facilities are approximately 3 miles away, the local primary school is approximately 1 mile away, secondary schools at least 4 to 5 miles away, I therefore feel that the travelling community themselves would not wish to have to stay on a site so far away from local services. I feel that there must be other suitable sites/areas closer to local amenities for this proposed development which should be considered before Little Tooter Quarry. - - I have not seen any travellers in the area for a long time which suggests they do not want to be here. They have however been at other locations such as behind Futures Park car park towards Lee Mill Quarry, Valley View and on an area of land off John Street Whitworth which suggests that they wish to be nearer to local amenities, I would therefore suggest that the Council considers these areas to see if they are more suitable for 'visiting' travellers. - - After having studied the proposal for a transit gypsy/travellers' site at Little Tooter Quarry I, and many other residents in the Sharneyford area, believe the site is unsuitable and the development of such would contravene many of the Local Plan's policies, some of which are noted above. I am therefore strongly objecting to this proposal. -</p>		<p>Although this is only a proposal at the moment I believe there are more issues that would need to be resolved than the breach of the policies. - - The actual site would have to have a lot of work carried out on it, presumably by a developer. How would the investment be recovered, from the occupiers of the site - would not think gypsy/travellers would pay for a pitch - does not seem like a viable plan. - How would the site be policed with regard to the length of occupation, sanitation, noise, waste etc and how would it be implemented in such a remote area? Would this come as an extra cost to the residents of Rossendale via Council Tax? - If and I stress 'if' there were any anti-social/criminal concerns how would these be dealt with effectively considering the nearest police desk is approximately 5 miles away? - - These are just a few issues raised at a residents' meeting attended by Councillors Barbara Ashworth and Andrew Walmsley who, unfortunately, could not provide us with any answers. I therefore strongly believe that this proposal should be dismissed by the Council. - - -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1481	John	Howorth	-		Object	<p>As the owner of the land surrounding this site I have no choice but to object to the plans I have read. - - First and foremost I feel a duty to protect the wildlife and habitats of the many animals who have made their homes in the old quarry. For the 12 years I have farmed the surrounding land I have seen a variety of wild birds (including Heron's and Snipe's); I have seen many badgers, and I know for certain there is at least one fox den within the quarry itself. I have lived close to this area for over 22 years and have seen the slow transformation of the quarry go from a barren wasteland to a fertile habitat for numerous species of plants and animals. It is obvious to anyone that if you now decide to open this land up and invite people to live there (whether permanent or temporary) you will be actively reversing over 20 years worth of work. - - The risk to livestock is obviously a personal concern to myself and my family. I am concerned that if the plans were to go ahead then the land I own and farm which borders the quarry is at real risk of contamination. If people begin living in the quarry, there will easily be a 100% increase in litter blowing across onto my land which will have a direct impact on my livestock. The other obvious risk I will face will be dogs. The travelling community, like the rest of society can and do own dogs as pets. Throughout my farming life I have dealt with numerous tragedies where my sheep are killed or injured by dogs who have been let off the lead. More residents equals more dogs, which subsequently equals more attacks on my livestock. A further issue this will cause for me is that should I wish to sell the land I have bought and worked so hard to farm, it will be massively devalued if there is a travelers site adjoining it (mainly due to the anticipated problems mentioned above). - - A final point I would like to make is that as a friend of several travelling families and having driven a horse and cart myself, this is not a route which anyone travelling by horse and cart would use by choice. I am sure you have considered that Todmorden Road is a long, steep road and the majority of the Calderdale side is national speed limit. Why would anybody choose to make an animal suffer the drag of that hill for seemingly no benefit? There are no shops or services up there and it is not the usual route taken by those travelling to Appleby horse fair. If you consider the places travelling communities choose to stay over, you will realise they are usually on car parks and places close to town centres and shops etc. There is good reason for this - they have needs very similar to mine and yours which cannot be met in isolated spaces such as the old quarry in Sharneyford. - - As I am sure you can imagine, me and my family have been worrying about these plans since hearing of them a couple of weeks ago. I have put forward to you my main concerns and hope you will consider them closely. However, if the plans are to go ahead, the only thing which gives me hope that my livelihood will not be affected is that the travelling community will see this site as too inconvenient and continue to park unlawfully in the areas which are of most convenience to them; thereby</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						making your efforts to destroy this beautiful piece of nature a complete waste of time and resources. - - I urge you to reconsider your plans. This site is of least convenience to travelling communities and to use it for such a purpose is of high concern to those farming or living around this area who care about the ecology and diversity of wildlife it currently attracts. Other areas such as Futures Business Park in Bacup and Valley View in Whitworth seem to be the preferred location for the travelers themselves, why are these areas not being considered in your plans? - - Regards, - John Howorth		
1495	christine	Dawson	-		Object	It is not appropriate to allocate a travellers site in Sharneyford both from the travellers point and from the residents point. The site is not suitable for accomodation due to its elevation and proximity to pylons and wind turbines and lack of amenities. - - I understand that travellers at times stay adjacent to Futures Park which would seem to be a more appropriate place . - -		
1527	Stephanie	Van der Hoeven	-		Object	I feel this site is inappropriate given its remote location not to mention this area has become an area of natural beauty and will be destroyed by the caravans and horses. The location of the site means policing will be difficult as no doubt the site will bring some anti-social behaviour problems with it. As this site has a maximum stay of 3 months for passing through travellers who will monitor this? Our nearest police are in Burnley or Rochdale. Also the site would be very far from shops and the transport links from this site for the families is not suitable. In addition, the site would put pressure on schools, doctors etc who are already over subscribed. I feel a much more suitable location could be found for this site within the Rossendale Valley. Lastly, surely the residents of Sharneyford have had enough to put up with e.g. smelly compost trucks driving past and the disruption the wind turbines have caused etc.		
1528	susan	Halliday	halliday healthcare ltd		Object	Location, Hills, ice, snow, not entirely suitable for caravans - - amenities. Not enough school places for my sons step children who needed to move into the area. Plus Doctors surgery over crowded. - - finance. Any excess funds should be aimed at existing facilities for current residents - - monitoring. Police station moving out of area. Travellers have no fixed address to contact with normal traffic etc violations. plus who will enforce 3 month time limit. - - areas beauty. The quarry has regenerated naturally and will be destroyed with the infrastructure needed I.. water, gas, electric and sewer pipes. - - Disruption. Wind turbines, unpleasant compost/was maggot factory. Have we not had enough.		Please treat any if not all residents objection seriously, whatever their opinions and in such a hilly location I feel sure that an alternative location could be found,

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1563	Yvonne and Alan	Peach			Object	With regard to the Traveller Site, it would be awful during the winters for anyone living there on the site. Being high up it is continually cold and windy, even through the summer. The particular piece of land is now a high biodiversity area, where over the past 30 years it has been left and now has natural flora and fauna. There is no sewage/mains electricity or mains water there either. These facilities would have to be installed along with access. There is also no bus route past there and people would find it difficult to get to shops etc. Also in winter Rossendale do not grit the Todmorden Road very often, although Calderdale do grit on their side. There is also the worry about any Fly Tipping that might occur. Who is going to "police" this site as I believe that there is a three month time limit on their stay there? I think the Kingfisher site is a more suitable place for them to stay. At Sharneyford they will be quite isolated.		
1564	D	Stevens			Object	<p>I am writing to object to a proposed traveller site near my home:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Location is not suitable - first thing people from West Yorkshire will see in entering Rossendale boundary. 2) Threat of pollution from old tyres, oil etc. that travellers do generate. 3) Location to Listed buildings on Todmorden Road Areas - Grade 2 Listed. 4) Policing of transient type criminal element associated with traveller sites. 5) Distance from schools - shops - garages - medical services etc. 6) Contamination of areas ref/wildlife oil into drains sewers - burning tyres and rubbish - (travellers lifestyle). <p>I would like a reduction in my Council Tax if a Traveller site is established in my area.</p> <p>I do not accept that RBC has a duty to identify sites of suitable use of travellers - may I suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trough Gate Britannia - opposite former Traveller's Rest Pub (primary school available) - Land at Landgate Shawforth behind former Red Lion Pub - primary and secondary schools available plus shops at Whitworth and Britannia also medical centre in Whitworth. <p>The Rossendale Valley has I'm sure many sites other than Tooter Hill that accommodate Traveller Sites.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1637	Robert	Goodwin		Tooter Quarry	Object	<p>I would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed draft plan for gypsy/traveller site at Tooter Quarry Sharneyford as described in policy HS16: Gypsies, Travellers and Show people.</p> <p>I have lived in Sharneyford for 30 years and about 25 years ago I would walk with my children and dog on Tooter Quarry at that time all that was there was a bit hole full of water</p> <p>Recently I walk on the Quarry and was surprised at its transformation it is alive with wild life and I am looking forward to showing my grandchildren who love looking for wild life</p> <p>Myself and my wife are keen walkers and enjoy walking the hills I feel this will be taken away from us if the site is approved</p> <p>I hope you take into account my objections when discussing the draft plan</p>		
1736	P A	King			Object	<p>I am very disturbed to hear of the proposal to turn Sharneyford Quarry into a site for transient Travellers. The site is just NOT suitable. The ground is unstable and now has a sizeable pond, the site has been designated as one to be allowed to return to a natural state. The idea of transient travellers coming and going would be most unsatisfactory with no guarantee as to how many might be there.</p> <p>Also it is a most unsuitable site for the Travellers themselves - stuck at the top of a hill, nowhere near any amenities, in an areas that can have the most inclement weather conditions. I don't believe any Traveller would be happy up there, and believe there are much better sites in the Rossendale area that are more suitable for them.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1745	Jean/Harold	Ormrod			Object	<p>1. The site is a disused quarry not being used for the last 20 years. There must be a lot of wild life in it now. There was a pond in it so there must be wild life in it.</p> <p>2. The stream that goes to the river irwell from Sharneyford, is that going to be contaminated</p> <p>3. Is there going ot be illegal dumping of waste all over Sharneyford for the residents of the village to see every day. As the council have to make cut backs also the police, who will keep te occupants of the site in order if need be.</p> <p>4. It Is said they may need to use the site for Travelling to appleby in Westmorland todmorden road A681 is not on that route so will not be used.</p> <p>5. Local businesses can be affected i.e farmers with their land, sheep, cows travellers have dogs which could worry sheep, lamb even young calves. THAT IS NOT A GOOD WAY FOR THEM TO DIE.</p> <p>As travellers used to come to sharneyford in the summer they calways left in the winter as it was to cold for them.</p> <p>They always left a lot of mess.</p> <p>When the sites were made inaccesible they have not come back. If they had wanted to do they would have been back.</p> <p>If there must be a site in the valley the deem to like Futures Park were the council can keep a eye on them.</p>		
1746	Jane	Durkin		Reference no, 13918	Object	<p>Objections for the above site</p> <p>The site is a disused quarry for about 20 years.</p> <p>There now must be a lot of wildlife and water ponds in it.</p> <p>There the stream at the side which flows to the river irwell. Is this to be contaminated from the site.</p> <p>Will there be illegal dumping of waste for sharneyford residents to see each day as the council have to make cutbacks will they want to clean it all up.</p> <p>Local businesses could be affected self catering accommodation,farmers even the local town(bacup).</p> <p>Travellers have dogs that could become a nuisance to the sheep and cows.</p> <p>As travellers came to sharneyford years ago and left a mess when they left after the site was made inaccessible they did not come backl they had wanted to they would have done so.</p> <p>If there is to be a site in the valley Futures park seem to be the site they want Where they can be policed by the council.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1750	Andrew	Walmsley		Tooter Hill SHLAA16405	Object	<p>I visited the site with a local resident, Cllr X and Cllr X</p> <p>I'm unclear if a full site inspection or an onsite visit has yet been completed ? I appreciate many points have been identified in the site assessment, in my opinion the unsuitability is understated and would have hoped that even by walking the site at this early stage this would have assisted in demonstrating its unsuitability.</p> <p>I will not reiterate the SHLAA assessment other than to say the site itself is very uneven, wet and boggy, and has pleasingly returned to somewhat of a natural habitat. The possibility of contamination to the land and water course has a wider impact further down the village. There are significant challenges in keeping the site safe. Given the site conditions and extreme winter weather, the likelihood of growing trees to reduce visual impact, is likely to take longer than the plan itself</p> <p>Travellers are one of the most marginalised communities in the UK, by creating a site on Sharneyford /Todmorden boundary does nothing to improve integration if anything it enhances segregation, however short the travelling visit. The remote location is inappropriate to tackle this issue, what work has been done to offer travellers equality in accordance with legislation?</p> <p>Capacity at the local junior school is also an issue, has this been reviewed as part of the SHLAA</p> <p>The site borders West Yorkshire. Has a response been sourced from both Lancashire and Yorkshire police forces as to identify the challenges a site on a border may bring, has information been sourced from other authorities who may face a similar issue and information from the bordering police forces elsewhere. ?</p> <p>Public Objection – attendees at a residents meeting exceeded 80 people. I'm sure the coordinator will share information.</p> <p>Neighbouring Properties – with a listed property neighbouring and overlooking the site, and moorland surrounding I'm unclear how the site would sit in visual terms.</p> <p>Appreciating that this is consultation, and responses are being invited, we are required to include a travellers site in the local plan. The consultation only has one option, I trust you will understand why residents feel this is already agreed and the consultation is a formality. With the benefit of hindsight, we should not have only included one option.</p> <p>Email received 23/10/2017:</p> <p>Appreciating there were many issues across Rossendale on Saturday evening Sunday Morning 21/22 October.</p> <p>Attached is evidence of the flooding issues at Tooter Hill quarry entrance tge pphoto was taken by me around 7.30pm</p> <p>I'm aware the consultation has closed but it's very difficult to evidence actual</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
						flooding in a consultation time fame. I trust therefore that this will be added as evidence of site issues to the process Please see appendix for photos.		
1752	Kelly	Baggaley			Object	I wish to oppose the travellers site at HS16 and would suggest that a more suitable location for this site would be Futures Park in Bacup. The reasons I object are as follows: Infrastructure (no police, schools, no high school, roads, public transport, doctors, dentists, no hospital) Width of roads (congestion) Width and lack of paths (especially for the elderly, disabled and parents with prams and young children Surface drainage problems, possible flooding in some of the areas (e.g. Bankside Lane) Sewerage problems Access roads Traffic in and out of Bacup at peak times Wildlife Areas of natural beauty Empty houses in Bacup		
1754	Douglas/Kat hleen	Hardman			Object	My wife and I wish to submit the following objections to the above proposed site as we feel that it would create a massive detrimental effect to the area, both on the site and covering a much wider area. Environmental damage to wildlife etc. would be seen to this lovely area which after 20+ years of non-use is re-establishing itself and proving a great asset to the community and further afield. (See your policy ENV5) We also feel that the setting up of this site would have a negative impact on the future (and present) residents due to the visual impact (ENV4) as to the type of dwellings and vehicles which would be present on the site. The proposed site is due to be set up right on the Lancashire/Yorkshire boundary and would not create a good impression as to the gateway to Rossendale. In fact the very sight of the "travellers camp" would suggest the opposite. We are disappointed also that the site not proposed as a permanent one but as a transient site which would mean less controls giving it to be out in place and making a transient site difficult to police with its comings and goings and short stays etc. Furthermore, we would have expected the proposed site to be contained within the Rossendale boundaries but it would appear that the majority of the site is in fact contained within the Calderdale boundary and should therefore be considered/consulted by same Whilst we have not touched on watercourses, natural springs and natural drainage etc. We trust that all the necessary surveys for same will be carried out.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1759			Brosters Environmental Ltd		Object	<p>We are instructed by our client Brosters Environmental Ltd in relation to the Local Plan Written Statement (regulation 18 Draft) in respect of Policy HS16: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople with specific reference to the proposed allocation of site HS16.1 as defined on the associated Policies Map. Whilst acknowledging the requirement to provide gypsy sites in appropriate locations, it is considered that the proposed allocation of site HS16.1 at the former Little Tooter Quarry, Sharneyford is unsound in that the site does not meet the criteria for locating such sites as set out in the adopted Core Strategy (CS) under Policy 5: Meeting the Needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>CS Policy 5 states that 5 permanent and up to 3 transit pitches are to be provided in the plan period (2011-2026). The stated criteria requires such sites to be within reach of schools, shops and other facilities and all sites should be close to "green infrastructure." It is noted that paragraph 212 states that "Many Gypsy families contain children and access to services is important and encourages better integration with the settled community."</p> <p>It is also noted at paragraph 213 that "The location of pitches should therefore be close to (within 30 minutes travel) of at least two of the following: shops, primary school, community facilities, GP."</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the Sharneyford Primary School is located approximately 750 metres from the centre of the allocated site, the Bacup Local Centre which contains many of the other required facilities, is approximately 2.5 kilometres away. The Institute for Highways & Transportation (IHT) publication "Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot" outlines that the preferred maximum walking distance for commuting from an origin point by persons without a mobility impairment is 2,000m. In this respect it is considered the proposed site, which is located well into the open countryside and substantially detached from the defined settlement of Bacup, does not meet the CS locational requirements. Additionally, the site is not located close to any designated "green infrastructure" as required by CS Policy 5.</p> <p>In respect of the above and other related matters it is considered that the location of site HS16.1 is not in accordance with the requirements of CS Policy 5 and is accordingly considered unsound.</p> <p>If there are any questions, please don't hesitate to contact us.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1762	Eileen	Goodwin			Object	<p>I would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed draft plan for gypsy/traveller site at Tooter Quarry Sharneyford as described in policy HS16: Gypsies, Travellers and Show people.</p> <p>I have lived in Sharneyford for 30 years and on numerous occasions gypsies, travellers and new age travellers have used the country side to pitch their caravans.</p> <p>On these occasions it has always caused disruption to the people living nearby Eg roads closed because of the volume of traffic coming into or leaving the area making it impossible for parents of the local school to collect their children</p> <p>Commercial and household) waste (including human waste) discarded on the site and a local resident having to clear the waste at their own costs</p> <p>People unable to walk and enjoy the countryside on public rights of way because in my opinion the fear of being confronted by the gypsies/travellers who will not like strangers anywhere near their caravans</p> <p>The proposed site is like a nature reserve which should be enjoyed for its biodiversity it has taken about 25 years for the site to transform itself from a disused quarry to its present condition and I feel turning it into a stop of site for gypsies/travellers goes against the biodiversity that has been created</p>		
1787	James and Janet	Eaton			Object	<p>could you please pass on my concerns about the proposed Travellers site Tooter Hill Quarry. The excess on and off Todmorden road, the spring water that feeds some of the farms, putting in services to the site, changing the landscape of the hillside and surrounding landscape, also devaluing properties on Todmorden road and surrounding areas.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS16.1	Further comment
1791	G&S	McCafferty			Object	<p>We would like to state our objections to Policy HS16 traveller site at Little Tooter Hill Quarry, Sharneyford, Bacup.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is very high above sea level with a very extreme climate. 2. There is no mains water supply and this would be difficult to achieve without installing pumps which would then have high running costs. 3. Todmorden Road is a very busy A road with national speed limit, not suitable for a site with young children running free not to mention livestock, travellers are not known for keeping their dogs under control. 4. This is a moorland area with free ranging sheep and cattle which would be subject to harrassment from free ranging dogs and this could cause traffic incidents. 5. The quarry is a haven for wildlife with owls, herons, ducks, badgers, foxes, hares, bats and rabbits all having their homes there. 6. Sanitation would be difficult to enforce. 7. Basically the area is a bog and the land disturbance required to provide sufficient hard standing would be detrimental to the area and also affect natural drainage with a knock on effect lower down the hillside towards Bacup. 8. The winds, particularly in winter, have in the past blown over large static caravans at Sharneyford. 9. The entry site to the quarry is straight onto Todmorden Road just after a bend coming off the moor and has over the years been a frequent scene of accidents even without traffic coming in and out of the quarry. Check police records for confirmation of this as I am sure they have kept them. 10. Over 60 HGV's travel daily up and down Todmorden Road to and from the composting factory making this an even more dangerous road to have trailers turning onto or from. 11. This is a dangerous entrance. Many a time I have been turning right into the quarry entrance and someone has shot up the hill behind me and tried to 		

Number of comments HS16.1

67

Housing Site Allocations

Reference	HS2.001	Land off Greensnook Lane
-----------	---------	--------------------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.001	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Support	<p>SUPPORT PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATION. PLEASE REFER TO SUBMITTED LETTER.</p> <p>GREENSNOOK LANE, BACUP</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. This consultation is the first public consultation stage in the production of the Local Plan (Regulation 18) and includes the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement) and its accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Hourigan Connolly is instructed by B and E Boys Limited to submit and provide comment on the above site in support of its future development for residential purposes. We have previously submitted representations in response to consultation relating to the Local Plan Part 2 in 2015 and subsequently the 'Call for Sites' exercise relating to the preparation of the new Local Plan in 2016.</p> <p>Along with this letter, we have also submitted an electronic consultation form via the Council's website and this letter should be read in conjunction with the submitted form. A site plan is also enclosed for information.</p> <p>Submissions</p> <p>We note that within the draft Local Plan land at Greensnook Lane in Bacup has a proposed allocation for residential development under draft site allocation HS2.1. The 1.13ha site is identified as being suitable to deliver 33 dwellings with an identified timescale for delivery of 1.5 years.</p> <p>Our client supports the proposed allocation of this site for residential purposes and considers that it is entirely appropriate for delivering such a use and quantum of development within the timescales proposed.</p> <p>We reserve the right to provide further supporting statements and evidence during the preparation of the Plan process and ask that we continue to be informed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>	-	

Number of comments HS2.001

1

Reference	HS2.003	Land at Higher Cross Row
------------------	----------------	---------------------------------

556	Ken	Hagans	-	Object	<p>This proposed housing site was previously a cemetery with still intact graves. The headstones and tombstones are now located to the south of the site to creating a lovely historic paved area. - The "common" as it is locally known is used daily by local residents for dog walking and in better weather, recreational activities for families and children. We do not want to lose this beautiful open space to housing. - - Parking in general is bad in the area, with barely enough on street parking for the existing properties. There is a cricket club nearby and on match days parking is terrible in the surrounding area. This would only be exasperated further by new housing -</p>	No
-----	-----	--------	---	--------	---	----

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.003	Further comment
630	Michaela Jayne	Cunningham		HS2. 3 Higher Cross Row	Object	<p>I moved to Bacup from Cornwall 2 years ago due to its similar landscape and it was in a conservation area. The area of Higher Cross Row has a number of gravestones within it and is of historical as are the terraces on Lanehead Lane, there are often visitors who come to look at these areas, these should remain protected and be kept as a clean green area. I think the lpa need to review and rethink there housing stock, there are lots of properties remaining empty on pennine, landlords who have no tenants, houses which are derelict. Property remains cheap here but still no one wants to come here so why by building a proposed site of 17 houses change thus, there are already plans to build on Greensnook. Lanehead Lane is a one way system which is already busy enough and cannot cope with heavy vehicles driving down the steep slope, there are parking issues for local residents having to find spaces on side streets, if you take away this space there will be more issues. This green space is used by dogwalkers and children and has also been a safe place for the air ambulance to land when there has been emergencies. We need to protect our areas of history and heritage and stop this area being developed. The reasons for designation vary widely but all Conservation Areas have in common historic and architectural features which make them worthy of additional protection. We recongise that this places extra responsibilities, and in some cases extra costs, on owners when proposing material changes to their properties. Not at any point has anyone around this area been consulted about this property proposal. The area also is a habitat for some local wildlife and should remain, green, protected and in the conservation area.</p>		<p>I am disgusted that they are proposing such a development so close to the town centre where the road plan is still being considered as there would be more road users heading straight towards the existing roundabout and this is already a dangerous crossing for both motorists and pedestrians the whole impact of this needs reconsidering. I think the LPA needs to reconsider its current housing stock in this area, is there a real need for new housing, there are properties which have been for sale for 2 years which still haven't been sold, some of these are empty, perhaps liase with these people first and come to an agreement and get these filled first. Consider the impact of more traffic in the area, more pollution, reconsider the road layouts they don't work, how many more road traffic collisions does there need to be, how many more deaths in the valley, repaint all the zebra crossings or change them to a pelican crossing simple solution, put speed bumps in some areas. You need to consider everything before you go ahead and build more housing, the town could do with a complete face-lift so families want to remain or move here, turn the derelict building sites into housing they would be more appealing than using our green sites. Stop being greedy by selling the land in the first place, developers don't care about local communities but people do. -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.003	Further comment
680	Danielle	Sutcliffe	-		Object	Higher cross row is a green space used by many dog walkers and numerous people around the area. - - Building on here would seriously obstruct the view from my house and devalue my property when I look to sell. - - the area of green had been used many times by air ambulance services and is a required green space for all residents on the surrounding streets. There are already housing developments on greensnook lane and I don't feel like we can lose this space to more houses.		-
681	Emma	Kierans	-		Object	This green area is not only the site of a number of graves but is used by the community for several reasons. Our children play safely there, local dog walkers use the area as a place to exercise their pets and it's used by the air ambulance in emergencies. Just to name a few. - As someone who has grown up in this area I'd be sad to see houses built there, I played there as a child and my son's do now!		-
682	Mark	Beverley	-		Object	The area above Earnshaw Road has always been part of the local greenbelt area incorporating the historical values of the previously positioned church and school. - The current conservation area splits the area in two thus sacrificing all it has represented to the town and community. - - Should a choice be made to erect houses on HS2.3 there is no reason why the houses can't be extended to incorporate the remainder of the area thus totally removing anything of historical and natural beauty from the town. - - In addition to the above the area will massively struggle with the road infrastructure which currently grinds to a halt at the slightest incident which will inevitably put additional pressure on the current residents. - - to sum up, I most vigorously object to the proposal.		I feel that should the residents of Bacup be consulted prior to any plans being drawn the final outcome for Rossendale Borough Council would be mutually beneficial. - - I would also suggest that had the council planned more efficiently we would now not be faced with what appears to be a knee jerk reaction/mass build any where that could physically accommodate a new house. - - More thought and consideration to the matter may / should have been applied by Rossendale Borough Council.
695	John	Egan	-		Object	Don't build on higher cross rd.		NO

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.003	Further comment
1141	Marie	Harris	-		Object	<p>You propose to build 17 properties on the land outside my house. I'm 37 now and I grew up in this house. My memories of growing up are the fun me and my friends and family spent on that field. The views of Bacup are beautiful... it's bad enough that trees were planted lower down as that as already taken part of how special the view were. It's a lovely quiet part of Bacup, where a lot of our elderly generation live. By building houses on the field you take away everything that's special about this area. In this area, we are working class people that enjoy the views from my house . I spend a lot of time sat outside enjoying the views, the calm relaxing atmosphere and you want to build houses that take all that away. It will reduce the value of my house. Make the area more vulnerable due to the kind of people you intend to move into these houses. I chose to take over this house to stay in the town I grew up in as everywhere else in Bacup is occupied by non working class and quite frankly a dump. You plan to do the same to such a beautiful area. Go and build houses somewhere else and leave this area alone</p>		
Number of comments		HS2.003				7		
Reference		HS2.004		Land off Rockcliffe Road, Bacup				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.004	Further comment
848	LORRAINE	WINNARD	-		Object	<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>		<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.004	Further comment
								<p>Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.004	Further comment
1142	CHRISTINE	JACKSON	-		Object	<p>ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN - BACUP AREA. - Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup, which is recognised as the best preserved milll town in the County. - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane),HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) and HS2.4 (land off Moorland Terrace) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that the majority of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there, it is also on the skyline, building on here would have a huge impact on the views for miles around.</p>		

Number of comments HS2.004

2

Reference HS2.005 Off Fernhill Drive and Anvil Street, Stacksteads

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
661	CA and VJ	Jennings	Home Owner		Object	<p>I am contesting these housing developments on several grounds. - - My issues and concerns will be submitted, in writing by the closing date of 9th October 2017.</p> <p>Letter received 06/10/2017:</p> <p>The statement "Improving the lives of people in the Borough" is central to the Borough's current "mantra" regarding their fundamental philosophy and how it is applied in all Departments, and in all the things that they do. However, I feel that some of the current proposals as outlined in the above DLP could fall far short of the Council's altruistic intentions.</p> <p>These are our concerns in respect of the Fernhill Crescent, Fernhill Drive and Bankside Lane development proposals:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation - there is an extensive line of "mixed" trees which decorate the hillside from the end of Bankside Lane above Fernhill Crescent and Osborne Terrace. As far as I understand it, we all have a shared commitment to protect and preserve trees and the landscapes on which they reside. From the above plans, it seems that there is the potential for the removal of some of this tree-line on site HS2.32. This would have a huge and negative impact on the aesthetic outlook onto that hillside, and the potential for land slip, soil erosion, water-runoff and flooding on lower levels • Protecting the Environment - there are many issues here that would negatively affect several aspects of the local environment. Some of which resulting from over-capacity and over-crowding caused by the over-expansion in this area by these proposed developments (particularly along Bankside Lane) • Preserving the local Character - the area around an incorporating site HS2.32 is particularly attractive (especially to the West of Bankside lane) and is an asset to the local area and its residents. It offers countryside walks along heritage sites and long established pathways (ideal for walkers, dog-owners, explorers in general and "kids" of all ages) • Infrastructure - this aspect has never been something to celebrate in the Rossendale Valley area: mostly due to the uncompromising geography of the area rather than the incompetence of the local authorities. However, focusing on one point only, transport through the Valley is often difficult, and sometimes almost impossible at certain times of the day. Therefore, the addition of around 200 units along Bankside Lane would severely impact on both movement and parking. AND, the thought of possibly an additional 350 vehicles exiting onto the Bacup/Rawtenstall road and heading through the valley, doesn't bare thinking about!! AND, what about the winter if it's like the Fernhill area, some of it, or all of it, will not be gritted!! • Impact - in my opinion, the impact from these proposals would be many and 		To be submitted before 9th October 2017.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
						<p>wide ranging, but some would militate against the "improvement of lives"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of Wild-life Habitats - the treed areas and adjacent open fields and moorland, are homes for thriving wild-life. In addition to the usual populations of wildlife, we have seen deer, foxes, squirrels, birds of prey and colonies of bats. The retention of range of wild-life would be threatened by the proposed invasion of their "space" • Ecological/Biological Considerations - these extensive developments could severely compromise the 'health', stability and integrity of the land, its trees; also its top-soil and sub-soil and the life forms that inhabit them • Local Heritage Preservation - there are some historical mule tracks, bridal paths & walkways and access routes into Yorkshire in this area, and we have a duty to protect and preserve them • Land Integrity - we have been aware for many years that the land above part of Fernhill Crescent has been subject to land-slip over the years. In fact, we were told by an authoritative figure that the extent of the problem had been measured over time. This weakness in the land caused our builder to reinforce the retaining walls in the back gardens of Nos 22, 24 and 26. Indeed, the retaining wall at No 26 actually collapsed. <p>Interestingly, the field behind these and other FC properties seems to show evidence of land-slip, whereas the adjacent wooded field seems not to suffer this problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic Balance - given the attractiveness (in all respects) of this residential area, we would suggest that the proposed plans could severely impact upon the "wholesomeness" of this area, and have a negative effect upon the valuation of properties. Which would be, at least, unfair!!! • Practicality and Compatibility - in conclusion, and looking at just one aspect, when we factor-in access roads, traffic congestion and general disruption over time, and deterioration in the quality of people's lives, is it appropriate or acceptable to further pursue the Fernhill proposals?!? <p>Finally, who is it in the best interests of</p>		
853	Ian	Read	-	HS2.5 HS2.32 HS2.13 HS2.11 HS2.12	Object	<p>Fernhill Drive is not capable of taking any more traffic, The main Bacup to Rawtenstall carriageway is at it's capacity for traffic. - The site HS2.5 is not a suitable site for hosing and will cause problems on Fernhill Drive. - The site HS2.5 will interfere with the views of the existing houses</p>		<p>Bacup is full and no other housing should be built until the infrastructure in Bacup is improved ie Road to Rawtenstall.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
857	Lucy	Beaumont	-	Hs2.32 + Hs2.5	Object	We use the hillside behind fernhill crescent extending down to bankside on a weekly basis with our young children, exploring the area, looking a local wild life & animals. These green areas are used regularly by members of the public on a daily basis. What a shame to ruin it for the whole community when so many empty unoccupied houses are scattered around rossendale. It is lovely to have access to such a beautiful green area just a minute from our home..our children have spend many hours exploring and playing here.. - - The second proposal site Hs2.5 is just off fernhill drive.. A road already backed up with parked cars the majority of the time. The road surface needs adressing at present with pot holes all over, more houses and cars conjesting this area would be awful for residents who already live in the area!		-
879	Nick	Earnshaw	-		Object	The access to the Fernhill estates is bad enough on its single track knackered potholes road as it is, what is the point in causing stress and hassle for local people. For a few extra houses shoehorn ex into another patch of green space. Extra hones= extra traffic on an already congested area, why not create a suitable car parking area permitted for residents of the drive instead, so that we can drive safely both ways on the drive.		I understand the need for some more housing, but please - drive around the valley, look at all the derelict and run down sites that exist already and build on them. Our valley infrastructure is overwhelmed already.. Roads are shocking, services stretched and minimum investment at the top of the valley (RBC inheriting the Lee quarry - it's a disgrace for the money spent on it, it should be a landmark). Grow a pair as a council and tell the policy makers Rossendale is full and stop ruining the only tourist attraction we have - our countryside location.
1112	Louise	Oddy	-		Object	The road is already heavily congested and parking spaces severely limited. - With just purchasing the house as it is tucked out of the way and being informed there was no known building plans. I am absolutely infuriated with just being informed of this. With the road already being busy we have got a young family and this is the reason of purchasing on fernhill drive as it is quieter. If we wanted to live on an estate then we would of chose to. - It would be absolutely devastating to wildlife as so many animals live amongst these trees and it would be absolutely tragic to destroy their homes. The environment would also suffer with more trees being destroyed for even more houses being built.		If you plan to build here: -• it would be aesthetically displeasing to home owners that live up fernhill drive. • road congestion would increase and so would road kill (do you want the death of animals to increase?) •there would be a major impact on the environment with more trees being cut down and even more animals losing their homes. • our babies bedroom over looks the proposed building site and we will not appreciate the disturbances, if you have children you will understand this.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
1115	Tom	Bray	-		Object	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development on Fernhill Drive. - - The road is already heavily congested at peak times with next to no parking spots, every day I am finding myself reversing up the entirety of the road to allow cars coming the opposite way from the main road access, this is extremely dangerous with the steepness and narrowness of the road and many cars have been damaged due to less confident drivers hitting parked cars and sometimes even driving off afterwards. - - To find this out less than a year into buying the property I am absolutely disgusted, not only are you ruining the quiet environment and the views all residents more than likely decided to purchase their homes on you are destroying the habitat of local wildlife, I have seen owls frequently using the space to hunt and squirrels jumping from tree to tree. - - Most of all we have just had our first child who's bedroom would overlook the proposed development, I will fight this plan the whole way in order to ensure she is at peace and has privacy as she grows.</p>		<p>To close I find it ridiculous that the spot has even been considered in the first place, not only would they be overlooked by us but they would be overlooking the houses along the main road so there would be no privacy for any of them. - - I strongly believe I speak for the entire street when I say that this will be heavily opposed and fought at every possible turn, I will be talking to all my neighbours on both sides of the proposed site and wish to put an end to this now as I do not believe it's worth ours or your time fighting to put up 5 cardboard affordable homes. - -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
1122	samantha	anderton	-		Object	<p>Fernhill drive, avenue and close have a respectable reputation within Stacksteads and is known to many as one of the nice streets in Stacksteads. Residents of these streets help each other to maintain the cleanliness of the streets and have a level of gratitude to one another. Elder people who live around the Fernhill area speak of Fernhill's history on a regular basis. This history will soon be forgotten about if unsightly new builds are surrounding the outstanding views Fernhill has. - There are many reasons this should not go ahead. - Vehicle access is already restricted, - There is already restrictions to parking on Fernhill drive, The road is not suitable for the traffic flow new housing will create, 'Affordable housing' will hugely decrease the value of housing already on Fernhill drive, Fernhill close, Fernhill avenue, - Outstanding views of countryside and Lee quarry will be gone, due to unsightly views of new build's, - A huge decrease in value to the current properties, due to various reasons. Such as even more limited parking (unless the house has a driveway) over populated area, poor traffic flow up and down the street, unsightly views, noise pollution, - 'Affordable housing' would create difficulty in current houses on Fernhill being sold, - Noise pollution, - Loss of wildlife, - Loss of beautiful countryside, - Limited places to walk dogs, as this countryside is used on a regular basis to walk dogs, - Loss of bridleway, - Loss of community - More damage to an already damaged road surface (due to constant use) - Lack of local school places within the required 3 mile radius, - Loss of privacy to overlooking residents, - Loss of vehicle turning area, - Loss of garage/storage space for residents, - Loss of trees, - A huge impact on residents due to construction work, - Ownership disputes over rights of way/ ownership of land. - This proposed housing development should not go ahead and above is just a few reasons as to why.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
1175	Lesley	Earnshaw	-		Object	As a resident we enjoy this area greatly for walking. We exercise ourselves and our dogs, see children playing and building dens, see a range of wildlife and just escape into our beautiful countryside. Horse riders take safe routes away from the valley traffic and noise. After 20 years of living here, I have seen our roads for the whole of Fernhill disintergrate and be unsuitable for the current level of traffic never mind adding to the situation. Roads are patched and pot holed and no money seems available to put this right. School's are full, local amenities are stretched already. We have limited banking facilities, shops and recreation areas. We cannot support the current level of people well with residents from this end of the valley needing to travel to swim, shop and bank. How then does adding more "improve the lives of people in the borough"? We have limited spaces for children to play away from traffic. The woods off Fernhill team with a variety of wildlife that we enjoy supporting. My husband and I take great pride in trying to keep the area clean by litter picking and helping with the footpaths. We are dismayed that this land would be potentially destroyed for yet more houses despite many houses standing empty in the valley. We have been told by elderly residents that the land you suggest is not suitable due to unstable land beneath. Our little patch of woodland that we so love and would so miss. An area of calm and peace. It would change our skyline dramatically from our beautiful trees to a block of ugly housing. - This seems to have all happened very quietly with consultations coming and going without any of us being informed. We found out with a few days to the deadline of 9th October from a note from a resident through our door, not from any department of Rossendale council, which all feels very underhand. - I'm not sure how this site is in any way in the best interests of local residents. The land off Fernhill Drive would again add more traffic to the already crumbling road. Poor choices! -		Bring the infrastructure to Bacup to support such schemes. Our town is dying in comparison to Rawtenstall. They have bars, banks, a range of wonderful shops, swimming pool and sports facilities, the train, the Newhallhey project, the Ski slope, park, museum What do we have?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
1213	Caroline	Bird	-		Object	<p>The proposed area has enhanced the current residences for many years. - Environmentally : - Many local wildlife use the current land and to scoop up the beautiful trees that adorn this area will leave much of the wildlife decimated. The trees have quite clearly been on the site for many many years and the thought of these being "scooped away" to make way for housing is heartbreaking. - The views alone are a huge selling point and provide a peaceful and relaxing escape. This area compliments the current surroundings. Looking at the other sites proposed these would , with the exception of Bankside, not appear to have such a damaging effect both on local wildlife and the aesthetics of the area - Access: - Parking itself, on Fernhill Drive is, at best, horrendous. By adding further proposed housing when the council is clearly not inclined to improve the current parking situation is utterly madness. Having experienced the negative affects of the parking for the last 9 years, I have seen speed restrictions ignored and have even had my own vehicle damaged due to lack of "road space" and adherence to the speed limit. By increasing the housing, and thus the traffic volume without any due consideration to the current situation will only lead to further accidents and lack of parking for the current residents. - - Surely this site, is at best, needing extensive irrigation and levelling, this alone would be detrimental to the land. By possibly by-passing natural streams this can only damage the surrounding area and create flooding issues. The trees have provided much needed "natural drainage and by removing them could lead to this outcome. - - I absolutely, and without question, object to this "proposed site"</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
1373	David	Schofield	-		Object	<p>Proposed site HS2.5 off Fernhill Drive - OBJECT - - The main reason for my objection is traffic, Fernhill Drive already has too much traffic flow which has resulted in a constant unmanaged contra-flow system and disintegrating road surfaces. The Fennhill Drive area cannot take any more vehicles and parking is already beyond its maximum capacity. - - The HS2.5 (off Fernhill Drive) site is currently a lovely wooded area with a wealth of wildlife, we know that it is home to a Badgers sett, as Badgers are often seen on the street at night disappearing into said wooded area. - - Further Points: - - - Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of (among other factors) noise*, disturbance*, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, etc. [*but note that this does not include noise or disturbance arising from the actual execution of the works, which will not be taken into account, except possibly in relation to conditions that may be imposed on the planning permission,dealing with hours and methods of working, etc. during the development] - - Unacceptably high density / over-development of the site, especially if it involves loss of garden land or the open aspect of the neighbourhood (so-called 'garden grabbing') - - Visual impact of the development - Our house is called "Quarry View" but this development will stop the Quarry from being in view - - Negative effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood - - Design - Fernhill has some period styled housing and "new builds" all not match this - - The proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity - - The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners - - the development would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users - as mentioned earlier with the contra-flow system that is already plaguing Fernhill. - - Property values, Fernhill is one of the nicer parts of our local community and to fill it with "affordable housing" will negatively impact the property values within this direct area. - - Overbearing - The scale of the works means that the development will have an oppressive impact on the surrounding area - what is currently a small woodland; would be replaced by 2 story houses with more cars.</p>		<p>Proposed site HS2.5 off Fernhill Drive - OBJECT - - The main reason for my objection is traffic, Fernhill Drive already has too much traffic flow which has resulted in a constant unmanaged contra-flow system and disintegrating road surfaces. The Fennhill Drive area cannot take any more vehicles and parking is already beyond its maximum capacity. - - The HS2.5 (off Fernhill Drive) site is currently a lovely wooded area with a wealth of wildlife, we know that it is home to a Badgers sett, as Badgers are often seen on the street at night disappearing into said wooded area. - - Further Points: - - - Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of (among other factors) noise*, disturbance*, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, etc. [*but note that this does not include noise or disturbance arising from the actual execution of the works, which will not be taken into account, except possibly in relation to conditions that may be imposed on the planning permission,dealing with hours and methods of working, etc. during the development] - - Unacceptably high density / over-development of the site, especially if it involves loss of garden land or the open aspect of the neighbourhood (so-called 'garden grabbing') - - Visual impact of the development - Our house is called "Quarry View" but this development will stop the Quarry from being in view - - Negative effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood - - Design - Fernhill</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
								<p>has some period styled housing and "new builds" all not match this - - The proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity - - The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners - - The development would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users - as mentioned earlier with the contra-flow system that is already plaguing Fernhill. - - Property values, Fernhill is one of the nicer parts of our local community and to fill it with "affordable housing" will negatively impact the property values within this direct area. - - Overbearing - The scale of the works means that the development will have an oppressive impact on the surrounding area - what is currently a small woodland; would be replaced by 2 story houses with more cars.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Object	<p>HOUSING ALLOCATION SHOULD BE REMOVED AS THE SITE IS IN ACTIVE EMPLOYMENT USE. PLEASE SEE REPRESENTATION FOR FULL DETAILS.</p> <p>Email received 11/10/2017: SUBMISSION TO THE ROSSENDALE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 18) CONSULTATION ANVIL STREET, BACUP</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. This consultation is the first public consultation stage in the production of the Local Plan (Regulation 18) and includes the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement) and its accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Hourigan Connolly is instructed by B and E Boys Limited to submit and provide comment on the above site to promote its retention for employment use. We have previously submitted representations in response to consultation relating to the Local Plan Part 2 in 2015 and subsequently the 'Call for Sites' exercise relating to the preparation of the new Local Plan in 2016.</p> <p>Along with this letter, we have also submitted an electronic consultation form via the Council's website and this letter should be read in conjunction with the submitted form. A site plan is also enclosed for information.</p> <p>Submissions</p> <p>We note that within the draft Local Plan land at Anvil Street in Bacup has a draft allocation for residential use. The 0.19ha site is identified under draft policy reference HS2.5 as being suitable to deliver 11 dwellings within years 6 to 15 of the plan period.</p> <p>Our client does not support this proposed allocation. The site is currently in employment use and will continue to be in such use for the foreseeable future. The site is not considered to be suitable for residential use and its retention for employment use will crucially allow the expansion of neighbouring employment uses who have expressed a preference to remain in this location. The site continues to be suitable for employment uses and we therefore suggest that the proposed housing allocation is removed in favour of more suitable sites for residential development – to this end please see our submission in relation to Booth Road, Stacksteads.</p> <p>We reserve the right to provide further supporting statements and evidence during the preparation of the Plan process and ask that we continue to be informed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		-
1536	Pamela	Haslam-Jones	-		Object	<p>Poor excess!! The syrain put on the infrastucter of stacksteafs and Bacup! Strain on local schools snd Doctors! Too many cars on the road!</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.005	Further comment
1806	Neil	Fielding			Object	<p>I have only very recently been made aware of the above plan and, in particular, the proposed development HS2.5.</p> <p>To be honest I cannot believe that you would be allowed to put such a proposal to consultation without writing to every household in the locality which may be affected by the proposed development – or was it just a plan to sneak this through unnoticed?</p> <p>I live at XFernhill Park and if you were to allow a development of additional housing on the marked area I can only assume that, given the geography the only viable access to these properties would be via the current entrance to the garages off Fernhill Drive.</p> <p>This additional traffic would create an additional hazard to what is already a very difficult and dangerous road to travel up and down – which is not very good given that it is the main road into what is now a large estate. Have you been to assess the access options via Fernhill Drive?</p> <p>What you have is a very quaint road that has, until government and local government cuts, been a very nicely kept road with a grass banking with trees. However the situation is that there are so many cars parked on the Fernhill Drive that the road is virtually, at certain times, nearly impossible to get up and down as there is nowhere for cars to pass. If you now increase the traffic on the road or add a major access off it then it will virtually become impossible to use. The volume of traffic using Fernhill Drive has also led to the breakdown of the road surface and it is absolutely diabolical to travel on and adding volume will only make this worse.</p> <p>The actual removal of the garages themselves would also lead to an increase in parked vehicles on Fernhill Drive.</p> <p>I would also appreciate it if you could elaborate on the plan for me. Do you intend to allow building on the land above Anvil Street i.e. straight in front of my house? If you do what plans have you for vehicular access and regulations regarding building height etc.?</p> <p>Due to the fact you did not advise all of the local residents of your plans the consultation period is now officially closed for this but I would appreciate it if you could consider my feedback and I look forward to hearing from you soon regarding the questions I ask above.</p>		
Number of comments		HS2.005				13		
Reference	HS2.006		Greems Farm and Bull Hall Barn, Bacup					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
66	Julia	Andrews	-		Object	<p>Developing this site would contravene a number of your SA objectives: -</p> <p>1.Protecting and enhancing high quality landscapes - it would have huge effect on landscape appearance as it is high up.There are plenty of brownfield sites available in Bacup as an alternative to this site. - 2.Conserving the setting of heritage sites - a number of grade 2 listed sites are nearby - 3 & 5.Protecting biodiversity and geodiversity - inside the Rossendale Minerals Safeguarding Area & a known area of land instability; also you admit that no site assessments of biodiversity have been carried out - there are certainly badgers in the area.. - 13. Reducing the need to travel (for example for work) - there is poor access to the strategic road network from Bacup (5 miles, not 3.5 according to my sat nav, minimum 15 minutes to Rawtenstall, longer when road is being dug up (as it usually is)). - - Furthermore, although the site is described as on a gentle slope, access to it is via Moorside Crescent which is a very steep road; many residents park on Todmorden Road in snowy weather due to the difficulty of getting up the hill. - - As with all Bacup sites it suffers from a lack of access to secondary schools and hospitals. - -</p>		<p>There is a proven lack of demand for houses in Bacup compared to elsewhere in Rossendale and in the country generally - existing houses do not sell, and young educated people move elsewhere for better career opportunities and amenities. Accessibility to employment via the road network is the problem, and in narrow valleys this problem cannot be surmounted. I was unaware of this when moving here. Our own daughters moved away immediately on finishing university.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
138	Andy	Ross	-		Object	<p>I wish to register my objections to the proposed boundary changes at HS2.6 (Greens Farm and Bull Hall) and proposed housing developments in the two areas mentioned , the site/s contain an abundance of wildlife, with Owls and Pipistrelle Bats inhabiting the area, it is one of only a few unspoilt views within Bacup remaining, the fields may have unknown mining entrances which will directly affect homes around the proposed areas should earthwork be disturbed, and no Coal Board risk assessment has been made, your site assessment document "Appendix E" says land contamination "no known issues" but surely tests need to be carried out, just saying no known issue isn't concrete evidence of there not being any ! it is also stated that a large part of the site is within high risk development area as far as Mineral Sterilisation is concerned and normally means after the site is developed the mineral cannot be extracted Prior extraction is likely to significantly affect the nature of the site, by potentially changing the ground conditions and making the site unstable possibly effecting local existing housing, any potential repair work to the ground with regards to previous mining attempts could also result in damage to nearby housing, the surrounding housing enjoys a peaceful "green" area of the town with low to no noise or light pollution, this will be adversely affected by the proposal so too will be the amount of Traffic envisaged - - Parking in the Green Farm/Bull Hall area is a big issue during winter icy months as many residents park their cars on the level on Todmorden Road and surrounding side roads when access up the steep inclines surrounding these two sites cannot be driven up, building more housing is going to make matters worse and lead to dangerous narrowing of main roads and walkways being blocked to pedestrians etc - - Transport in the area is already bad and access out of the locale suffers from Peak Hour congestion with limited alternative routes when blockages occur, In the infrastructure delivery study under the TRANSPORT heading it states that performance is forecast to "deteriate over the plans period" it is unacceptable and bad policy to introduce an increase in housing and population locally in an already badly congested area. - Links to Manchester A56/M66 improvements are "Dependent" on Highways England Funding, so nothing definite here then, plans cannot be made based on agencies "maybe" getting funding - - Schooling - in the Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery plan you mention "A number of schools in the Borough, at both Primary and Secondary level are operating close to capacity" again we see no real planning has been done prior to this project submission and another reason why we cannot handle any more housing/population - - Health - in the Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery plan you mention "In June 2016 the nine Rossendale GP Practices were consulted on their current patient capacity levels. The collective position is that their existing workforce could absorb no more than an additional 2,690 patients, before all of the practices would consider closing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
						<p>their patient lists to new registrations.... without investment in both infrastructure and workforce will have reached capacity between two to five years. It then goes on to state There are no guaranteed NHS funding streams for either the staffing or the premises cost involved in any GP Practice or Dental Practice expansion described above - - Sustainability Appraisal Document (LC-303-Rossendale_SA_9_230517RC.docx) - on page 81 "Green Farm" the symbol set against the Landscape column reports that this will likely have an "ADVERSE" effect, the appraisal's objectives were to "Protect and Enhance high quality landscapes and townscapes in the Borough Especially those that contribute to local distinctiveness" you are failing to uphold this objective by even contemplating digging up the areas described and shoe horning more blots on a very nice local landscape in the form of unnecessary housing" - - Cultural heritage and biodiversity - reports "uncertain effects" your objective is to "CONSERVE" and "ENHANCE" the historic environment, heritage assets and "THEIR SETTINGS" - - - - - Biodiversity and Geodiversity - your objective is to "PROTECT" and "ENHANCE" again you are failing here also to uphold your objectives and from the same publication the following quote:- - "Bacup is a main settlement within Rossendale, located in the east of the Borough. It is rich in heritage, recognised as the best-preserved mill town in the country" - this will not be for long if this council keep coming up with stupid ideas to build all over our green areas turning it more and more into a concrete jungle, part of the charm of Bacup is the moorland landscape that surrounds it and the green fields that make it feel more rural and countrified, there are enough "Brown" sites available in the area for building new or replacing old buildings without touching what makes our town/village special. - recent development of Burnley Road has introduced a number of new properties I don't see the need for any more, as far as I am concerned the infrastructure around Bacup cannot handle any more properties, - - - In roundup to the above, in every aspect of this planning application, boundary move, and change proposed for the Bacup area and for Greens Farm and Bull Hall in general each of the sections shows that the council has not - Thought this through thoroughly enough and has had a knee jerk reaction to the governments housing policy requirements calling on all unspoilt/un built on land in their area to fulfil a tick in the box with WhiteHall - The Sustainability Appraisal itself contained the following disclaimer - - "The assessments above are based on the best available - information, including that provided to Lepus by the Council and - information that is publicly available. No attempt to verify these - secondary data sources has been made and they have assumed - to be accurate as published." - - In my opinion this hasn't been thought through and therefore the application should be withdrawn -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
172		Resident			Object	<p>I wish to register my objections to the proposed boundary changes at HS2.6 (Greens Farm and Bull Hall) and proposed housing developments in the two areas mentioned, the site/s contain an abundance of wildlife, with Owls and Pipistrelle bats inhabiting the area, it is one of only a few unspoilt views within Bacup remaining , the fields may have unknown mining entrances which will directly affect gomes around the proposed areas should earthwork be disturbed, and no Coal Board risk assessment has been made, your site assessment document "Appendix E" says land contamination "no known issues" but surely tests need to be carried out, just saying no known issue isn't concrete evidence of there not being any ! It is also stated that a large part of the site is within high risk development area as far as Mineral Sterilisation is concerned and normally means after the site is developed the mineral cannot be extracted Prior extraction is likely to significantly affect the nature of the site, by potentially changning the ground conditions and make the site unstable possibly effecting local existing housing, any potential repair work to the ground with regards to previous mining attempts could also result in damage to nearby housing, the surrounding housing enjoys a peaceful "green" area of the town with low to no noise or light pollution, this will be adversely affected by the proposal so too will be the amount of Traffic envisaged. Parking in the Green Farm/Bull Hall area is a big issue during winter icy months as many residents park their cars on the level on Todmorden Road and surrounding side roads when access up the steep inclines surrounding these two sites cannot be driven up, building more housing is going to make matters worse and lead to dangerous narrowing of main roads and walkways being blocked to pedestrians etc.</p> <p>Transport in the area is already bad and access out of the locale sudders from Peak Hour congestion with limited alternative routes when blockages occur, in the infrastructure delivery study under the TRANSPORT heading it states that performance is forecast to "deteriate over the plans period" it is unacceptable and bad policy to intoduce an increase in housing and population locally in an already badly congested area.</p> <p>Links to Manchester A56/M66 improvements are "dependant" on Highways England Funding, so nothing definite here then, plans cannot be made based on agencies "maybe" getting funding</p> <p>Schooling</p> <p>in the Rossendale infrastructure delivery plann you mention "A number of schools in the borough, at both primary and Secondary level are operating close to capacity" again we see no real planning has been done prior to this project submission and another reason why we cannot handle any more housing/population</p> <p>Health</p> <p>in the Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery Plan you mention "In June 2016 the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
						<p>nine Rossendale GP Practices were consulted on their current patient capacity levels. The collective position is that their existing workfroce could abosrb no more than an additional 2,690 patients, before all of the practices would consider closing their patient lists to new registrations... without investment in both infrastructure and workfroce will have reached capacity between two to five years. It then goes on to state There are no guaranteed NHS funding streams for either the staffing or the premises cost involved in any GP Practice or Dental Practice expansion described above</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Document (LC-303-Rossendale_SA_9_230517RC.docx) on page 81 "green Farm" the symbol set against the Landscape column reports that this will likely have an "ADVERSE" effect, the appraisal's Objectives were to "protect and Enhance high wuality landscapes and townscapes in the Borough Especially those that contribute to local distinctiveness" you are failing to uphold this objective by even contemplating digging up the areas described and show horning more blots on a very nice local landscape in the form of unnecessary housing.</p> <p>Cultural heritage and biodiversity reports "uncertain effects" your objective is to "CONSERVE" and "ENHANCE" the historic environment, heritage assets and "THEIR SETTINGS"</p> <p>Biodiversity & geordiversity your objective is to "PROTECT" and "ENHANCE" again you are failing here also to uphold your objectives and from the same publication the following quote:- "bacup is a main settlement within Rossendale, located in the eat os the Borough. It is rich in heritage, recognised as the best-preserved mill town in the country"</p> <p>this will not be for long if this council keep coming up with stupid ideas to build all over our green areas, turning it more and more into a concrete jungle, part of the charm of Bacup is the moorland landscape that surrounds it and the green fields that make it feel more rural and countrified, there are enough "Brown" sites available in the area for building new or replacing old buildings without touching what makes our town/village special.</p> <p>Recent development of Burnley Road had introduced a number of new properties I don't see the need for any more, as far as I am concerned the infrastrucutre around Bacup cannot handle any more properties,</p> <p>In roundup to the above, in every aspect of this planning application, boundary move and change proposed for the bacup area and for Greens Farm and Bull Hall in general each of the sections shows that the council has not thought this through thoroughly enough and has had a knee jerk reaction to the governments housing policy requirements calling on all unspoilt/un built on land in their area to fulful a tick in the box with WhiteHall The Sunstainability Appraisal itself contained the following disclaimer "The assessments above are based on the best available information, including that provided to Lepus by the Council and information that is publically</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
						<p>available. No attempt to verify these secondary data sources has been made and they have assumed to be accurate as published."</p> <p>Lepus haven't even verified that the details given are accurate and in my opinion have done half a job! And therefore the application should be withdrawn</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
481	John	Atherton			Not Applicable	<p>We recently sent an e-mail to you (please see below *copied e-mail sent to you on 21/6/17) regarding the withdrawal of the public bus service on Todmorden Road and would like to add this and some more points to you about the accuracy and omissions of the site assessment.</p> <p>We refer to: The Appendix E - Site Assessments, Site Ref: SHLAA16052, Site Name: Green Farm, Todmorden Old Road, Bacup.</p> <p>Regarding the Availability section of the Site Assessment - the land required for access from Moor View is not owned by the sponsor of this proposed development - the owner(s) have an easement but the site assessment infers that all land required for the development is: 'single private ownership'.</p> <p>In the Suitability section, under Access by public transport, it shows that there is a bus service but there is no longer a bus service on Todmorden Road - the service was withdrawn in January 2017 - therefore the colour coding should be red.</p> <p>In the Suitability section, under Flood risk it states: ' flood zone 1 or low surface water flood risk' but would the surface water flood risk rise due to the land engineering work required to mitigate the known issues on this piece of land? - these engineering works would reduce the land's capacity to absorb rain water and this would increase the vulnerability to flooding further down the valley, unless a SuDS scheme is put in place.</p> <p>In the Suitability section, under Recreational Value, it states: 'no recreational value' and is colour coded green but there are public footpaths along the boundaries - this should be amber colour coded. To state that the land has no recreational value after the submissions in the last planning consultation from local residents, about this green field site, is puzzling. After looking at several other different sites assessments which have public footpaths along or within boundaries, these are coloured coded amber and the future maintenance of the footpaths are noted as a requirement.</p> <p>In the Conclusion section, under Suitability summary, it states that: 'Most local services are accessible within a 15 minutes walk' but it does not mention the steepness of the roads and streets from the centre of Bacup up to the site, which would be more difficult when walking with children, prams, carrying shopping bags etc. and even more arduous for the elderly and people with impaired mobility.</p> <p>The conclusion also mentions that the secondary school and GP Surgery can be accessed by public transport but as we've mentioned previously, there is no public transport.</p> <p>Even if this bus service was still available - the assessment does not detail the poor bus service that was provided - the service was hourly and did not run in the evenings or on Sundays - it was not a good service for people attending late doctors appointments or for workers (days, nights or different shifts) or for people visiting from and to the site. Also, there was no mention of the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
						<p>steepness from the bus stop to the site, via Moorside crescent and Moorview - both are very steep. The location of the site would be only suitable for car owners - it is not suitable for people without their own transport.</p> <p>The possibility of prior extraction of the coal near the surface is not mentioned either in the conclusion, unlike other site assessments where it is noted that potential extraction of minerals might occur to avoid sterilisation of recourses.</p> <p>We are concerned that Greens Farm site assessment will be matched against the planning matrix when it does not contain the correct information and does not contain important details which other Site Assessments seem to have. We would be grateful if you would look at the Greens Farm Site Assessment again and amend it to show the correct details.</p> <p>Would you please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail and please contact us if you require any further information.</p> <p>Submitted online 08/10/17:</p> <p>Our objection is regarding HS2.6 and the inadequate access to the proposed site. The access to this allocation is from Todmorden Road, into Moorside Crescent, then into Moorview which is a Cul-de sac of four houses - then across a private garden which starts at the end of the cul-de-sac – the garden is between No. 3 and No. 4 Moorview. The intention of the developer, is to build a public road over this garden, which is a private easement between the landowner and the owners of No. 3 and 4 Moorview, to then access the proposed sites. The owner(s) have benefit of the right of way over the easement but do not have the right to make it a public road and to join it to other parcels of land. - - RE: TODMORDEN ROAD ACCESS - The journey from Todmorden Road (A681) to the proposed site will need expensive modifications to the Road, the Crescent, and the Cul-de-sac, to accommodate the large increase in the vehicle movements to and from the site, and to meet the requirements set out in the ‘Manual for Streets 2’. - The junction of Todmorden Road with Moorside Crescent and Greave Road would not meet the site line requirements in today’s Manual for Streets 2 and consequently the view for drivers exiting Moorside Crescent onto Todmorden Road is poor – of particular concern is the traffic coming down Todmorden Road where the clear majority of vehicles, including HGV’s, have to move into the centre of the road when over-taking the parked cars on Todmorden Road, especially cars parked directly opposite Moorside crescent. A significant number of vehicles exceed the speed limit when travelling down the steep incline of Todmorden Road and due to this, these vehicles move into the centre of the road higher up Todmorden Road, to pass the parked cars, reducing the visibility of the drivers trying to exit Moorside Crescent even more. Vehicles coming down Todmorden Road, preparing to turn left into Greave Road must execute a risky</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
						<p>manoeuvre of swerving to the right, then turning left, which places them almost 90 degrees across the carriage way, which is the only way they can enter Greave Road – almost like Raleigh driving. - - RE: MOORSIDE CRESCENT ACCESS - Moorside Crescent is a very steep incline and gets steeper the higher up you go, until the road turns sharply to the left and levels off. This road only has a footpath on its western side and the foot path is not particularly wide. The developer who built this part of the estate went bankrupt and the bond was called in to finish the roads - the bond must have been inadequate, or the council would have finished the pathways. Today there is a more pedestrian centred policy, requiring retrospective changes to accommodate people with disabilities. On Moorside Crescent, footpaths on the Eastern side should be completed. - The planners say that most services and facilities are available from the proposed site, within a 15-minute walk – many people would find this difficult. The vast majority of people would find the return journey from Bacup to the proposed site impossible within 15 minutes, if you consider the steepness of the roads and footpaths, and especially with children, carrying bags of shopping etc. The elderly and people with disabilities would struggle even more to walk the steep road and pathways - in winter, the slightest snowfall would isolate this site. - Realistically, the only journeys to and from the proposed site would be by car. - - RE: MOORVIEW ACCESS - Moorview Cul-de-sac would require an expensive re-modelling to change it from a Cul-de-sac to a through-road, with a footpath on both sides of the road. The Cul-de-sac has been in place for over 25 years and the houses and the driveways of each house is positioned in such a way around the cul-de-sac, to enable the residents to safely drive on or off their driveways. Changing the cul-de-sac to a through-road, which would result in a large increase in traffic, would make it more hazardous for the residents driving on and off their driveways. The increase in traffic and public access could also have an impact on our security. We are aware of the developer’s right to pass and re-pass over the right of way but the four families living in Moorview have rights as well. It is our intention to ensure that the Council does not deprive us of any of our rights concerning this land, by the Council enabling access for the developer. - The right of way from the cul-de-sac into the developer’s field is also part of the Coal Authority High Risk Development Area, and the developer is proposing building a road across this, to access his field. - - RE: HS2.6 SITE - The HS2.6 site which consists of Greens Farm and Bull Hall, is in the Coal Authority High Risk Development Area and in the Lancashire County Council’s Mineral Safeguarding Area. We have communicated this fact to the Planning Department previously and consequently they have requested information from the Developer regarding mining and land stability reports/information. It seems that there is still no policy in the Local Plan which cover Mineral Safeguarding and the prior extraction of minerals, if the development is going to sterilise the mineral resources.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
746	Harry & Linda	Dutton			Object	<p>We would like to oppose the proposal for allocating housing sites at Bull Hall, SHLAA116051 and Greens Farm, SHLAA116052.</p> <p>Both of these sites require the moving of the Urban Boundary which we feel is unacceptable in the light of the cross-party Keep Rossendale Valley Green campaign which has succeeded in reducing the number of housing sites required by Government for Rossendale. We think that if fewer sites are now needed the priority for those 'drop out' sites should be given to those that require the moving of the Urban Boundary. The SHLAA for Greensclough recommends 621 houses on greenfield sites 100 on mixed sites and only 30 on brownfield sites, which is less than 5%. This figure does not include the 33 houses already granted permission on a greenfield site on land at Greensnook Lane less than 200 metres from the proposed site at Greens Farm. We feel this is disproportionate and unsustainable, placing an intolerable strain on the existing infrastructure in this area.</p> <p>Both the Bull Hall and Greens Farm sites fail the sustainability criteria set out in PPG which states they must be within 400 metres of a regular transport service, since January 2017 there has only been a twice daily school bus service between Bacup and Todmorden.</p> <p>Greens Farm:</p> <p>As stated in the assessment, the access to the site is inadequate. The alternative access mooted from the Bull Hall site would require the removal of a dry stone wall, the removal of trees and bushes which have formed a valuable wildlife corridor and would cross a public Footpath.</p> <p>The Council's proposal to build only on the southern half of the site but still wanting to extend the Urban Boundary to include the northern section would surely weaken any attempt to restrict a developer wishing to use the whole of the site for housing.</p> <p>Presently the Urban Boundary is robust and well defined by historic dry stone walls, it is surely a retrograde and illogical step to move the boundary and try to restrict development to an imaginary line across a hay meadow.</p> <p>In the landscape assessment study it states that housing should be low density, but the 23 house total is based on the standard density of 30 per hectare.</p> <p>The site is categorised by the Coal Authority as high risk and there are well documented geological problems due to previous mining operations. In Rossendale Rambles p.19 written by Ian Goldthorpe, a former chief planning officer at R B C, "coal measures can be seen a short distance past Laneside Cottages, open cast mining operations were carried out in this area in 1956 and 1957'. Underground mine workings from the former Blue Bell Colliery will probably also affect this site.</p> <p>Although in a designated low flood risk area, the result of housing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
						<p>developments on both sides of Todmorden Old Road has meant that in bad weather the road turns into a river discharging onto Greensnook Lane. If the proposed housing at Greens Farm and the 33 houses due to be built on land off Greensnook Lane were to go ahead the frequency and severity of these problems would obviously increase.</p> <p>The trees on the Greens Farm site along Todmorden Old Road form an important wildlife corridor for both birds and animals, Badgers, Roe Dear, Foxes and Weasels are frequent visitors. Many species of birds, Thrushes, Jays, Owls, and Woodpeckers and the usual array of garden birds use these trees as nesting sites. This biodiversity will be jeopardised both during and after any development.</p> <p>These greenfields are mown annually for hay and used for cattle and horse grazing and the footpaths 370 and 371 are well used by ramblers and dog walkers, if the Urban Boundary is moved as proposed these footpaths would be just paths on the periphery of housing estates and it would adversely impact on both local and longer distance vistas.</p> <p>For all the above reasons we would ask that you reject the moving of the Urban Boundary to facilitate these unnecessary housing developments and preserve the tranquil nature of these greenfields.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
848	LORRAINE	WINNARD	-		Object	<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>		<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
								<p>Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>
1139	Andy	Stephenson	ASA Micros Ltd		Object	<p>Direct effect on wildlife - foxes, badgers, bats, owls etc - Loss of amenity - Loss of rain water soak away - Loss of managed land - Increase in noise and light pollution - Effect on local roads, schools and health services - Arbitrary movement of urban boundary to facilitate development - Not in keeping with the area - Poor access - Already a highly developed area -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
1142	CHRISTINE	JACKSON	-		Object	<p>ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN - BACUP AREA. - Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup, which is recognised as the best preserved milll town in the County. - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane),HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) and HS2.4 (land off Moorland Terrace) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that the majority of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there, it is also on the skyline, building on here would have a huge impact on the views for miles around.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
1305	Fiona	Knapper	-		Object	<p>I have recently been made aware of this ongoing consultation into moving the urban boundaries in Bacup. I have lived in Bacup for 17 years and have become very familiar with it. I have experienced first hand the nightmare of commuting into Rochdale, Oldham and Manchester. I have also been through the soul destroying experience of trying to sell a house here, in a saturated and flat market, and having to accept an offer well below market value in order to move my family to more appropriate accommodation. - With dreadful transport links, and no improvement in that on the horizon, a run down and lifeless town centre and several new estates full of transient tenants because the builders can't sell them, the last thing Bacup needs is to lose one of its few advantages - protected green space. - The land above Greens Farm is beautiful, peaceful and a haven for walkers and wildlife. It is accessible, if steep, on foot in good weather - much less accessible in snow, which would be a major issue if funnelling more road traffic up the hill. The road built up to Moorside Crescent is extremely steep and treacherous, both in snowy and icy conditions, as well as when it is covered in autumn leaves. Having had to crawl up it on hands and knees at 8 months pregnant because the surface underfoot was so slippery, it makes me quite sure that increasing the number of people requiring access up it would not be advisable. - Additionally, there is currently NO public transportation available in this part of Bacup. The nearest buses are almost a mile's walk away. - I am a resident of Moorside Crescent, and obviously this gives me a vested interest in preserving the current environment. However, I am also a member of our community and if there was a genuine shortage of housing and more stock was desperately needed, then I would accept that sacrifices had to made. But this is not the case. It is MADNESS to continue planning new builds when the housing market is so flat, mainly due to the significant factors mentioned in my first paragraph. It is even worse to facilitate this by sacrificing the green space which gives Bacup one of its few advantages. This site also lies outside the urban boundary, and any development which is approved for areas such as this have to 'enhance the rural environment'. There is no possibility that covering a clear, green field with houses improves its rural environment. It is simply unacceptable. - In conclusion, to be clear, I strongly oppose the movement of the urban boundary at Greens Farm and the related housing application.</p>		Please look more closely into developing the brown field sites proposed, and leave our green spaces alone.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
1463	Michael	Foley	-		Object	<p>The development is planned on greenfield – The site has poor access - - The assessment states it's on a gentle slope this is not the case as it is a steep slope site. - Vehicular access is going to be a major problem with the potential of causing travel delays and danger to children playing on streets. - The site is surrounded by mature trees and dry stone walls that all need conserving and should not be removed and would need repair - - There is poor access to strategic road network and the assessment talks of 3.5 miles distance which feels like a very underestimate. - Public transport is very poor, schools and GPs are all a distance from the planned development. - There is already a vast amount of recent housing developments of 3-4 bedroom houses in the Bacup area that have flooded the market, some housing has still not been sold and it has caused a flooding of the private rental sector – - There is a water flood issue that the site holds a large amount of water that runs down to adjoining site on Rosemount and moorview, if building on the site and preventing water draining and increasing run of rate this has potential to cause problems for adjoining housings and drains. - The assessment talks of an hourly bus service but this is not the case at weekend there is no service between Todmorden and Bacup - The assessment speaks of developing higher value properties, as we have already stated the market for 3-4 bedroom house in Bacup is flooded which has actually depressed prices in the Bacup area, prices are static or loosing value it would seem strange to want to add to large houses that don't seem what the market needs – What's happening to 2 bedroom LA / HA properties. - My understanding is this land is green belt and was not within the urban boundary - Wildlife - - The fields at Greens farm act as run for Foxes, we get bats flying across the field and around the houses at the top of Rosemount, these bats return each summer to the area. - There are field mice, shrews, hedgehogs using the green fields. Various small birds feed in the fields, thrush, blackbirds, greater spotted woodpecker, redwings, blue tits, great tits, gold finches, sparrows, starling's, robins, dunnocks, magpies, crows, doves and buzzards. - Environment - The fields have a number of large trees that larger birds use to nest each year. - These large trees are the near the last line of larger trees before you gain further height and only have smaller trees and shrubs. - The open fields also have a number of natural water springs. We list the springs as they cause some potential to create a flood worry for us on Rosemount during heavy rain. At present the drains have dealt with the springs that come through the dry-stone walls but if building were to take place in the field and concrete and tarmac were to take away the natural draining into the field/grass the danger of standing water and flooding to houses further down the hill could increase. - Weather considerations - It is worth note that the urban boundary being looked at is at a high altitude- Housing would be difficult to heat or require constant heating in the cold damp Bacup climate especially winters. This is at a time there are concerns</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
						<p>about the use of energy. - Drainage – At present I understand houses on Moorside struggle with surface water that comes down the hill from open fields. The problem of water drains becomes worse when you get onto Todmorden Road and down into Bacup where drains do not cope and often have running surface water – To build further on high open fields covering with Tarmac and concrete is only likely to increase drainage problems. - Density – This is a large change to the urban boundary, with what we feel leaving open further request to extent towards todmorden road area- The present planned urban boundary changes and suggested housing development will automatically create an area of high density housing. - Unused sites- We have concern that there are a number of site held waiting development i.e. greensnook lane, Old GP surgery todmorden Road, old mills to name just three. Surely to aim should be to use up land already vacant before moving the urban boundary. - - Social Implications - Transport – Public transport and car access to Bacup has always been under strain. - There are no local trains that can help reduce road congestion. - Although buses are fair in the rush hour, they are poor at other times. - Driving to Rochdale or Rawtenstall in rush hour can increase a 20 to 30 minute journey to 1hr. - Access – If further development were to go ahead in the open fields we understand access will be via a narrow easement on Moorview. We suggest there are chance of problems and accidents with this narrow access point. There is also issue of narrow access for essential services. - It is also worth note that in winter and ice and snow many people are forced to park on Todmorden road as it become impossible to get up the steep hill to homes. Cars have to be left near Bacup town centre and people struggle to walk up the steep hill to their homes. Any changes to the urban would increase this - The steep access road (Moorside Crescent) is so steep that it is at the maximum allowed nowadays. - Infrastructure - We have concerns if local facilities can cope with further development. Apart from poor transport and roads. We have always felt shopping opportunities are limited in Bacup. People seem to travel to Rawtenstall or Rochdale for food shopping. There seem limited opportunities for children’s facilities. The local library offers very limited hours. We are not aware of GP and school capacity but feel this needs careful consideration - Housing strategy - Looking at the local plans to increase housing and what has already been built there seems an unusually high level of housing already built in Bacup without taking further green belt. - There are still various sites being developed around Bacup and empty land. - It seems looking at Rossendale as a whole there is much more housing being targeted at Bacup than other areas i.e. Haslingden, Rawtenstall, Whiteworth - - Over-provision – We have lived in Bacup for 20ys and with recent housing developments on the Rochdale Road area and other smaller sites we would question if too much housing is being generated in Bacup with no real demand. We mention this as when we tried to sell our house over the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
						<p>last 5years we reduced the asking price from 195k to 160k and could not sell the house. - It's worth looking at the number of houses already around Bacup that cannot be sold. - - We are aware of the large trading development built down at Rawtenstall that has remained empty – We fear over developing housing at Bacup without a clear need may just lead to empty houses or empty fields half developed or empty fields marked for development and left vacant. All of which will further damage the economy of the local Bacup area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
1525	Martin	Illman	-		Object	<p>Please see below for my concerns regarding the proposed development of land at Greens Farm, Todmorden Old Road, Bacup and proposed change to the Urban Boundary. - - The current and present Urban Boundary at Greens Farm is strong, robust and permanent as stated and confirmed by the Council itself in July 2014 in its reply to a previous consultation. The proposed changes to the Urban Boundary consist of moving the Urban Boundary to a remnant dry stone wall on one side and post and wire fence with mesh on another side (as described in an earlier Greens Farm Landscape Assessment by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects, I think this was undertaken in 2015), quite a significant change. The proposed move will weaken the Urban Boundary and in no way make it as strong or stronger than what currently exists. I would also like to draw your attention to the following statement taken from Rossendale Councils website The statement reads: "But, don't panic! We're not planning to radically change the boundaries and we understand how important the countryside is to local people and the natural environment." It sounds like the proposed change is quite a radical one to me. The Green Farm Landscape Assessment undertaken by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects in 2015 calls for "existing boundaries to be retained and repaired where appropriate using dry stone walls" and I concur with this 100% percent. - The proposed development at Greens Farm plans for access for vehicles to be provided from Moor View which is off Moorside Crescent from Todmorden Road. This would result in increased traffic generation at the junction of Moorside Crescent, Todmorden Road and Greave Road. This junction is notoriously difficult to navigate and an increase in traffic would result in further problems of highway safety for road users and non road users alike. At the moment the steepness of Moorside Crescent and Moor View causes problems for vehicle users in the Winter season especially. Often cars are left on Todmorden Road as they simply cannot get up the two aforementioned steep roads. More vehicles being abandoned on Todmorden Road will again lead to an increase in highway safety. I believe having access from Moor View to any proposed development will be a major constraint.</p>		<p>It is noted that mature sycamores line the site and that the trees on site are covered by Tree Preservation Orders. I am concerned that although the recommendation is for the existing trees to be protected and maintained any development on the site will result in loss of some of the trees or at best will have a negative effect on the trees. The trees are home to a diverse range of birds and other wildlife that will again be disrupted severely by any development. - A tree impact plan and tree constraints plan prepared by a qualified arboriculturalist will need to be undertaken but surely the best option would be not to develop at all. I am concerned by the layout and density of the proposed development and the adverse effect this will have on the local character which is described as "settled valley landscape" by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects in the Landscape Assessment and "a very attractive tranquil site". In Section 123 of The National Planning Policy Framework it states: - "Planning policies and decisions should aim to:" - · "Identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason." - I am also concerned at the loss of privacy for several residents on Rosemount, Moor View and Change Close that will surely happen if the proposed development goes ahead. It is obvious that many of the properties on the three roads mentioned in my</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.006	Further comment
								previous sentence are currently not overlooked and enjoy a high degree of privacy because of this. Any new development will surely eradicate this and result in substantial loss of privacy. - I trust that the above will be given serious consideration before a decision is made.
1621	Judith Bussy	Carl Hanson		SHLAA16051 and SHLAA16052	Object	We wish to oppose proposal to move urban boundary to allow building on greenfield land at Bull Hall SHLAA116051 and Greens Farm SHLAA116052		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	HS2.6 – Greens Farm – Subject to vehicular access being secured via the Moorside Crescent Estate and designed in accordance with MfS to maximise permeability and distribute traffic throughout the estate, the site access would be acceptable.		
Number of comments		HS2.006				13		
Reference		HS2.007		Land off Cowtoot Lane, Bacup				
57	Barbara	Ashworth	Elected member RBC	SHLAA 16067	Object	This land is subject to an agricultural tenancy where RBC is the landlord. Depending on when this tenancy was granted, it may be that there are succession rights which could make this a problematic site for development because of the tenant's rights. This is information I have read on the directgov website. I hope the details of the tenancy are therefore examined carefully before progressing further. - - My other objection is that this is a large site and to accommodate so many properties, would need major work to the existing road system. Cowtoot Lane - a no - through road on which we have Bacup Nursery school and Bacup's largest Primary school as well as BARB FC. has already got major problems at school entry and exit times. In order to access Cowtoot Lane, the traffic either comes along Greensnook Lane, itself far too narrow for parked vehicles and two - way traffic or from Burnley Rd, across the culvetted River Irwell and straight up Cooper St which is extremely steep and again has parked cars on one side. The other access to this site would be up Gordon St but this again means crossing the same culvetted stretch of the River Irwell. I see no solution to this traffic problem.		-
560	Hilary	Fairclough	-		Object	I object to the loss of green space where this housing development Is been proposed.		I object to loss of green space been lost due to the housing development proposed.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
768	Sandra	Navesey	-		Object	<p>There are multiple reasons for my objection. I do not believe it is necessary to build houses on greenfield sites whilst there are many brownfield areas in Bacup, some of them with large decrepit mills and other sites which are unsightly and need to be demolished and developed to improve the area. The land in question is regularly visited by walkers and hikers as it is part of the Irwell Sculpture Trail where a large Sculpture has been built on the hillside on Cowtoot Lane, created to highlight links between rural and industrial heritage. Named THE SENTINAL, meaning a soldier posted to keep guard over a special place. Access to this site is problematic as there I no proper roads into the greenfield site. Cowtoot lane is actually a grassy, muddy footpath. I feel the large number of houses squeezed onto these fields (151) has a negative impact on the local area as it is visible from several areas in the town because of its elevated position. There are already insufficient schools - only two secondary schools, one of which is BRGS grammar school which is only accessible to higher achieving students who need to pass a rigorous entry exam to be accepted. This leaves one under achieving school under special measures, Fearn, for the remaining students. Hardly an attractive situation for potential new residents! The same situation applies to the Irewell Medical Centre which is already over subscribed. I assume the planning dept are aware of the historical mining carried out on this area, and also that it is very prone to flooding. This area was once a playing field, but is now frequently used by hikers and dog walkers, and it begs the question, has anyone checked whether there is a covenant on it preventing building and development? One of the major problems for more traffic in the area is the only road to Rawtenstall and access to the motorway system. This route is a nightmare during school runs and commuter periods, more often than not being dug up for various reasons with temporary traffic lights constantly in place.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
848	LORRAINE	WINNARD	-		Object	<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>		<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
								<p>Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
1068	Lynn	Cavanagh	-		Object	<p>The proposal will have a large impact on many things that will be of detriment - to the local community, whilst this is intended to be an extensive list with reasons I dont believe this is an exhaustive list. - 1) The impact on the local traffic will be extreme, there is currently large volumes of traffic that go through bacup to both whitworth which only has one road through and is also intending on building many houses, and to Rawtenstall, which due to the motorway connections is already very busy. Increase in traffic means increase in pollution, road traffic accidents and increased wear and tear on already tired roads. Many of the roads in Bacup are small and narrow and again already in need of repair putting extra pressure on council funds to repair them. - 2) A major problem in the area that is already identifiable today is the over crowding of the schools in this and surrounding areas, Whitworth high have rejected many from Bacup due to not enough space that has left pupils travelling (as noted in the local press) as far as Bury and Todmorden, again increasing the cost of school buses to take pupils to these schools. Primary schools are as oversubscribed and this is effecting the future of our community, those that we expect to stay in the region and buy such houses. With a major zchool now being in special measures where are the extra children supposed to be schooled? The increase on pressure for parents will be phenomenal, siblings at xifferent schools miles apart will be impossible to manage. - 3) Medical practices will be unable to manage more patients with an nhs already strugglung with funds and staff. The main practice in Bacup is extremely hard to get an appointment with at the moment so increasing patient numbers would be catastrophic, along with medical emergencies currently being dealt with at either Oldham or Blackburn will a death be caused before zomeone will take note? - 4) Births, there has already been a major increase in housing in the area which with it comes new families and younger couples, Rochdale stopped allowing births so now couples are left with Burnley or Oldham, if they can manage to get a bed! - 5) Dental practices along with doctors will be unable to meet the demand for increased nhs patients which will ultimately lead people to either travel far for a dentist, go private and pay or go without treatment which inevitably costs the nhs more in the longer term. - 6) Local police will need to have a larger presence and larger task force for the area due to the ratio of people, is there the funding to enable that, specifically as you are looking at a traveler stop over. Those that are travelling through the community often have little respect for it as has been seen in the past. - 7) Scenery and landscapes, Bacup is a wonderful area of beauty and this area especially has wonderful landscapes and views building on this will destroy this lanscape, the light on neighbouring properties and noise pollution to say the least. - 8) Wildlife, there is an abundance of natural wildlife on the fields throughout the year from field mice to hedgehogs, foxes and kestrels, sparrowhawks and weasels, where will they</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----------------

go? On top of this the fields are used almost hourly for dog walkers and horse riders and it is a joy to see! - As described before this is not an exhaustive list as it goes on and on but I strongly object to the building!!!!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
1070	Stacey	Mairs	-		Object	<p>The proposal will have a large impact on many things that will be of detriment to the local community, whilst this is intended to be an extensive list with reasons I dont believe this is an exhaustive list. - 1) The impact on the local traffic will be extreme, there is currently large volumes of traffic that go through bacup to both whitworth which only has one road through and is also intending on building many houses, and to Rawtenstall, which due to the motorway connections is already very busy. When there ard bad weather conditions roads are extremely dangerous due to cars being unable to get up the valleys hills and parking on the main roads. Increase in traffic means increase in pollution, road traffic accidents and increased wear and tear on already tired roads. Many of the roads in Bacup are small and narrow and again already in need of repair putting extra pressure on council funds to repair them. When road repairs are made traffic comes to a complete standstill with the current traffic so increasing this would impact all surrounding areas. - 2) A major problem in the area that is already identifiable today is the over crowding of the schools in this and surrounding areas, Whitworth high have rejected many from Bacup due to not enough space,that has left pupils travelling (as noted in the local press) as far as Bury and Todmorden, again increasing the cost of school buses to take pupils to these schools. Primary schools are as oversubscribed and this is effecting the future of our community, those that we expect to stay in the region and buy such houses. With a major school now being in special measures where are the extra children supposed to be schooled? The increase on pressure for parents will be phenomenal, siblings at different schools miles apart will be impossible to manage. School holidays are different from school to school creating problems for parents. Safety for children will put at risk as school intakes increase or travel becomes further. - 3) Medical practices will be unable to manage more patients with an nhs already strugglung with funds and staff. The main practice in Bacup is extremely hard to get an appointment with at the moment so increasing patient numbers would be catastrophic, along with medical emergencies currently being dealt with at either Oldham or Blackburn will a death be caused before zomeone will take note? More doctors will need to be on call out of hours to deal with demand. - 4) Births, there has already been a major increase in housing in the area which with it comes new families and younger couples, Rochdale stopped allowing births so now couples are left with Burnley or Oldham, if they can manage to get a bed! More people causes more pressure for hospitals which could mean people are left being unable to go to hospital. - 5) Dental practices along with doctors will be unable to meet the demand for increased nhs patients which will ultimately lead people to either travel far for a dentist(not practical), go private and pay or go without treatment which inevitably costs the nhs more in the longer term. - 6) Local police will need to have a larger presence and larger task force</p>		Do not build in this area

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----------------

for the area due to the ratio of people, is there the funding to enable that, specifically as you are looking at a traveler stop over. Those that are travelling through the community often have little respect for it as has been seen in the past.increased crime statistics will drive insurance prices up and the lack of and increase police time. Vulnerable people will also need more help from the local authorties again increasing costs. - 7) Bacup is a wonderful area of beauty and this area especially has wonderful landscapes and views building on this will destroy this lanscape, the light on neighbouring properties and noise pollution to say the least. - 8)There is an enormous amount of natural wildlife on the fields throughout the year from field mice to hedgehogs, foxes and kestrels, sparrowhawks and weasels, where will they go? On top of this the fields are used almost hourly for dog walkers and horse riders and it is a joy to see! - As described before this is not an exhaustive list as it goes on and on but I strongly object to the building!!!!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
1071	Jonathan	Mairs	-		Object	<p>The proposal will have a large impact on many things that will be of detriment to the local community, whilst this is intended to be an extensive list with reasons I dont believe this is an exhaustive list. - 1) TRAFFIC is already horrific there is currently large volumes of traffic that go through bacup to both whitworth which only has one road through and is also intending on building many houses, and to Rawtenstall, which due to the motorway connections is already very busy. Increase in traffic means increase in pollution, road traffic accidents and increased wear and tear on already tired roads. Many of the roads in Bacup are small and narrow and again already in need of repair putting extra pressure on council funds to repair - 2) SCHOOLS ther is massive over crowding of the schools in this and surrounding areas, Whitworth high have rejected many from Bacup due to not enough space that has left pupils travelling (as noted in the local press) as far as Bury and Todmorden, again increasing the cost of school buses to take pupils to these schools. Primary schools are as oversubscribed and this is effecting the future of our community, those that we expect to stay in the region and buy such houses. With a major school now being in special measures where are the extra children supposed to be schooled? The increase on pressure for parents will be phenomenal, siblings at xifferent schools miles apart will be impossible to manage. - 3) DOCTORS Medical practices will be unable to manage more patients with an nhs already strugglung with funds and staff. The main practice in Bacup is extremely hard to get an appointment with at the moment so increasing patient numbers would be catastrophic, along with medical emergencies currently being dealt with at either Oldham or Blackburn will a death be caused before zomeone will take note? - 4) HOSPITALS there has already been a major increase in housing in the area which with it comes new families and younger couples, Rochdale stopped allowing births so now couples are left with Burnley or Oldham, if they can manage to get a bed! What about going to hospital also no one will get a bed, hospitals were shut down as towns didnt need them (apparantly) andnow we are increasing headcount???! - 5) DENTIST Dental practices along with doctors will be unable to meet the demand for increased nhs patients ahich will ultimately lead people to either travel far for a dentist, go private and pay or go without treatment which inevitably costs the nhs more in the longer term. - 6) POLICING police will need to have a larger presence and larger task force for the area due to the ratio of people, is there the funding to enable that, specifically as you are looking at a traveler stop over. Those that are travelling through the community often have little respect for it as has been seen in the past. More people means more crime! - 7) Scenery and landscapes, Bacup is a wonderful area of beauty and this area especially has wonderful landscapes and views building on this will destroy this lanscape, the light on neighbouring properties and noise pollution to say the least. - 8) Wildlife, there is an</p>		This is a huge mistake

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
						abundance of natural wildlife on the fields throughout the year from field mice to hedgehogs, foxes and kestrels, sparrowhawks and weasels, where will they go? On top of this the fields are used almost hourly for dog walkers and horse riders and it is a joy to see! - As described before this is not an exhaustive list as it goes on and on but I strongly object to the building!!!!		
1142	CHRISTINE	JACKSON	-		Object	<p>ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN - BACUP AREA. - Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup, which is recognised as the best preserved milll town in the County. - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane),HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) and HS2.4 (land off Moorland Terrace) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that the majority of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - The local infrastructure, schools, nurseries, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there, it is also on the skyline, building on here would have a huge impact on the views for miles around.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
1306	Gavin	Bridge	-		Object	<p>The great majority of this site is red-flagged as an 'undevelopable' area by the Landscape Study (2015): Bacup and Stacksteads Sites Assessment, Volume 2 (see map on p.12). The same study found that development for housing will have a 'substantial adverse impact' (p. 27) over most of the area, and decisively concluded it is "Not suitable for development on landscape grounds" (p.28). - - The SHLAA has also confirmed that development of this site will have "high landscape impact". In addition, it is adjacent to sites of significant ecological value, and the Landscape Study (2015) concluded "it provides an important separation between Industrial Age, Settled Valley and Moorland Fringe landscape character types and *has a key role in forming the edge of the built environment of Bacup*"- - The SHLAA has found that "access is a major constraint" for the site, that it has poor accessibility for public transport and that, if housing is developed on the site, most of the residents will commute by cars adding to the significant transport infrastructure problems in the Valley. The SHLAA has also found the site ranks highly on coal risk assessment. - - Overall, it is clear from the SHLAA study and supporting documentation that this plot of land (a) has been unambiguously assessed as "not developable" on landscape grounds; (b) the combination of access constraints and other factors (including coal risk) impose such significant costs for developers that the site is only regarded by the SHLAA as being (at best) 'marginally viable' in the long-term; and (c) any development of the site will require a major and permanent change to the Urban Boundary, which goes against the long-established goal (written into the previous local plan) to maintain openness and separation between urban development on the north east edge of Bacup and Weir. - - The evidence presented to support the case for allocating this land to housing is weak. The evidence from the SHLAA study concludes the site is not viable in the short to medium term; and, furthermore, that there is only a possibility of it becoming viable if the time-line is stretched out into the future (10-15 years): this is a time-horizon which requires some heroic assumptions about land prices, developers costs and discount rates. Indeed, the evidence of marginal viability suggests that, if it is allocated to housing, it ll likely end up in the 'land bank' of a developer who will then seriously struggle to finance the construction. The result will be a lose-lose situations: no houses, and a blighted piece of land on the edge of Bacup. - - It is irresponsible to allocate the land to housing in this context. The evidence points to the commercial case being marginal at best (and then only if one stretches the time horizon out to its maximum extent. To allocate it to housing directly contradicts the findings of both the Landscape Study and the SHLAA's conclusions regarding landscape value and access. There is a much stronger case for maintaining the landscape and ecological values the land supports.</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
1376	Peter	Ackerley	-	land off Cowtoot Lane at rear of properties on Windermere Road	Object	Please accept this as a strong objection to the proposed development on Green Belt land which would have poor access and massively increase traffic near a school and through road system that is already overcrowded. - The development of brown field sites in the Rosedale area has not been exhausted and there are many empty properties across the area. - This site development is not required and would blight the green belt and rural aspects of existing development. - The already overcrowded road and transport system is unable to cope with existing population and these further developments will only add more congestion, demand on schools and services which are already overstretched - Please do not build on this greenbelt land		Need to rethink whole development policy across Rossendale as the valley infrastructure cannot cope with massive increases in housing
1542	J M	Morris		SHLAA16067	Object	I am totally against the proposal. No adequate infrastructure in place to support 151 homes. Profound effect on Greensnook and surrounding areas. Vast amount of money spent on flood prevention only to propose something that will disturb the natural water table. It would be better to demolish some of the dirty old buildings that make Bacup look unkempt and build. You can't make a town with village facilities.		
1563	Yvonne and Alan	Peach		SHLAA16067	Object	Houses built in the Green Field in Cowtoot lane would be affecting the Heritage Site Sentinel there. Also, the field is like a bog, continually wet although it is a popular area for dog walkers. The schools and GP surgeries are full to bursting, it's a constant battle to get a GP appointment and get our children into schools.		
1585	I & PJ	Boswell			Object	With reference to the above, we wish to register our comments (objections) to the emerging local plan which proposes the inappropriate development/building of 151 properties on the above land. -Any housing development will permanently damage the topography of this land area forever destroying the landscape and character in this green area. -Obviously this will severely impact the visual outlook of this amenity and will do nothing for its amelioration and nature conservation -One 'knock-on' effect would inevitably mean more congestion on the local roads where parking is already a major issue - more importantly it presents additional danger particularly to children attending the only school in the area. -around the town (and the valley in general) there are many empty properties with a significant number of others displaying 'For Sale' signs. - The local MP has been quoted as calling for a suspension of any proposal to remove Green Belt land for development and prioritise new developments in Rossendale on brownfield and forer industrial sites of which there are plenty.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.007	Further comment
1763	Elaine	McGinley			Object	<p>I write to express my objections in regards to the above proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. working on the assumption that there will be 2 children and 2 adults per house therefore 300+ people and adding in the factor of 1.5 cars per household (225) this will have a massive impact on local schools and health services with little or no employment to take such numbers. 2. the access will impact significantly with congestion in what is already a built up area not to mention the increased flooding possibilities when natural drainage is taken away and replaced by a concrete jungle. 3. there are few facilities for children/adults in the area as it is, no leisure centres, no cinemas and libraries under threat! <p>Surely there are numerous brownfield sites that can be accessed without taking more of our countryside away. I for one is totally against this proposal.</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>HS 2:7 – Subject to more than one vehicular access onto the highway network being provided to distribute the traffic on the adjoining grid of terraced streets this site could be deemed acceptable. It would be necessary to use the football ground to provide one of the access points. Cowtoot Lane is too narrow to the east of the football ground boundary to accommodate any development traffic</p>		
Number of comments		HS2.007		15				
Reference		HS2.008		Land south of the Weir Public House				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.008	Further comment
762	John & Ann	Farrow	-		Object	<p>There are many problems facing this proposal:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access - proposed site is on a bend. - Visibility - dangerous as vehicles speed through the village - Separation values - no separation then for Weir Village from Township of Bacup. This field is the separation marker for the township. - The possibility of coal mine shafts. - Surface water issues - This area being hilly obviously gets a large amount of rain, and in most instances of heavy rain water gushes from the fields onto the main road, which although not causing flooding on this site may increase flood risk elsewhere lower down the valley. - The local school cannot fit in the village children as it is without more houses with children being built. - Sustainable location - there is nothing in the village as regards to facilities therefore new residents would be heavily reliant on the use of private cars and although the distance to the closest amenities might be considered as short the use of vehicles would conflict with the governments desire to reduce the number and length of vehicle movements as they move towards lowering the carbon economy. - Need for housing - in the Planning and Design and Access statement it is stated that Weir is probably considered with the Rossendale core strategy to be 'other smaller and isolated settlements' as per criteria 4 of policy 3 (distribution of additional housing) which outlines a locational hierarchy for where new housing is to be distributed. It is also stated that this means 'minimal numbers of additional houses will be built in this settlement'. 		<p>There are a number of homes already for sale in the Weir area - currently numbering 60 . These homes are constantly becoming available especially after harsh winters where commuters (not used to snow and having to park on the main road) get fed up with the location and move onto homes further down the valley. - In summary, we would object to this development strongly on the basis of all the arguments previously mentioned and would hope that sensibility would prevail in the making of the relevant decisions on the possibility of new homes being proposed.</p>
982	Michael	Chadderton	-		Object	<p>Observations on the Draft Local Plan site HS2.8 - Burnley Road, Weir</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reason the green area between Lower Weir Cottages/Farm & the former Weir Hotel has not been built upon previously is the existence of a periglacial slip plane of lacustrine deposits. If any additional excavations are carried out, this would cause a catastrophic effect on the adjoining land & highway. One look at the former Weir Hotel with its substantial subsidence gives physical evidence of this. - It is a very similar situation to a site in Ewood Bridge (Rawlinsons) where the whole hillside moved & the site was abandoned & no further work carried out for over 40yrs & never likely to. 2. When the area is subjected to excessive rain, the properties across Burnley Road have been in danger of flooding because of poor land drainage & due to the site being several metres higher than the highway. 3. Any development would rid the site of all wildlife, where badgers & foxes freely roam. 4. There are no retail facilities in Weir now (shops, public houses etc) and there is currently a waiting list for the local school, so any additional development would impact detrimentally on the existing infrastructure of the Village. 		<p>Appreciate acknowledgement of this e mail.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.008	Further comment
1362	adam	taylor	-	HS2.8, HS2.9, HS2.10	Object	Facilities in Weir are almost non-existent. No doctors, shops, schools. - There is one primary school located on the main road at the lower end of Weir, but I doubt it has the capacity to accept many more pupils. The road does become incredibly congested at school start/end times. More pupils will mean more congestion and an increased risk of traffic related accidents. Because it's on a busy road, most children are dropped off/picked up by car. - The nearest shops and Doctors surgery are almost two miles away. - Bus services in Weir are very limited. - The result is that private car journeys have to be relied upon for everything, so adding a new estate will multiply the number of journeys being made. A walk around the existing village reveals that almost every house owns at least two cars. Thus it can be surmised that for each proposed new property, at least two cars will be adding to the traffic. - The wider Rossendale area may also be affected by increasing the traffic to and from Weir. The nearest access to the motorway network is approximately 6 miles northwards, 8 miles away westwards, or over 10 miles to the south. The roads in all those directions are single lane carriageways that are always busy. There is very little scope for adding more traffic without causing major holdups for everyone. There are also few alternate routes due to the geography of the region. - Although I have not yet experienced a winter in Weir, several people have told me how snow is more of a problem than for other lower lying towns. When others get rain, Weir gets snow, and the first signs of snow mean many people park their cars on the main road to ensure easier road access. Again, adding more cars will exacerbate the current problems and could impact on the Gritters ability to ensure the roads remain clear! - There are far too many improvements required to the current infrastructure and to the village as a whole that would require funding and implementing before such a proposal could be considered. - Shops, schools, better road networks would all need to be in place. - And I haven't even mentioned the negative impact all of this would have on the landscape, and the surrounding natural habitats. - One of the challenges set out on the Lancashire County Councils Environment Directorate "Woodland Vision, 2006" document relates specifically to the Enclosed Uplands area of Rossendale: "Protect the open character of the upland summits" - building several new estates in Weir certainly does nothing to achieve that goal! - It also states amongst the Opportunities for Enclosed Uplands:- - Enhance the habitat mosaic of the Enclosed Uplands Landscape - Exploit opportunities for woodland creation on less viable agricultural landholdings. - So the land being earmarked should be considered for Woodlands, if it's not viable as agricultural land (which it is currently being used as). - the document can be read online at http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/191686/Composite-1-5.pdf - There are many brownfield sites visible driving around Rossendale, and these should be exhausted before considering ruining the small rural villages		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.008	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

by expanding them into gridlock.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.008	Further comment
1380	sharon	taylor	-	HS2.8, HS2.9, HS2.10	Object	Facilities in Weir are almost non-existent. No doctors, shops or schools. Having recently moved to Weir we had to wait 2 MONTHS just to get an appointment to register at the local surgery. - - The one primary school, located on the main road at the lower end of Weir, according to neighbours, is subscribed to capacity. Other schools in the area are also feeling the strain. Where are all the children who will be moving to the area, if these houses are built, get an education? Will they have to bus the 90 minutes to Bury as recently shown in an article in the Rossendale Free Press? - - Furthermore, during school pick up and drop off times the road around the primary school becomes incredibly congested and downright dangerous. More pupils will mean more congestion and an increased risk of traffic related accidents. - - The nearest shops and doctors surgery are almost two miles away and, as stated, very difficult to get appointments. If it's like this now how much worse will it get once several hundred more people move into the area? Bus services in Weir are very limited. The result is that private car journeys have to be relied upon for everything. Adding several new estates will multiply the number of journeys being made. A walk around the existing village reveals that almost every house owns at least two cars. Thus it can be surmised that for each proposed new property, at least two cars will be adding to the traffic. During winter when there is snow, people in the estates around Weir, have to park on Burnley Road to avoid being unable to get to work. How will Burnley Road cope with a further 200+ cars being parked on it? This will also impact the road gritters ability to clear and make the roads safe. - - The wider Rossendale area will also be affected by increasing the traffic to and from Weir. The nearest access to the motorway network is approximately 6 miles northwards, 8 miles away westwards, or over 10 miles to the south. The roads in all those directions are single lane carriageways that are always busy. There is very little scope for adding more traffic without causing major holdups for everyone. There are also few alternate routes due to the geography of the region. - - There are far too many improvements required to the current infrastructure and to the village as a whole that would require funding and implementing before such a proposal could be considered. Shops, schools, better road networks would all need to be in place. - - Some of these proposals do not take into consideration parking on a day to day basis. For example, the building around the lower end of Weir on Burnley Road, seems to allow for very little parking. The only option being Burnley Road, further exacerbating the dangers and snarl ups this causes. During the building of these houses where will the contractors park? Again, Burnley Road, causing further disruption & dangers not to mention potential accidents due to muddy roads from construction traffic. Over the last couple of months we've seen the chaos caused by the Electricity works being completed on Burnley road. How much worse will it be with all this building going on? - - Next we need to take into account the		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.008	Further comment
						<p>negative impact all of this would have on the landscape and the surrounding natural habitats. One of the challenges set out in Lancashire County Councils Environment Directorate "Woodland Vision, 2006" document relates specifically to the Enclosed Uplands area of Rossendale: "Protect the open character of the upland summits" - building several new estates in Weir certainly does nothing to achieve that goal! - It also states amongst the Opportunities for Enclosed Uplands:- Enhance the habitat mosaic of the Enclosed Uplands Landscape. Exploit opportunities for woodland creation on less viable agricultural landholdings. So the land being earmarked for housing should, according to your own directorate, be considered for Woodlands if its not viable as agricultural land (which it is currently being used as). The document can be read online at http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/191686/Composite-1-5.pdf. There are many viable brownfield sites around Rossendale, and these should be exhausted before ruining the few bits of open land and small villages left.</p>		
1431	Christopher	Dance	-		Object	<p>Site Location- This is the last piece of land which is green space on both sides of Burnley Road which separates the village of Weir from Bacup. If it is developed for housing, the village will be swallowed up by "greater Bacup" and will lose its village identity. - Topography- This is definitely not an accurate description. See photos sent by email. - Vehicular access- Will emerge on the concave side of a bend in the road, requiring extensive cutbacks. - Access to primary school- Northern is already oversubscribed. If all developments in Weir proceed, a new primary school will be required. - Access to Secondary school- Many parents already do everything in their power to avoid children going to Fearn. - Flood risk- Water streams across this land pouring out onto Burnley Road. There are actually ponds formed on the far side of the dry stone wall that separates the two fields. These cannot be seen from the road. - Ecological value- There are known badger sets adjacent to this site. - Mineral sterilisation- There are known mine workings in the village close to this land which may mean there are coal deposits under it. - Conclusion: Justification- As Northern School is oversubscribed, those not getting a place will find they are far from "within walking distance" and will be in for a very long walk to Bacup, or the County Council may find they are having to fund transport if places are not available within the prescribed distance. The "hourly" bus service stops just after 18.00 so unless a car is available, residents are cut off from all services after this time. Coal risk assessment: there are known mine workings in the village close to this land and may extend under it.</p> <p>Email received 09/10/2017: Further to my discussion with Adrian Smith at the consultation event at Futures park, please ensure these photos are submitted along with my objection to the above proposal made via the consultation website.</p>		<p>With the exception of the Baptist Church/Community Hall, Weir is totally devoid of infrastructure: no shop, no pub and a bus service that is totally inadequate during the day and non-existent after about 18.00. Therefore, the amount of traffic travelling from the village to Bacup will increase significantly if all the proposed developments in Weir proceed. A new primary school will be required because Northern School is already oversubscribed. Weir will lose its village identity.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.008	Further comment
1550	Shelley	Carter		SHLAA16070	Object	I am not happy that HS2.8 (52 homes) is still on the Draft Plan. This is a large Greenfield site adjacent to Burnley Road (A671) at the south of Weir Village. Building a housing estate on this land would have a significant impact and if this land is lost it will only be detrimental in terms of wildlife habitat and grazing loss, visual impact and added traffic.		

Number of comments HS2.008

6

Reference HS2.009 Land west of Burnley Road, Weir

762	John & Ann	Farrow	-		Object	There are many problems facing this proposal:- - Access - proposed site is on a bend. - Visibility - dangerous as vehicles speed through the village - Separation values - no separation then for Weir Village from Township of Bacup. This field is the separation marker for the township. - The possibility of coal mine shafts. - Surface water issues -This area being hilly obviously gets a large amount of rain, and in most instances of heavy rain water gushes form the fields onto the main road, which although not causing flooding on this site may increase flood risk elsewhere lower down the valley. - The local school cannot fit in the village children as it is without more houses with children being built. - Sustainable location - there is nothing in the village as regards to facilities therefore new residents would be heavily reliant on the use of private cars and although the distance to the closest amenities might be considered as short the use of vehicles would conflict with the governments desire to reduce the number and length of vehicle movements as they move towards lowering the carbon economy. - Need for housing - in the Planning and Design and Access statement it is stated that Weir is probably considered with the Rossendale core strategy to be ' other smaller and isolated settlements' as per criteria4 of policy 3 (distribution of additional housing) which outlines a locational hierarchy for where new housing is to be distributed. It is also stated that this means 'minimal numbers of additional houses will be built in this settlement' .		There are a number of homes already for sale in the Weir area - currently numbering 60 . These homes are constantly becoming available especially after harsh winteres where commuters (not used to snow and having to park on the main road) get fed up with the location and move onto homes further down the valley. - In summary, we would object to this development strongly on the basis of all the arguments previously mentioned and would hope that sensibility would prevail in the making of the relevant decisions on the possibility of new homes being proposed.
-----	------------	--------	---	--	--------	--	--	---

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.009	Further comment
1362	adam	taylor	-	HS2.8, HS2.9, HS2.10	Object	<p>Facilities in Weir are almost non-existent. No doctors, shops, schools. - There is one primary school located on the main road at the lower end of Weir, but I doubt it has the capacity to accept many more pupils. The road does become incredibly congested at school start/end times. More pupils will mean more congestion and an increased risk of traffic related accidents. Because it's on a busy road, most children are dropped off/picked up by car. - The nearest shops and Doctors surgery are almost two miles away. - Bus services in Weir are very limited. - The result is that private car journeys have to be relied upon for everything, so adding a new estate will multiply the number of journeys being made. A walk around the existing village reveals that almost every house owns at least two cars. Thus it can be surmised that for each proposed new property, at least two cars will be adding to the traffic. -The wider Rossendale area may also be affected by increasing the traffic to and from Weir. The nearest access to the motorway network is approximately 6 miles northwards, 8 miles away westwards, or over 10 miles to the south. The roads in all those directions are single lane carriageways that are always busy. There is very little scope for adding more traffic without causing major holdups for everyone. There are also few alternate routes due to the geography of the region. - Although I have not yet experienced a winter in Weir, several people have told me how snow is more of a problem than for other lower lying towns. When others get rain, Weir gets snow, and the first signs of snow mean many people park their cars on the main road to ensure easier road access. Again, adding more cars will exacerbate the current problems and could impact on the Gritters ability to ensure the roads remain clear! - There are far too many improvements required to the current infrastructure and to the village as a whole that would require funding and implementing before such a proposal could be considered. - Shops, schools, better road networks would all need to be in place. - And I haven't even mentioned the negative impact all of this would have on the landscape, and the surrounding natural habitats. - One of the challenges set out on the Lancashire County Councils Environment Directorate "Woodland Vision, 2006" document relates specifically to the Enclosed Uplands area of Rossendale: "Protect the open character of the upland summits" - building several new estates in Weir certainly does nothing to achieve that goal! - It also states amongst the Opportunities for Enclosed Uplands:- Enhance the habitat mosaic of the Enclosed Uplands Landscape - Exploit opportunities for woodland creation on less viable agricultural landholdings. - So the land being earmarked should be considered for Woodlands, if it's not viable as agricultural land (which it is currently being used as). - the document can be read online at http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/191686/Composite-1-5.pdf - There are many brownfield sites visible driving around Rossendale, and these should be exhausted before considering ruining the small rural villages</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.009	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

by expanding them into gridlock.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.009	Further comment
1380	sharon	taylor	-	HS2.8, HS2.9, HS2.10	Object	<p>Facilities in Weir are almost non-existent. No doctors, shops or schools. Having recently moved to Weir we had to wait 2 MONTHS just to get an appointment to register at the local surgery. - - The one primary school, located on the main road at the lower end of Weir, according to neighbours, is subscribed to capacity. Other schools in the area are also feeling the strain. Where are all the children who will be moving to the area, if these houses are built, get an education? Will they have to bus the 90 minutes to Bury as recently shown in an article in the Rossendale Free Press? - - Furthermore, during school pick up and drop off times the road around the primary school becomes incredibly congested and downright dangerous. More pupils will mean more congestion and an increased risk of traffic related accidents. - - The nearest shops and doctors surgery are almost two miles away and, as stated, very difficult to get appointments. If it's like this now how much worse will it get once several hundred more people move into the area? Bus services in Weir are very limited. The result is that private car journeys have to be relied upon for everything. Adding several new estates will multiply the number of journeys being made. A walk around the existing village reveals that almost every house owns at least two cars. Thus it can be surmised that for each proposed new property, at least two cars will be adding to the traffic. During winter when there is snow, people in the estates around Weir, have to park on Burnley Road to avoid being unable to get to work. How will Burnley Road cope with a further 200+ cars being parked on it? This will also impact the road gritters ability to clear and make the roads safe. - - The wider Rossendale area will also be affected by increasing the traffic to and from Weir. The nearest access to the motorway network is approximately 6 miles northwards, 8 miles away westwards, or over 10 miles to the south. The roads in all those directions are single lane carriageways that are always busy. There is very little scope for adding more traffic without causing major holdups for everyone. There are also few alternate routes due to the geography of the region. - - There are far too many improvements required to the current infrastructure and to the village as a whole that would require funding and implementing before such a proposal could be considered. Shops, schools, better road networks would all need to be in place. - - Some of these proposals do not take into consideration parking on a day to day basis. For example, the building around the lower end of Weir on Burnley Road, seems to allow for very little parking. The only option being Burnley Road, further exacerbating the dangers and snarl ups this causes. During the building of these houses where will the contractors park? Again, Burnley Road, causing further disruption & dangers not to mention potential accidents due to muddy roads from construction traffic. Over the last couple of months we've seen the chaos caused by the Electricity works being completed on Burnley road. How much worse will it be with all this building going on? - - Next we need to take into account the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.009	Further comment
						<p>negative impact all of this would have on the landscape and the surrounding natural habitats. One of the challenges set out in Lancashire County Councils Environment Directorate "Woodland Vision, 2006" document relates specifically to the Enclosed Uplands area of Rossendale: "Protect the open character of the upland summits" - building several new estates in Weir certainly does nothing to achieve that goal! - It also states amongst the Opportunities for Enclosed Uplands:- Enhance the habitat mosaic of the Enclosed Uplands Landscape. Exploit opportunities for woodland creation on less viable agricultural landholdings. So the land being earmarked for housing should, according to your own directorate, be considered for Woodlands if its not viable as agricultural land (which it is currently being used as). The document can be read online at http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/191686/Composite-1-5.pdf. There are many viable brownfield sites around Rossendale, and these should be exhausted before ruining the few bits of open land and small villages left.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.009	Further comment
1431	Christopher	Dance	-		Object	<p>Vehicular access- The suggestion that access could come through Hillside Crescent as it would give "improved" access is beyond belief. Those making the suggestion have obviously never tried emerging from Hillside Crescent in a car at busy times. The line of sight to the right at the junction with Burnley Road is reasonable, as the terraced houses on that side are slightly set back. However, those to the left are contiguous with the pavement (see photos sent by email). This means that the line of sight to the left is virtually non-existent and a driver has to wait until there is no traffic from the right and then slowly draw forward to try and see if it is safe to emerge. If it is not, then one often has to reverse back when more traffic comes from the right. Building these houses will double the number of vehicles needing to emerge onto Burnley Road at this dangerous junction. Additionally, residents of Burnley Road have increasingly used Hillside Crescent as a car park, meaning that although it is a double carriageway road, because of this parking on both sides of the road, there is often barely space for a car to get through. Indeed, there have been occasions when I have been unable to get up Hillside Crescent towing my caravan because of the parking situation. The access via Deer Street gives far better line of sight for drivers emerging onto Burnley Road. - Access to primary school- Northern is already oversubscribed. If all developments in Weir proceed, a new primary school will be required. - Access to Secondary school- Many parents already do everything in their power to avoid children going to Fearn's. - Mineral sterilisation- There are known mine workings adjacent to this land which may mean there are coal deposits under it. - Conclusion: Justification- As Northern School is oversubscribed, those not getting a place will find they are far from "within walking distance" and will be in for a very long walk to Bacup, or the County Council may find they are having to fund transport if places are not available within the prescribed distance. The "hourly" bus service stops just after 18.00 so unless a car is available, residents are cut off from all services after this time. Coal risk assessment: there are known mine workings in the village close to this land and may extend under it.</p> <p>Email received 09/10/2017: Further to my discussion with Adrian Smith at the consultation event at Futures park, please ensure these photos are submitted along with my objection to the above proposal made via the consultation website.</p>		<p>With the exception of the Baptist Church/Community Hall, Weir is totally devoid of infrastructure: no shop, no pub and a bus service that is totally inadequate during the day and non-existent after about 18.00. Therefore, the amount of traffic travelling from the village to Bacup will increase significantly if all the proposed developments in Weir proceed. A new primary school will be required because Northern School is already oversubscribed. Weir will lose its village identity.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.009	Further comment
1482	GARY	BARKER	-		Support	I would very much support the use of the land in this location being used for development, for the following reasons: - - It is central to the Weir village location. - - There is a recreation field close to the site - - The location is close to the main road, and access routes in the area have been recently redeveloped - - The area is supported by a good local primary school. - - The boundaries included are within the existing urban dwellings on the west side of the village, so the proposed area to be included, in my opinion, should be considered as infill, to the village boundary and therefore should be further developed. - - Development of site will benefit the local and surrounding area, bringing more people and wealth to the area. This is very much required given the decline in the local footwear industry over the last two decades.		I have reviewed the other plots in the Local Plan and I support the development of the other areas in the Bacup area. - I believe that it is important that the Rossendale Valley is developed equally through out the area, to ensure that the is not too much congestion in any particularly area. - I therefore strongly agree with any development in the Bacup and surrounding area, so that it can be balanced against the Rawtenstall and Helmshore areas.
1550	Shelley	Carter		SHLAA16071	Support	The small Greenfield pockets to the west of Weir Village HS2.9 (14 homes) would not have much visual impact on the landscape as they would be screened by existing development within the Village. However, they would add to the traffic congestion and result in the loss of wildlife habitat and grazing land.		
Number of comments							HS2.009	
					6			
Reference		HS2.010		Irwell Springs				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.010	Further comment
1362	adam	taylor	-	HS2.8, HS2.9, HS2.10	Object	Facilities in Weir are almost non-existent. No doctors, shops, schools. - There is one primary school located on the main road at the lower end of Weir, but I doubt it has the capacity to accept many more pupils. The road does become incredibly congested at school start/end times. More pupils will mean more congestion and an increased risk of traffic related accidents. Because it's on a busy road, most children are dropped off/picked up by car. - The nearest shops and Doctors surgery are almost two miles away. - Bus services in Weir are very limited. - The result is that private car journeys have to be relied upon for everything, so adding a new estate will multiply the number of journeys being made. A walk around the existing village reveals that almost every house owns at least two cars. Thus it can be surmised that for each proposed new property, at least two cars will be adding to the traffic. - The wider Rossendale area may also be affected by increasing the traffic to and from Weir. The nearest access to the motorway network is approximately 6 miles northwards, 8 miles away westwards, or over 10 miles to the south. The roads in all those directions are single lane carriageways that are always busy. There is very little scope for adding more traffic without causing major holdups for everyone. There are also few alternate routes due to the geography of the region. - Although I have not yet experienced a winter in Weir, several people have told me how snow is more of a problem than for other lower lying towns. When others get rain, Weir gets snow, and the first signs of snow mean many people park their cars on the main road to ensure easier road access. Again, adding more cars will exacerbate the current problems and could impact on the Gritters ability to ensure the roads remain clear! - There are far too many improvements required to the current infrastructure and to the village as a whole that would require funding and implementing before such a proposal could be considered. - Shops, schools, better road networks would all need to be in place. - And I haven't even mentioned the negative impact all of this would have on the landscape, and the surrounding natural habitats. - One of the challenges set out on the Lancashire County Councils Environment Directorate "Woodland Vision, 2006" document relates specifically to the Enclosed Uplands area of Rossendale: "Protect the open character of the upland summits" - building several new estates in Weir certainly does nothing to achieve that goal! - It also states amongst the Opportunities for Enclosed Uplands:- Enhance the habitat mosaic of the Enclosed Uplands Landscape - Exploit opportunities for woodland creation on less viable agricultural landholdings. - So the land being earmarked should be considered for Woodlands, if it's not viable as agricultural land (which it is currently being used as). -the document can be read online at http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/191686/Composite-1-5.pdf -There are many brownfield sites visible driving around Rossendale, and these should be exhausted before considering ruining the small rural villages		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.010	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

by expanding them into gridlock.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.010	Further comment
1380	sharon	taylor	-	HS2.8, HS2.9, HS2.10	Object	Facilities in Weir are almost non-existent. No doctors, shops or schools. Having recently moved to Weir we had to wait 2 MONTHS just to get an appointment to register at the local surgery. - - The one primary school, located on the main road at the lower end of Weir, according to neighbours, is subscribed to capacity. Other schools in the area are also feeling the strain. Where are all the children who will be moving to the area, if these houses are built, get an education? Will they have to bus the 90 minutes to Bury as recently shown in an article in the Rossendale Free Press? - - Furthermore, during school pick up and drop off times the road around the primary school becomes incredibly congested and downright dangerous. More pupils will mean more congestion and an increased risk of traffic related accidents. - - The nearest shops and doctors surgery are almost two miles away and, as stated, very difficult to get appointments. If it's like this now how much worse will it get once several hundred more people move into the area? Bus services in Weir are very limited. The result is that private car journeys have to be relied upon for everything. Adding several new estates will multiply the number of journeys being made. A walk around the existing village reveals that almost every house owns at least two cars. Thus it can be surmised that for each proposed new property, at least two cars will be adding to the traffic. During winter when there is snow, people in the estates around Weir, have to park on Burnley Road to avoid being unable to get to work. How will Burnley Road cope with a further 200+ cars being parked on it? This will also impact the road gritters ability to clear and make the roads safe. - - The wider Rossendale area will also be affected by increasing the traffic to and from Weir. The nearest access to the motorway network is approximately 6 miles northwards, 8 miles away westwards, or over 10 miles to the south. The roads in all those directions are single lane carriageways that are always busy. There is very little scope for adding more traffic without causing major holdups for everyone. There are also few alternate routes due to the geography of the region. - - There are far too many improvements required to the current infrastructure and to the village as a whole that would require funding and implementing before such a proposal could be considered. Shops, schools, better road networks would all need to be in place. - - Some of these proposals do not take into consideration parking on a day to day basis. For example, the building around the lower end of Weir on Burnley Road, seems to allow for very little parking. The only option being Burnley Road, further exacerbating the dangers and snarl ups this causes. During the building of these houses where will the contractors park? Again, Burnley Road, causing further disruption & dangers not to mention potential accidents due to muddy roads from construction traffic. Over the last couple of months we've seen the chaos caused by the Electricity works being completed on Burnley road. How much worse will it be with all this building going on? - - Next we need to take into account the		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.010	Further comment
						negative impact all of this would have on the landscape and the surrounding natural habitats. One of the challenges set out in Lancashire County Councils Environment Directorate "Woodland Vision, 2006" document relates specifically to the Enclosed Uplands area of Rossendale: "Protect the open character of the upland summits" - building several new estates in Weir certainly does nothing to achieve that goal! - It also states amongst the Opportunities for Enclosed Uplands:- Enhance the habitat mosaic of the Enclosed Uplands Landscape. Exploit opportunities for woodland creation on less viable agricultural landholdings. So the land being earmarked for housing should, according to your own directorate, be considered for Woodlands if its not viable as agricultural land (which it is currently being used as). The document can be read online at http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/191686/Composite-1-5.pdf . There are many viable brownfield sites around Rossendale, and these should be exhausted before ruining the few bits of open land and small villages left.		
1550	Shelley	Carter		SHLAA16073	Support	I understand that HS2.10 (52 homes) has already got PP and as this is a Brownfield site it can only serve to improve this derelict area.		

Number of comments HS2.010

3

Reference	HS2.011	Land at Huttock Top Farm, Bacup
------------------	----------------	--

443	Jim	Leach			Object	Bankside Lane is already a hazardous road, access is frequently restricted to existing houses by car. There is existing a sign " Gritting Route, Problem access road " Further Housing and therefore Traffic would only add to the existing problems A Domestic Fire would,at present,be difficult for a Fire Engine to attend during the daytime, - at night ,when everyone is at home it would be impossible These areas should be returned to Green Belt status		Not at Present
-----	-----	-------	--	--	--------	--	--	----------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
486	Susan	Ormerod			Object	<p>All of the above sites are in the Bankside Lane area of Bacup. All are Greenfield Sites and should be changed back to this status without delay.</p> <p>All of these sites are currently used by the local people and their children, in one form or another, as well as the local deer herds (of which there are two), foxes, badgers and a host of other wildlife, including the birds of prey from the Stacksteads area.</p> <p>Some of these sites are owned by local farmers to breed and train horses. The vehicle activity on Bankside, where there are three serious hazards on the approach from the town centre due to narrow roads and a blind bend on a steep incline, is already a danger with the local traffic. These three narrow sections are all within a 20 metre stretch and will not allow even two small vehicles to pass. This hazard has been increased by the "home delivery" method of purchasing goods for the already existing occupants and further population increases would inevitably mean increases of delivery wagons and vans.</p> <p>Any changes of road from the Stacksteads area would provide a "rat run" between the town centre and Stacksteads and any road up from an improved "Lodge Lane" would be a worse hazard than Bankside is at the moment. Almost certainly impassible in winter.</p> <p>The current parking situation on Bankside Lane is already causing concern as shown by the council notices which appeared some time ago. Access for the emergency services has already caused hold ups on five occasions know to myself during the past twelve months.</p> <p>In conclusion, these plans, if passed, will implement a serious deterioration in living standards for all existing occupants of the Bankside Lane area and an increased health risk factor for all who use the lane either in a vehicle or as a pedestrian.</p>		
487	Lorna Lucy	Doherty			Object	<p>We live at top end of Bankside Lane. We object most strongly to the proposed 4 new building sites off Bankside Lane. The beginning of Bankside Lane is extremely narrow with room for just one car with no possibilities to widen and very steep, and with no vision round a blind corner. The increase in traffic is definitely not an option due to danger particularly in winter with snow and ice.</p> <p>Also, I believe there is a proposal for Bankside Lane to be continued at the upper end which is now a dead end. This is also totally unacceptable due to the above reasons.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
488	Helen	Koczur			Object	<p>To even consider planning further homes on any part of Bankside Lane, Bacup is totally ludicrous.</p> <p>The lower part of Bankside Lane is exceptionally steep and narrow in 2 sections and cannot cope with any further traffic. On days that the Golf Club holds events, or football teams are playing on the recreation ground, access becomes impossible. In bad weather, the gradient together with the width restrictions leads to chaos and accidents, of which I have not only witnessed but suffered in the past. There is also limited pedestrian access at these dangerous sections. The route CANNOT cope with any further traffic. As these access problems are at the lower part of Bankside Lane ANY future housing expansion at any point further up the lane would affect this section.</p> <p>We recently had road improvement work which proved access problems. I dread to think what would happen to emergency services under these conditions as access will not be easy.</p> <p>The difficult access means that houses do not sell here, so why on earth build more? I do not see an increase in employment opportunities in the area so the occupants of any new build would travel out of the area for work. This would mean that the volume of vehicles would increase to a dangerous level. If some of the build is required to be for social housing, access for young families with prams and elderly would be impossible without transport.</p> <p>There has been a development of houses over in Weir. All have normal road access, not single track as on Bankside Lane, yet in bad weather the access problems cause the main Bacup to Burnley Road to be severely restricted with abandoned vehicles. Putting further houses off Bankside Lane would also cause a similar problem to the centre of Bacup.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
489	Denise	Duffy			Object	<p>I have lived in the Bankside Lane area some 47 years, in effect all of my adult life. The journeys up and down the Lane have become increasingly hazardous and dangerous and I am appalled that RBC is considering allocating 4 locations for new housing.</p> <p>> For a start the blind narrow bend around Ivy Cottage has always been hazardous and the increase in car numbers has made it doubly so over the years. Further traffic will only serve to exacerbate the conditions we experience daily.</p> <p>> Parking and especially double parking along the Lane and even on pavements has increased significantly. You only have to ask your own drivers (bins, gritting) of the difficulties they regularly face. Emergency services , especially Fire Engines, would also confirm their difficulties along the Lane.</p> <p>> As most home owners frequently have more than one car in their families, sometimes up to four cars once adult children start driving, the addition of garages does little to ease the situation. Apart from the fact that garages are often storage places rather than car shelters.</p> <p>> Although I have personally not been involved in an accident, accidents have happened on numerous occasions. The steepness of the lower Lane, especially in winter conditions, calls for careful negotiation. Again, additional traffic will exacerbate the residents safety concerns.</p> <p>Thank you in anticipation for forwarding this to whom ever it concerns</p>		
503		McKeown			Object	<p>I am against the proposed new housing off Bankside Lane as I am worried about road safety with poor visibility of oncoming traffic in areas and speeding vehicles. Also there would be gridlock at the bottom of Bankside Lane if there is to be additional housing because there are not two lanes of traffic which relies on drivers good faith on many occasions as you travel up the hill (there are many difficulties with this now).</p> <p>I am a resident Meadow Way. At present I have increasing issues with run off of rain water which already requires bailing out of water in winter. The new housing area, no longer being fields to absorb the rain water, will impact further on the massive drainage problem I am having to cope with.</p> <p>I would be very keen to know more about sewage system and how and which route the new system will follow as I have sewage pipe work under my side garden which serves about 24 houses.</p> <p>I am concerned about trucks during the building works and the additional dirt on the roads creating slippery areas for vehicles, damage to the road, and being additionally busy leading to increased chance of accidents.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
534	Romanii	Fitton	-		Object	I most certainly want to object to anymore houses being built on or around bankside lane in bacup. The street is congested with cars and wouldn't be able to cope with more vehicles coming up and down it every day. We also love the little bit of green land we have left and don't want it spoiled by any more houses being built.		-
539	Simon	Midgley	-	HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32	Object	This site would be accessed from Bankside Lane which is already difficult to navigate at peak traffic periods: it is narrow and is accessed from Market Street via a very steep and narrow hill section. In normal conditions this needs extreme care when navigating, in winter snow and ice this access is dangerous and often impassable. Additional traffic generated by housing on these sites (HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32) would make a dangerous situation even worse. Cars are parked on both side of Bankside Lane narrowing it to one car's width in many sections: there is nowhere else for the cars to park. - - Development on sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32 would also be "skyline" development which residents were told would not be permitted. This would destroy the green character and visual amenity of this part of Bacup - forever. - - Currently farmland, these sites soak up precipitation helping to reduce flood risk which development would increase.		Bankside Lane is an inappropriate area for housing development for the reasons already outlined above. It is important that we do not lose this green space on the Valley side.
540	BRETT	HARRIS	-		Object	BANKSIDE LANE CAN NOT SUPPORT MORE TRAFFIC IT IS ALREADY STRUGGLING WITH THE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC.		-
543	Thomas	Hammant	-		Object	Objections fall in line with all objections for HS2.13 - relating to safety of cars on Bankside Lane, and the Greenbelt area.		Whilst I understand the need to balance new housing in the area, building on land which is currently used as both a farm and/or public access land is against all previous council policies and should not be entered into lightly. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
545	Lisa	Hartley	-		Object	Greenfield site and should remain as such - full of wildlife e.g. 2 deer herds, foxes, badgers and birds of prey. Landowners train and breed horses on this land. - Bankside already extremely congested with traffic- not enough parking facilities now - council have had to put notices up asking people to park more consideratly as emergency services (fire engines) and council services (gritters) have been unable to pass through. - Bankside has 3 very narrow points where only one vehicle can pass at once and these areas are extremely close together in proximity incorporating blind bends as well - more houses would cause more cars causing chaos and accidents. Any through road to stacksteads that might be made would lead to bankside being used as a racing track for cars to pass through from stacksteads trying to avoid the busy main road! This in itself would be extremely dangerous as more houses Lead to more people living on bankside -probably children - resulting in more road traffic accidents and fatalities! We have enough at the moment we don't need anymore. - It would be a nightmare waiting to happen. - Building houses would cause further chaos with wagons attempting to make their way through when there is so little room - home shopping vehicles struggle at moment and are sometimes unable to gain access all the way across bankside! -		Please re think your plans as they will have very serious consequences for both the public and wildlife of bankside!
557	michael	hudson	-		Object	first the bankside lane cannot support any more traffic its a 20 mph zone but traffic goes a lot faster,the road floods a lot. most of that from old newtownroad waters running all the time.the inferstructure cannot cope with any more houses or veicles your concerned resident [...].		i think there is plenty of brown sites around this area that could be used.and empty proerties around not being used.
558	Terry	Nightingale	-		Object	I wish to object to the proposals as follows - - 1. lack of suitable access to to the proposed sites .There is no suitable access to any of these sites with all traffic having to access and exit onto Bankside Lane (see also point 4) - - 2. risk of flooding to properties on Bankside Lane if housing built on green field site to rear. During periods of wet weather rainwater cannot now drain away and as such runs down through these properties gardens onto Bankside lane . increased building will further increase the risk of flooding for these properties - - 3. in addition to the flood risk there will be the increased sewerage demands onto the existing sewerage system on Bankside Lane /Close - - 4. A huge increase in vehicular traffic on an already overcrowded one way in and out Lane . - during winter months lack of available parking / inconsiderate parking on lower Bankside Lane regularly prevents LCC Gritters from being able to access this area . An increase in housing will inevitably bring increased fire risk . - - 5. There will be an environmental impact on wioldlife in the area . Land in the area is frequented by deer and many other types of wildlife . -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
581	B	Woodrup			Object	<p>We are writing to object to the proposed plans to change areas of previous green belt sites to building sites of potentially 100 new houses. These are our concerns.</p> <p>The bottom of Bankside Lane has three bottle necks very steep and narrow and a bad bend only room for one car, a very narrow pavement on one side. Children will be walking down and up to get to school.</p> <p>The school run will be dangerous the road is already overloaded.</p> <p>In winter people try to park at the bottom of the lane in the morning, ready to go to work, because the road is always gritted. The road is sometimes so icy. It's frightening to drive down, as you could easily crash into the wall or another vehicle parked or moving. I dread to think what could happen with more pedestrians (children).</p> <p>I am also concerned about the fire engines and ambulances and gritter trying to drive up and over bankside lane, especially after 7PM when most residents are home and their vehicles are all parked on the roadside's and pavements. This is a concern now. It's going to be really bad if another 100 houses are to be built. Most households have two cars.</p> <p>What about our wildlife. Bats, hedgehogs, deer, rabbits, badgers, toads and frogs.</p> <p>What about our beautiful countryside and outdoor spaces that we and our children and grandchildren really enjoy.</p> <p>We hope you seriously consider our concerns and objections.</p> <p>It has been mentioned to me that previously planning to build houses was turned down by the ministry of transport. Because of the bottlenecks at the bottom of bankside lane.</p> <p>There's also the question of policing all these extra residents and homes.</p>		
582	G	Pearson			Object	<p>Dear Sirs I will raise my objections to this Development due to the following reasons..</p> <p>The lane is already over loaded with vehicles from the existing houses, the Council has placed notices on the lampposts about the problem of gritting the lane due to traffic.</p> <p>My wife had a vehicle accident Two years ago as a vehicle reversed into her vehicle due to cars parked on Bankside lane.</p> <p>The road itself in a bad state of repair due to traffic movement.</p> <p>When your refuse teams come to collect they complain of the problems of traffic on the Lane.</p> <p>When the Animal farm is allowed to have functions on such as Halloween there are even worse traffic problems.</p> <p>The Green areas currently enjoyed by the locals and their children will be affected and even lost .</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
584	Craig	Ovenden	Next Century Property Services Ltd		Object	<p>I'm am led to believe that a new draft local development plan includes a proposal to allocate land for housing at 4 locations off Bankside lane? As a long term resident of Bankside lane I would object to the proposal on several counts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The lane is already extremely busy and access is always restricted down to a single track lane, if the proposal involves further vehicle access the road would need to be made wider. 2) The lane is in a poor state of repair, adding more traffic would create further ongoing maintenance. 3) We live right at the top of the lane, on refuse collection days, dependent on what time the collection takes place it can take me an extra 10-15 minutes to travel down the lane, the collection drivers are always really obliging and pull over when possible, however due to the amount of parked cars and traffic travelling in the opposite direction I often have to follow behind the vehicle right to the bottom, further housing would only compound the problem. 4) The bend in the road towards the bottom and the further narrowing of the road is a bottle neck often leading to vehicles waiting at the bottom to let oncoming traffic up and down the lane, this sometimes backs up as far as the main road, further housing/vehicular access would cause a danger at the junction with Newchurch road as vehicles que to access the lane. <p>Please can you consider these points before any decision is made to allocate the land for housing.</p>		
586	Sandra	Robinson			Object	<p>This email is in regards to the proposal for housing at 4 locations off Bankside Lane, I am a resident of Bankside Lane,I feel that there is too much traffic at the moment on this narrow road,I am lucky to have off road parking,however most do not which then causes problems for pedestrians.</p>		
592	Jean & Peter	Hannan			Object	<p>I am submitting our opposition to the proposed building plans within the Bankside Lane area. Bankside Lane is already overloaded and congested with motor vehicles and we feel that added traffic will cause untold problems. Inadequate parking facilities already add to this problem and we feel very strongly that the above proposals will potentially cause accidents and traffic delays.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
605	Maurice	Leyland			Object	<p>With reference to the above proposed plans I wish to make the strongest objection mainly because of the geography of Bankside Lane and Newchurch Old Road.</p> <p>Bankside Lane Has four pinch points from the town centre to the top of the hill (approx 200yds.) This means only wide enough for one vehicle. If there is a wedding or funeral at the church then there is no room to pass Likewise when events finish at the golf club you can get a stream of traffic coming down the hill which means near misses and hard braking When winter arrives you can almost guarantee there will be some shunts as all the cars off Rose Bank street park on Bankside lane. I know of three cars last winter that were damaged in this way When you have got to the top of the hill, the rules of the highway code have long since been discarded, double parking and parking on the pavement is taken as normal. Thus reducing the lane to single line traffic. When a lorry or wide vehicle attempts to pass sometimes it cannot fit, and I have seen the driver knocking on doors to try to find the owner of the car causing the problem. This is all before you reach Newchurch Old Road. Newchurch Old Road This is no more than an old cart track single car width for its whole length and certainly not fit for any vehicles. Once it was a good tarmac road from Bankside Lane to the farm, but now it is no more than a river bed. Someone? Has been allowed to dig a great hole in the field alongside the lane creating a substantial water flow down the lane after any rainy period, after the rain has stopped the water continues to flow for three to four days. The water has forced a hole through the wall on the lane, creating the problem. Once there was a fire at the farm and the fire engine was damaged scraping between two walls more recently a caravan forced its way through bringing down the wall which had to be rebuilt (the caravan never came back down in one piece). The amount of traffic, and speed, at present is as much as the road can take, taking into account the petting farm traffic and the stables further along the road. Access onto the lane is totally blind due to the wall heights. These are problems we are encountering now, if more houses are built especially the number suggested, who knows what will happen there is a lot more needs doing before houses are erected. Finally Bankside Lane & Newchurch Old Road are one long Cul-De-Sac. So</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
						<p>whatever comes up also has to return the same way terefore doubling the traffic useage. Please keep our green areas green. Build on land which has previously been built on.</p>	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
608	A J	Doherty			Object	<p>Email received 29/09/2017:</p> <p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I attended the road show at Futures Park on 21st September and saw the four sites you proposed for building upon.</p> <p>I object most strongly to all of them.</p> <p>Bankside Lane has a very narrow access from A 681 with room for one car only at the turning.</p> <p>A very steep incline for some yards and then at Dale Street the road narrows even more, again with room for one car only.</p> <p>The incline is even steeper.</p> <p>Near the end, there is a treacherous incline and turn.</p> <p>Parked cars line the whole of Bankside Lane already.</p> <p>In winter, in spite of efficient gritting by the Council, snow and ice can stop traffic.</p> <p>If the proposed building takes place,</p> <p>In the short term, many heavy vehicles would create chaos to our local traffic.</p> <p>Long term, the traffic would double making access a nightmare.</p> <p>I commend the services of Rossendale Council for their efficient rubbish collection and gritting in winter.</p> <p>I am sure they will tell you how difficult it is already to access Bankside Lane.</p> <p>In the case of an emergency - ambulance or fire - we would be put at great risk of delays.</p> <p>Perhaps we could call a helicopter...</p> <p>Email received 30/09/2017:</p> <p>Bankside Lane Bacup proposed building sites</p> <p>I attended the road show on 21st September 2017 at Futures Park, Bacup</p> <p>I object to any of the proposed building sites because</p> <p>Access is extremely restricted.</p> <p>The entrance to Bankside Lane from A 681 is very narrow and cannot be widened.</p> <p>The road is very steep.</p> <p>It continues between a house to the left and high bank to right leaving room for just one vehicle round a blind bend. The road here is also very steep and cannot be widened.</p> <p>Near the end of Bankside Lane there is another very steep incline, round two corners.</p> <p>The whole of Bankside Lane is congested with parked vehicles.</p> <p>If the proposed building takes place, access will be a nightmare.</p> <p>Already it is amazing that local authority vehicles - refuse collection and gritting in winter - manage so efficiently, but it would be almost impossible to continue were traffic to double.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
						<p>Winter snow and ice make the road dangerous and sometimes impassable. In the short term: probably over several years, heavy vehicles would block access.</p> <p>In the long term: four building sites would probably increase traffic to double what it is now.</p> <p>Ambulance , Fire Services and Police must have easy access and these would be put at risk.</p> <p>What do you suggest? Hire a helicopter?</p> <p>Lastly, you are intending to build on virgin moorland, destroying forever the natural beauty and wildlife it supports.</p>		
611	Christine	Hudson			Object	<p>I am writing in regard to the building of 183 houses in all off Bankside Lane. I drive up and down Bankside Lane most days (week and weekend) and it does get very congested at times with lorries and cars, the lane is not very wide and people who lvie here have to park both sides of the lane which only leaves enough space to get through.</p> <p>The very narrow park of Bankside Lane, as you go up the hill leaves only enough space for single traffic. A lot of people get very frustrated and angry putting it mildley. People forget it is a 20 mile limit so there is often a near miss.</p> <p>If the houses are going to be built 183 in all they will all have to use Bankside, so that means there will be an extra 30 cars. There would be heavy lorries and vans whilst they are being built. Most households are 2 car families hence 380 cars extra.</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>When we have heavy rainfalls which is often. We get a lot of water coming down from old newchurch road and onto the lane. In the last 5 years we have had flash flooding.</p> <p>One day we were sitting in our front lounge and our wheelie bins were floating about in the front garden. We opened our garage doors front and back and it was like a river running down the garden. All our plants were lost as they were in a pile of mud at the bottom of the garden.</p> <p>If these houses are going to be built, there will have to be better drainage. Also we have some lovely open green spaces around Bacup, that we all enjoy and cherish.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
615	Elaine	Garrard			Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed housing development sites referenced HS1.11, HS2.12, HS2.13 and HS2.32 which are listed in the housing allocations section of the above plan.</p> <p>The reason for my objection is that vehicles travelling to Bacup Town Centre from each of these sites will need to use Bankside Lane. This will add to the existing traffic which already presents a significant safety hazard for me personally at the steep and narrow section between its junctions with Maden Road and Market Street.</p> <p>I am disabled and have to travel to Bacup from my house via Bankside Lane either by car or whenever possible by mobility scooter. However, because the width of the pavement is very narrow I have to drive my scooter on the roadway and this means choosing the times of my journeys carefully to avoid peak congestion when I would be dangerous for me to use the road. In particular there are two sections of Bankside Lane which narrow to a single lane and where I cannot take evasive action if a hazard incident occurs. I consider therefore that by allowing additional developments along Bankside Lane and hence additional traffic hazards, the council will discriminate unfairly against me and also other disabled road users.</p> <p>On this basis I ask you to remove the above housing sites from the Local Plan unless the pavement or road widths can be improved to an acceptable standard.</p> <p>I attach a photograph which illustrates the difficulties.</p>		
621	David	Carey	-		Object	<p>Bankside Lane is a cul de sac which already has a lot of traffic going up and down, and parking is on road for the most part, making it very difficult bearing in mind the amount of people who already live on bankside lane, to pass. To add an extra 100 houses and the additional traffic this would cause would make it intolerable for existing house owners. - The added pressure of extra traffic would also affect our children, as there is no place on Bankside Lane to play bar on small play area, and for the most part children ride their bikes and play in front of their houses, this would be an additional safety risk. - It would also ruin the countryside feel we have and make it impossible to walk our dogs as you are planning on taking all our recreational grounds from us. - In the winter we have a lot of bad weather and the gritter's find it hard to get up and grit the Lane, it will be worse with the amount of traffic added. - Again no thought has gone into the additional traffic and the impact on the people living on bankside Lane. - - I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! - -</p>		Not at this time

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
648	Robert	Ormerod	-	HS2.11. hS2.12 HS2.13 HS2.32	Object	<p>These four sites are all Greenfield sites. After the council has done a good job at improving this type of site in Bacup it would be absurd to destroy the fields which complement all the wooded areas of our town. The countryside of Rossendale looks bad enough with all the wind farms without destroying the remaining countryside of Rossendale. Our fields and woods are just returning to being used by the local wildlife and wildlife needs open spaces as well as enclosed spaces to live and prosper. - The traffic on Bankside is already becoming dangerous and unacceptable with the one narrow road and the increases of traffic. Nearly all residents now have more than one vehicle and delivery traffic, usually large vans or wagons, have increased tenfold whilst the road has been left to deteriorate. The slow signs, road centre signs and markings are now almost completely gone and the road, which we were all told was due for replacement surfacing was actually patched up, once again, and still has many holes, dips and bumps. This is especially on the blind steep bend from the town centre. Unless the access situation is addressed the many unreported non injury collisions will soon become serious injuries or fatalities. -</p>		Please take these plans away from from the overcrowded area

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
661	CA and VJ	Jennings	Home Owner	HS2.32	Object	<p>I am contesting these housing developments on several grounds. - - My issues and concerns will be submitted, in writing by the closing date of 9th October 2017.</p> <p>Letter received 06/10/2017:</p> <p>The statement "Improving the lives of people in the Borough" is central to the Borough's current "mantra" regarding their fundamental philosophy and how it is applied in all Departments, and in all the things that they do. However, I feel that some of the current proposals as outlined in the above DLP could fall far short of the Council's altruistic intentions.</p> <p>These are our concerns in respect of the Fernhill Crescent, Fernhill Drive and Bankside Lane development proposals:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation - there is an extensive line of "mixed" trees which decorate the hillside from the end of Bankside Lane above Fernhill Crescent and Osborne Terrace. As far as I understand it, we all have a shared commitment to protect and preserve trees and the landscapes on which they reside. From the above plans, it seems that there is the potential for the removal of some of this tree-line on site HS2.32. This would have a huge and negative impact on the aesthetic outlook onto that hillside, and the potential for land slip, soil erosion, water-runoff and flooding on lower levels • Protecting the Environment - there are many issues here that would negatively affect several aspects of the local environment. Some of which resulting from over-capacity and over-crowding caused by the over-expansion in this area by these proposed developments (particularly along Bankside Lane) • Preserving the local Character - the area around an incorporating site HS2.32 is particularly attractive (especially to the West of Bankside lane) and is an asset to the local area and its residents. It offers countryside walks along heritage sites and long established pathways (ideal for walkers, dog-owners, explorers in general and "kids" of all ages) • Infrastructure - this aspect has never been something to celebrate in the Rossendale Valley area: mostly due to the uncompromising geography of the area rather than the incompetence of the local authorities. However, focusing on one point only, transport through the Valley is often difficult, and sometimes almost impossible at certain times of the day. Therefore, the addition of around 200 units along Bankside Lane would severely impact on both movement and parking. AND, the thought of possibly an additional 350 vehicles exiting onto the Bacup/Rawtenstall road and heading through the valley, doesn't bare thinking about!! AND, what about the winter if it's like the Fernhill area, some of it, or all of it, will not be gritted!! • Impact - in my opinion, the impact from these proposals would be many and 		To be submitted before 9th October 2017.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
						<p>wide ranging, but some would militate against the "improvement of lives"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of Wild-life Habitats - the treed areas and adjacent open fields and moorland, are homes for thriving wild-life. In addition to the usual populations of wildlife, we have seen deer, foxes, squirrels, birds of prey and colonies of bats. The retention of range of wild-life would be threatened by the proposed invasion of their "space" • Ecological/Biological Considerations - these extensive developments could severely compromise the 'health', stability and integrity of the land, its trees; also its top-soil and sub-soil and the life forms that inhabit them • Local Heritage Preservation - there are some historical mule tracks, bridal paths & walkways and access routes into Yorkshire in this area, and we have a duty to protect and preserve them • Land Integrity - we have been aware for many years that the land above part of Fernhill Crescent has been subject to land-slip over the years. In fact, we were told by an authoritative figure that the extent of the problem had been measured over time. This weakness in the land caused our builder to reinforce the retaining walls in the back gardens of Nos 22, 24 and 26. Indeed, the retaining wall at No 26 actually collapsed. <p>Interestingly, the field behind these and other FC properties seems to show evidence of land-slip, whereas the adjacent wooded field seems not to suffer this problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic Balance - given the attractiveness (in all respects) of this residential area, we would suggest that the proposed plans could severely impact upon the "wholesomeness" of this area, and have a negative effect upon the valuation of properties. Which would be, at least, unfair!!! • Practicality and Compatibility - in conclusion, and looking at just one aspect, when we factor-in access roads, traffic congestion and general disruption over time, and deterioration in the quality of people's lives, is it appropriate or acceptable to further pursue the Fernhill proposals?!? <p>Finally, who is it in the best interests of</p>		
667	Helen	Phythian	N.A.	HS2.11,HS2.12,H Object S2.13 and HS2.32		<p>I wish to object on the grounds that the proposed 100 houses will have at least two cars for each dwelling, this will mean a daily increase of journeys by at least four hundred trips on what is, in two places on Bankside Lane a single track road. - If the developers were to continue the road through to Stacksteads prior to start of the proposed development which would give an option to all residents, then maybe the plans would be viable. At the moment if Bankside Lane is left as is, the resulting traffic jams would increase the risks of accidents and also increase pollution,(drivers trying to pass the two single lane place , one of which is a blind bend as well as single lane, would be revving their cars to restart on an exceptionally steep hill).</p>		<p>overall I understand that the Government is laying down numbers for each area, instead of cramming in houses in every available green space left in Rossendale would it not be better to take a flat area of land and build a new village with all required facilities</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
679	leslie	hargreaves	-	h52.11.12.13. andh52.32	Object	Bankside lane is already completely saturated with cars having to park on the pavements and at times heavy commercial cannot get through ie road gritters and refuse vehicles.This is worse when vehicle that normally park on maden road have to park on bankside lane due to winter conditions i.e. ice and snow. Approximately 50 years ago excavation was started for house building was started on the two fields between lodge land and so called bonks area which was stopped because the area in what they call shifting sand. Acces to bankisde lane is tottally in adequate and I totally object to this proposal as we already have our share of accidents on this road	-	
685	Lesley	Giddins	-		Object	Living immediately adjacent to this site we are very concerned about negative impact. The land behind us is at a higher level and our house is already quite dark. We would have afditional traffic to contend with and it would mean a loss of green space in the area.	-	
714	Marie	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	1) Bankside Lane is already very busy. There's already too many cars going up, down and along Bankside. Adding another 100 or more houses and therefore cars will just add to the congestion. 2) Bankside Lane has tight and narrow bends. Add more traffic to the mix and there will easily be some serious accidents especially in the winter when it snows. 3) Vehicles are already parking on pavements to allow other cars to get past. In case of an emergency (fire or ambulance) the emergency vehicles would already have trouble getting to the destination. Adding those extra cars would make it impossible. The gritter has problems now! 4) The proposed land is home to lots of wildlife including deer, badgers and foxes. Why should we disrupt their habitat? Where would they go? It's not fair on them when they cannot speak up for themselves. 5) 50 years ago they evacuated Bankside because the field was on shifting sands. 6) the local schools are already full, getting a doctors appointment is already difficult without getting extra residents and the same with the dentists. The proposed building seems unrealistic, unreasonable and unsustainable. -	I thought the idea was to build houses on brown sites not green sites. There's plenty of unused, rundown, empty, derelict properties in and around bacup, why not use them? Why take our countryside when there's perfectly good other land to use. Don't ruin it for future generations.	
715	Jennifer	Hargreaves	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	Conversion on Bankside at moment, in the snow when vehicles can't get up the Lane this is what happens. The residents who live on Maiden Road and Rode Street occupy both sides of Bankside. - Ordinarily care are parked on both sides of the Lane a lot on pavements so that ambulances, fire engines can get through! - The gritter has problems as well the Council even put a sign up!! - - Loved on Bankside 52 years, all my married life , and about 50 years ago they tried excavating and stopped because of shifting sand. - - There isn't the infrastructure to accommodate this development as the road down the valley to Rawtenstall , and the road to Rochdale are a nightmare at peak times! - - Schools are full. - - Doctor's appointments are very difficult as it is without extra residents. - - I am completely against this proposal.	Thought the idea Jake Berry agreed to was to build on Brown Sites not Green sites. There are plenty of derelict, empty properties in this area without taking our countryside from us!!! I'm thinking of my children and grandchildren.	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
718	Joanne	Leyland	-	HS2.11 HS2.12 HS2.13 HS2.32	Object	I've lived on bankside lane for 20 years and I'm strongly objecting for the planning proposals of houses being built it's already overflowing with cars as, most my neighbours and myself have 2 or 3 cars each and every one falls out all the time over parking as it is now so for more familys to be moving will just cause more problems, the roads are to narrow in many places it really will not work. Over the years I've lived here my 2 daughter's along with there friends who also live on bankside lane have grown up playing on the lane and it's so dangerous with the amount of cars going up and down it's an accident waiting to happen		It's just not acepticable to be building more houses with only a narrow road leading up to bankside lane and an average of 200 extra cars it will be an awful place to live and I love living here
729	Stanley	Horsfall			Object	Email received 30/09/2017: I would like to protest again at some of the the plan for bankside lane Email received 02/10/2017: I want to oppose the plan as the traffic on bankside is already congested		
759	Martin	Stansfield	-		Object	The width of the roads and the bends on Bankside Lane are already an accident to happen and cant support any oncrease in traffic,		have the same objection to the other 3 sites on bankside lane
769	Trevor	Bartram			Object	Access to all of the above sites is via Bankside Lane which is struggling to cope with the amount of traffic now using it. Another 150 houses, as proposed, would mean potentially a further 300 vehicles, which would add to an already congested road, there being only one way in and out of the town. - - With regard to the whole of Bacup a house building project of this scale will bring problems with Primary Schools, which are already full, doctors and roads. -		-
770	Jacqueline	Stansfield	-		Object	The road is too narrow and bendy for extra traffic. Near misses everyday sooner or later there will be a serious accident.		I do not think any of the other sites should be built on bankside lane for the same reason.
774	Stanley	Horsfall	-		Object	Bankside lane is already congested with traffic and and cannot take the extra that the plan would cause		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
785	Robert	Astbury	-		Object	Bankside Lane does not have a suitable road to support the additional through-traffic created by additional housing, there are several narrow parts of the road on steep inclines that do not allow two way traffic and these are heavily congested at peak times. Additional housing on Bankside lane (and the connecting side roads) will make access very difficult and impede the access for emergency vehicles. when large vehicles such as lorry's or bin men are on this road; you are unable to pass them and it is difficult to find a place to park for them to pass you, additional housing will only further amplify these access problems. problems will also occur during winter months when some roads are inaccessible due to snow and normally residents park on the lower roads for safety, this will be more dangerous due to increased vehicles needing to do the same with no additional flat parking spaces provided. The development will get rid of a thriving petting farm which brings in much needed tourism to Bacup. local town development is in dire need of renovation and adding more houses will not improve the local community and will only add more strain to local services.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
848	LORRAINE	WINNARD	-		Object	<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>		<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
								Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.
853	Ian	Read	-	HS2.5 HS2.32 HS2.13 HS2.11 HS2.12	Object	Fernhill Drive is not capable of taking any more traffic, The main Bacup to Rawtenstall carriageway is at it's capacity for traffic. - The site HS2.5 is not a suitable site for hosing and will cause problems on Fernhill Drive. - The site HS2.5 will interfere with the views of the existing houses		Bacup is full and no other housing should be built until the infrastructure in Bacup is improved ie Road to Rawtenstall.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
906	Graham	Smyth	-	HS2.11 (and 2.12, 2.13, 2.32)	Object	<p>Grounds for objection as follows: - 1. Access: Bankside Lane is narrow, winding & steep with two blind bends, and already heavily used by vehicles. The bends are dangerous, the more so in winter, and such dangers would grow with any increase in traffic. Additionally there are already access problems for larger vehicles (eg. gritter lorries, emergency services) on Bankside Lane because of its narrow width, compounded by on-street parking on both sides (many houses - notably terraces - have nowhere else to park); again the problem would be compounded by more vehicles using the Lane. Access for construction traffic would also be problematic. Opening access from the other end would not be a solution - creating another very steep way, and a potential 'rat run' for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the main road through the valley. - 2. Infrastructure: there are issues more generally in significantly adding further to housing in Bacup, given the limited scope to improve the already clogged route down the valley to Rawtenstall / the A56/M66 etc. It is likely that many taking new housing in Bacup would be commuting in and out, reducing traffic flow further. - 3. Capacity: Bacup is already at capacity in important areas such as schools, health services, dentists and extended services and lacks the capacity to absorb lots more households. - 4. Flooding dangers – from HS 2.11 in particular, to houses immediately below it, at a much lower level, and to the terrace adjacent to it (60-68) which already often suffers from ground water rising into cellars. - 5. Landscape – would be impacted. These sites, notably HS 2.11 are at a high level, visible from many points so building would visibly add to the erosion of the countryside amenity in Bacup. It would also impact on wildlife in the area.</p>		<p>While accepting that the task set the council is a difficult one, it is my view that further destruction of the countryside areas in and around Bacup should be resisted, and that Bacup has neither the capacity nor the infrastructure to absorb a high number of houses. Bankside Lane in particular is unsuitable as an access route for more housing, which would create dangers and obstacles for vital services.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
907	Carol	Mitchell	-	HS2.11 in particular and also HS 2.12, 2.13 and 2.32	Object	<p>Grounds for objections as follows: - - 1. Access: Bankside Lane is narrow, winding and steep with two blind bends, and already carrying more traffic than is ideal. The dangerous inherent in the bends would increase with growth in traffic; they are also particularly prone to accidents in wintry conditions, which again would be exacerbated. The Lane is narrow throughout its length and now regularly parked up on both sides, creating access problems for larger vehicles (such as gritter lorries, fire engines etc); many householders have nowhere else to park other than the road. The addition of more vehicles (not to mention construction vehicles) having to use the Lane will significantly increase difficulties passing through. If it were intended to create access from the other end, this would create another steep and a potential 'rat run' for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the main road through the valley – hence adding further to problems. - - 2. Other access issues: adding to the housing stock in Bacup more generally is also problematic, given the limited scope to improve the already clogged route down the valley towards Rawtenstall and the motorway – particularly given the likelihood that the majority of any new housing would be taken by people relying on commuting for employment. - - 3. Capacity: Bacup is already at capacity in important areas such as schools, health services, dentists and extended services and lacks the capacity to absorb many more households. - - 4. Flooding dangers: the field at HS 2.11 is well above the level of houses below it, raising potential flooding hazards to them from building. Interference to thw water table could also pose risks to the adjacent terrace (60-68) which already frequently suffers from ground water rising into the cellars. - - 5. Landscape: the elevation of the area around Bankside Lane also means that there would be an adverse impact on landscape as viewed from various points around and above the town. - -</p>		No
1003	john	dempsey	-	HS2.1 HS2.12 HS2.13 HS2.32	Object	<p>There are 3 separate places at the bottom of Bankside Lane, where the lane narrows to a single track. This means that you always have to stop to allow someone through, no matter what of day. Another 200 or so cars having to use this lane daily, would put an enormous amount of strain on the already stretched and limited road space. - This is an area where there are a lot of families and the extra traffic would be an accident waiting to happen, as many of the children play on or near the road. - One of the areas at the back of the semi detached houses is also an area where various wildlife roam and live. There are foxes, badgers and deer that are regularly seen in this area, making their way in or out of the wood.</p>		Only that we as a resident of Bankside Lane are totally opposed to the redevelopment of this area. We feel that it would spoil a green belt area of Bacup that leads onto the local countryside.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1023	Dave	Harding	-		Object	<p>The suggestion that further housing development is suitable on Bankside Lane is bordering on ridiculous. By the council's own admission, this road is already a "Problem Street for access" with vehicles double parking and the road itself being only wide enough for 1 vehicle to use at one time - in particular near the church and indeed pretty much all the way up to the proposed site HS2.11 and HS2.12. - Further housing would not improve the access and traffic density on this tiny lane - it would make it considerably worse. - - In addition to this, the increased noise and air pollution the extra properties would bring would be considerable - both during and after the building process.</p> <p>Rossendale Council showcase on their website a "clean and green Rossendale". Hardly clean or green if we use all our green spaces for building sites. - - The amenities also need to be improved before building many, many more houses. - - e.g. the options available for children going to secondary school in Bacup are extremely poor. The majority of "good" schools are oversubscribed, so children in Bacup are now being given the choice of a school in "Special Measures" - Fearn. As a parent of a child not far off secondary school, I'm considering moving out of the area - I certainly wouldn't consider moving in. - - The congestion on the main roads is ridiculous at rush hour times & quite simply, there isn't the demand for this many houses in Bacup. The development on New Line / Rockcliffe Rd area has never been finished - purely down to lack of interest from buyers. - - There are many suitable brownfield properties in the area that would be ideal for the right redevelopment however developers like the easy option... - - I'm not against change, however one of the biggest "selling points" of Rossendale are its green and open spaces. Remove these & it's one less reason for living round here. There aren't many left... -</p>		<p>The council should be looking at attracting people to the area by improving amenities, transport, education, shopping etc. Bacup in particular is becoming a joke. No Police Station, public transport is poor, schools are oversubscribed and / or failing miserably, the town centre looks rundown and scruffy etc. Hardly an area that is desirable.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1033	Ewan	Rowland		HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32	Object	<p>The additional houses proposed for the above sites will: - * increase traffic to and from Bankside Lane. The road is narrow and steep at key places along the route which allows only one car at a time to pass at specific points on the route. Driver's visibility is restricted by bends and rises in the road causing blind spots for drivers. Because of the narrowness at specific points, cars, vans and lorries have to swing across the road to pass buildings. - *there will also be an increase in traffic such as delivery vans/lorries and their service vehicles. - * houses opposite The Laurels Care Home at the junction of Maden Road and Bankside Lane have no off road parking and therefore park half on the road and pavement further restrict visibility for up hill and down hill traffic. Vehicles moving off the junction from Maden Road have very limited sight of cars coming down Bankside Lane at this narrow point and are forced to creep out onto Bankside Lane in order to safely access Bankside Lane. This also affects up hill traffic at this point forcing them to stop or slow down. - *vehicles joining Bankside Lane from Dale Street also have limited sight of approaching traffic at its junction and have to creep into the road until drivers have clear sight of up hill or down hill traffic. The road is only one car wide at this junction. - *the problem is compounded by traffic parking close to this junction for those attending services at St Mary Church, Dale Street. - *during the football season especially at weekends there is a high volume of traffic going to Maden Recreation Ground which causes congestion before and after football matches. The park is also popular with families and dogwalkers, most of whom arrive in cars, throughout the year. - *farm vehicles frequently use Maden Road via Bankside Lane on a regular basis which adds to congestion creating further potential hazards for other vehicles and pedestrians using Bankside Lane. - * Pedestrians have to cross the road at pinch points along Bankside because pavements stop due to the narrowness of the road. - * most households have two cars and the proposal to build an additional 140 houses on Bankside Lane will increase traffic by a potential 280 cars. The current access to these developments is inadequate for this amount of daily traffic. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1142	CHRISTINE	JACKSON	-		Object	<p>ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN - BACUP AREA. - Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup, which is recognised as the best preserved millll town in the County. - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane),HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) and HS2.4 (land off Moorland Terrace) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that the majority of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there, it is also on the skyline, building on here would have a huge impact on the views for miles around.</p>		
1242	David	Greenhalgh	-	HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	<p>My objection is that Bankside lane is not capable of taking any more traffic and that extra housing with access onto this road will not only increase congestion even further on this already busy road, but will also be a potential safety hazard as there are already several narrow single car sections on this road, which have blind spots, due to housing and steepness of the road.</p>		
1267	Steven	Fielding	-		Object	<p>The access road of Bankside Lane is already conjested and way to narrow for cars to pass one another. I think it would be ridiculous to build more houses leading to potentially another 200 cars having to use Bankside Lane. - -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1270	Beverley	Walsh	-		Object	It is overpopulated now and the road was never meant to take heavy use of traffic. Tight narrow bends and doubled park cars. Pavements are narrow and not fit for families with buggies and the disabled using their disabled scooters. There already have been numerous accidents on this road. Access for emergency vehicles is already very difficult. - Wildlife will be destroyed foxes, deers and badger sets etc will disappear. More houses are unsustainable as we have very limited facilities in Bacup. E.g. Primary schools are oversubscribed. The road from Bacup to Rawtenstall will be permanently gridlocked.		-
1271	Demi	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	I object to the plans to build houses on bankside lane for many reasons: - 1) Bankside lane is already congested - everyone already parks on the pavements and it's already quite difficult for gritters, fire engines and larger vehicles to get through. We do not need any more traffic added to this! As this will cause a huge amount of problems, not just for the residents but for the local council and the firebrigade. - 2) There are many narrow bends up Bankside lane therefore adding more cars would definitely be a health and safety issue with the only places left to park being near these bad bends causing collisions especially during the winter. - 3) The sites you are proposing to build on are are habitats of many different animals ranging from deer to foxes and badgers! These animals would lose their homes which would lead to them dying out in this area as they struggle to survive. We don't want to lose any more of our precious wild life which has lived there undisturbed for many years! - 4) Building on some of these sites would also mean cutting down trees and getting rid of the wonderful country side the valley prides itself in so dearly! We need to look after areas like these and not build houses on them. There are many sites way more suitable for new housing that will not cause damage to the environment in the same way - what about old buildings that are no longer used? Why do we not use these first, this would cause so much less damage to the country side! - Building more houses on bankside would not only mean finding more space for houses but also finding a second route up Bankside to allow for more traffic. Bankside lane does not have the space to do this! It would be almost impossible to do this without causing a huge amount of damage and a huge amount of time, effort and money that could be better spent! Overall I think that building up Bankside would be a very big mistake, one which can be avoided!		-
1279	Stephen	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	1) Bankside lane is already congested . It has many narrow parts that will become dangerous if more cars use the lane. - 2). Emergency services would have trouble getting past extra parked cars. - 3) It would have an affect on the wildlife eg deer foxes badgers if the fields disappear .		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1291	Alan	Mickleburgh	-		Object	The local and area infrastructure in Rossendale, and Bacup in particular, is insufficient to support the proposed housing developments. Roads, Public Transport, Schools, Police, NHS Services (GP' s and Dentists) will all suffer a major impact from the proposed developments. I am particularly concerned about the proposals for the Bankside Lane area. - - - Bankside Lane has only one access and departure route, via Market Street. Access is particularly difficult at peak times. - - - There are four single lane sections on Bankside Lane which creates congestion problems at any time. - - - Many households have more than one vehicle, and with restricted availability off road parking, vehicles are often double parked on both sides of the road with two wheels on the footpath. - - - Even at non-peak times, larger vehicles have considerable difficulty negotiating Bankside (eg. Trade deliveries, Council and Emergency Services). - - - Pavements are narrow, particularly where vehicles are double parked, creating major problems for pedestrians and the disabled. - - - Drainage is already a concern, with the amount of water draining from the higher ground. If these developments are approved, the excess water will be unable to be absorbed by the surrounding land and will potentially lead to flooding.		The proposed developments need a major rethink. I am aware that these proposals are a result of Central Government policy, but insufficient thought has been given to the impact on local infrastructure, and too many of the planned developments involve the loss to the community of valuable 'greenfield' sites, rather than using existing 'brownfield' sites.
1296	Sharon	Mickleburgh	-		Object	The reasons for my objection are:- - 1. There is no reasonable access as there is only one road (Bankside Lane) for both in and out. - 2. There are 4 extremely narrow sections on Bankside Lane. In some cases it is only wide enough for one car. - 3. The footpath is extremely narrow for pedestrians to use without increasing the amount of both people and Cars. - 4. It is virtually impossible to get out of Bankside Lane onto Market Street at peak times due to the amount of traffic on the main road. - 5. Turning left from Market Street onto Bankside Lane is very difficult if there is already a car waiting to get out Of Bankside Lane into Market Street as the road entrance is very narrow there. - 6. Some of the houses on Bankside Lane already suffer from water draining down from the fields due to lack of sufficient drains without more houses being built. - 7. I am concerned about the proposed expansion of housing in Bacup as the increased population will cause Problems for NHS facilities (doctors and dentists), schools, roads, public transport and policing. - 8. The Green Areas must remain to protect the environment and the wildlife around us. There are also quite a Number of bats around this area and other species that need protecting		The proposed expansion to Bacup needs to be rethought as it will impact on the local infrastructure immensely. - It will cause problems in both the NHS Services, schools, public transport, roads and policing. Whilst I realise it is Government Policy to build more housing, I think the proposals need to be reconsidered

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1343	Jane	Jones	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32	Object	Development at these sites would attract higher volumes of traffic travelling along Bankside Lane over a more concentrated period of time during the busy morning and early evening periods. This road has limited capacity and the increased levels of traffic could lead to traffic congestion and highway safety issues in this area having a detrimental effect on road safety on Bankside Lane and the busy A681 Market Street junction. - - There are already problems with access for council refuse vehicles due to the parking of residents vehicles along both sides of a narrow road, this has led to the placing of warning notices by the council informing residents that access for emergency vehicles including snow ploughs and gritting trucks is impeded by the number of inconsiderately parked vehicles. - - The vehicular access and car parking arrangements for any new developments would have an unacceptable impact on existing residents in terms of noise and safety, creating a traffic hazard and generating an undue environmental impact, exacerbating existing parking problems and resulting in excessive levels of on-street parking which would adversely affect local residents and the efficiency and safety of the highway network. - The introduction of in excess of 140 new homes; each with an average of 2 – 3 cars per household would produce approximately 300 – 350 additional vehicles per day using Bankside Lane, a road which has single lane pinch point access due to the existing narrowing of the road at its steepest point; which has a gradient of approximately 17%. During the winter months; weather conditions of ice and/or snow constantly prevent 2 wheel drive vehicles from driving up this hill, and lead to accidents when drivers are unable to control vehicles whilst attempting to descend when snow and ice have made this route impassable. -		I am fully aware that there is a need for more housing across Bacup and the whole of Rossendale, but meeting these requirements and government targets for the building of new homes should not be the sole focus of the council. - Understanding the current issues within local residential areas such as limited access due to road lay out, road safety concerns especially when there is an marked increase in the number of vehicles joining the main road from a street with an obstructed view due to the existing buildings (Bank on A681, parking on double yellow lines) should be given the highest priority.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1352	Alicia	Campbell Astbury	-	HS2.13, HS2.32, HS2.11, HS2.12	Object	I have many concerns about the area being developed further for houses. The access road via Bankside Lane is both steep and heavily congested with parked vehicles, with additional traffic there will be issues with passing places being available, as this is already an issue at peak times. - During winter months people at the top of the road leave their cars further down the street, if more cars were to do this the road would be inaccessible. - Bats are known to the area proposed, so how will the new development impact our local wildlife? - Will additional housing cause any issues with rain run off from paving over a large mass of land on top of a hill? Will it cause water-logging of neighbouring properties or any drainage issues? - Land proposed is alongside public right of ways, will new pathways be made available to the local people; children use these paths to get to the recreational ground, which is a safer route as the roads are hazardous with tight bends and lack of pavements on some sections or cars mounting the kerb on others making them inaccessible. - My main concern is the additional traffic on the road and possibly parked cars to emergency services being able to gain access through the street? Many homes on this stretch do not have a drive and the number of cars on the street is excessive and difficult to navigate. Also there are two sections where the road narrows significantly and one of these is steep with a blind corner, additional traffic will add to the danger. - Will extra traffic entering the street cause delays to the main highway as the road isn't wide enough to allow traffic to pass when turning right into Bankside close? - How easy is it for heavy goods vehicles to access the street, especially significant numbers for a development, will this cause delays to residents?	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1375	Margaret	Priestley	-		Object	<p>I have examined the plans and I know the sites well. I wish to object strongly to all the development of houses on or adjacent to Bankside Lane. - - The proposed siting of the developments is particularly ill-considered due to access, - Bankside Lane already has a high volume of traffic to the residential properties in the area. - - There is little pavement for pedestrians, the addition of extra traffic would create a safety hazard for them also. The pavements these days are a safety issue due to the amount of leaves from overhanging trees which the council no longer seem to cut back and maintain causing a buildup of slippery moss on the pavement surfaces. - Access is particularly hazardous in the winter months. The area is not always gritted, resulting in cars being abandoned along Bankside Lane as it becomes inaccessible. This leads to a knock-on effect resulting in access issues higher up Bankside Lane itself. - I therefore fail to see the advantage of building more houses in an already built up and inaccessible locations - In November 2013 due to the untreated surface I myself skidded into the wall just below the golf club during winter weather. - The other issue I would like to mention with Bacup itself< and forward thinking, is the lack of infrastructure with respect to banking. Two of the towns banks were closed last year with I think no objections from the council or at least no fight to keep them open that I am aware of. When the banks go people go out to other areas (e.g. Rawtenstall, Burnley, Rochdale, Bury) This will be the case with new residents, most of whom, if in employment, will be working out of the valley making Rossendale yet more of a commuter belt than it already is. Anyone travelling from Bacup via Rawtenstall or From Bacup to Rochdale can testify to this and know that anymore commuter traffic will be disadvantageous and effects all roads in the valley. People work outside the valley will conduct personal outside of Bacup.. - Therefore, I ask that Rossendale Borough Council refuse planning relating to the building of houses on Bankside Lane..</p>		<p>The redevelopment of the old cinema site on Burnley Road needs to be looked into, the building is currently in a dilapidated condition and will only become more of a danger. I can see this hanging on for years and eventually like Smiths Engineering in Whitworth having to be demolished probably at the councils expense under compulsory purchase!</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1429	Nina	Byers	-		Object	<p>1) There would be a minimum of 200 extra cars using Bankside Lane if these houses were to be built! This would cause major problems with traffic building up at peak times (morning, evening, beginning and end of school times) in both Bankside Lane and Market Street. That corner is particularly tight, especially if there is a car waiting to come out of Bankside Lane. Then imagine a queue of traffic in the narrow, single track areas of Bankside Lane (of which there are 4) and you can see that traffic could easily come to a standstill on Market Street! Sometimes it is very difficult to turn right onto Market Street if there is a lot of traffic. - - 2) There is only one way to access these proposed development sites, via Bankside Lane. There are 4 stretches of the road which are only wide enough for one car. These stretches of road also happen to be on the steepest part of the road with blind bends. In bad weather conditions and at peak times this already causes problems without any extra traffic . There are also several further stretches of road which are only wide enough to get a car through due to people who already live on Bankside Lane needing to park their cars on the road due to them not having off road parking available! - - 3) The pathways for pedestrians are very narrow and non-existent in some places! For example, by Cookoo Hall the path is very narrow! This is also made worse by cars being forced to park partially on the path and bins being stored on the path as there is no sensible alternative due to many houses being built much higher than the road! This makes it difficult for all pedestrians but especially the disabled elderly and parents with prams and young children! - - 4) Surface water run off will cause problems. I live on Bankside Lane, in front of and below Animal Quackers. There is already a lot of water running down from the fields behind us into our garden, which becomes very waterlogged and completely unusable! Our house is also down a flight of stairs which during heavy rainfall resemble a waterfall. I know that some of my neighbours have experienced some flooding into their house as a result of this. If that land was built on then this surface water would increase! This could result in possible flooding due to insufficient drainage. - - 5) There are already problems with the sewers, certainly with my neighbours, several houses either side have regular blockages which need unblocking using rods. Where would the sewerage drain to from the new housing? Would they also run through the same pipes? - - 6) These are all areas of natural beauty and support a lot of wildlife! There are also a lot of bats in the area which are protected.</p>		<p>The infrastructure of the area would be compromised. - - There is no police station - Not enough schools, no high school - Only one doctors surgery in Bacup - Only one Supermarket - Public transport. - No bus route on Bankside Lane as too narrow and steep. - All roads leading out of Bacup are narrow, some are steep and extremely busy at peak times</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1544	Enid & Kenneth	Burke		SHLA16075	Object	<p>We strongly object to the proposed plans to change previous Green Belt sites to building sites mainly on the narrowness and steepness of the pavements and roads. Presently the volume of traffic is overloaded because most households have 2 or more cars. Visitors to the Golf Club, Football Pitches and Petting Farm add to the problem, especially at weekends when the volume of cars and work vehicles doubles. Last winter the council gritting vehicles could now operate in parts because of parked cars/vans. We have also witnessed a number of near "misses" on the bad bend near to the Laurels Nursing Home.</p> <p>The use of outdoor space is essential for our grandchildren and children, to lose this is not acceptable.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1576	David	Thompson			Object	<p>I object to the proposed housing development sites referenced HS2:11, HS2:12, HS2:13 and HS2:32 listed in Chapter 1 (HS2) of the above plan. My concern is that the connectivity of each of these sites to essential facilities in Bacup Town Centre is unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <p>There are only two routes from the sites to the Town centre, one of which is lodge lane and the other is Bankside lane.</p> <p>Lodge lane is to the South and East of the four sites, and is closed to motor vehicles as a through road. It has a very steep slope with an average gradient of 15% (1 in 7) and therefore does not comply with any national or regional planning guidance as being acceptable for use by pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists. It would therefore be improper to suggest lodge lane as a route from the sites to Bacup Town Centre.</p> <p>This means that Bankside lane is the only acceptable access to the Town Centre for all highway users. However Bankside lane has a particularly steep section for a length of 242 metres between its junctions with Market Street and Maden Road and I believe it to be unsatisfactory as a means of access to the proposed housing developments as evidenced in the following disclosures attached to this letter:</p> <p>Disclosure 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Non Compliance with the Lancashire County Council Code of Practice on Mobility , Inclusive Mobility' Section 3 Footways b. Non Compliance with the Lancashire County Council Transport and Design Guidance 'Creating Civilised Streets' Section 5.5 Connected Streets c. Non Compliance with the Department for Transport 'Manual For Streets' Section <p>7.6 Visibility Requirements. (Note this section includes calculations that have safety implications for highway users and I request that it is submitted to LCC Highways Engineers for verification).</p> <p>Disclosure 2.</p> <p>Breach of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan Policies:</p> <p>ENV1 - High Quality Development in the Borough</p> <p>ENV2 - Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Disclosure 3.</p> <p>Prior refusal of a planning application for development off Bankside Lane.</p> <p>On the basis of the above submissions I request that the proposed housing sites HS2:11, HS2:12, HS2:13 and HS2:32 be removed from the Rossendale Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1586	Adrian	Boyden			Object	Has a resident of Bankside Lane my concerns are of increase in traffic on this busy lane , more accident s and near misses especially on the blind bend . There are no other access routes for residents so to add more traffic is irresponsible.Also how do you propose to get wagons . Machinery .Etc to building sites ? Without causing chaos on a now fragile road .Shows the plans having been thought about properly .		
1588	Alison	Whittaker			Object	<p>I strongly object to these proposed plans to change areas,of previous Green Belt Sites,to building sites.The visual impact of the development will greatly effect my property,building work at the front of my property has already caused loss of existing views and is out of character in terms of its appearance. The proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood, the green spaces and rural views would be lost changing the landscape of a quiet rural area to an over populated housing estate. There would be significant loss of the open aspect of the current residential properties. The enjoyment of the current views, design and landscaping is an important residential amenity, and the loss of these features would have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of the existing properties.</p> <p>The new development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing properties adversely impacting on the character and appearance of the communityin particular the green spaces that is valued open space enjoyed by local residents. Furthermore there is a requirement to enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats and rural lands. Further housing development would result in overlooking, unacceptable high density, overshadowing and loss of natural light. Further over development would be overbearing and result in an adverse effect on the residential amenity of the current neighbourhood. Designs that are inappropriate in there context and fail to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions should not be approved.</p> <p>Unacceptable over development on Bankside lane would adversely affect highway safety and cause great problems for road users,the lane is just too narrow, steep with a blind bend that is already hazardous for road users. The current infrastructure is insufficient to support further increased vehicular access.Please can this concern be referred to qualified engineers for technical clarity.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1620	Jennifer	Cudworth			Object	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the plans mentioned above.</p> <p>My primary cause for objection is on the grounds of safety. Any proposal to build more houses using Bankside Lane as vehicular access is quite frankly dangerous. Bankside Lane already suffers badly with traffic issues - access to the proposed sites is via a steep, narrow road which is reduced to a single-track for the vast majority by parked vehicles. There have been numerous traffic collisions on Bankside Lane due to poor visibility caused by parked vehicles, and "near misses" are almost a daily occurrence. (The problem is exacerbated in bad weather as the gritter encounters difficulties passing the many parked vehicles, meaning there are often delays in treating the road at the top end of Bankside Lane. In addition there are the emergency services to consider - just a few weeks ago, a fire engine was forced to undertake a dangerous manoeuvre to negotiate a corner that was obstructed by parked vehicles, endangering the crew and causing damage to a resident's grass verge).</p> <p>The proposed building works would add to this situation not only short- to medium-term while large construction vehicles access the site, but also long-term due to the increased number of private vehicles requiring daily access to homes. The element of danger to pedestrians, animals and motorists would be greater still if an access route were to be constructed from the Stacksteads end, as this would inevitably be used as a "rat run" for people travelling between Bacup and Stacksteads and wanting to avoid congestion at Lee Mill. Secondly, the fields currently occupied by Huttock Top Farm, and the area of rough land known locally as "Old Joey's", between the top end of Bankside Lane/Rooley View to one side and Osborne Terrace/Hill Crest to the other, are both habitat to a multitude of wildlife including deer and bats. Both areas are affected by the proposed plans. The destruction of natural landscape and the pollution (noise and environmental) brought about by the construction would drive out the wildlife that residents enjoy sharing our green spaces with. Furthermore, Bacup been cited by English Heritage as the best preserved cotton town in England. The construction of new homes would affect the general appearance of the area to the detriment of Bacup's Heritage status. Also to build on the land locally known as "Old Joey's" (see above) would impact upon the skyline of the Rossendale Valley.</p> <p>In view of the above I would urge you to reject the proposals and keep Bankside Lane a safe place for its residents and wildlife.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1636	Kevin	Woods			Object	<p>I am responding to the proposed local plan to develop 4 building sites (100 new houses) off the Bankside Lane area of Bacup. I strongly oppose the plans as the topography of area is not suitable for further development which increases traffic flow, and should be changed back to green belt site.</p> <p>The reason I consider the area to be unsuitable for this development is that the access via Bankside Lane is too narrow and too steep to support development which increases traffic flow. Bankside Lane is single track in parts with both single and dual road junctions joining. The volume of traffic with existing demands is already a significant risk to safety.</p> <p>Each year for the past 20 years living on Maden Road we have been cut off from vehicular transport/ access at least once, when snow falls. Not all residents are able/ willing to buy a 4-wheel drive vehicle and so many become stranded each year. The consequences of this extend beyond personal inconvenience to being unable to get to work, to access emergency services or to discharge caring responsibilities for elderly relatives. Sometimes, due to the hazard of abandoned vehicles, the lane becomes impassable even with a 4 wheel drive vehicle.</p> <p>Since I have lived on Maden Road (above Bankside Lane) myself and family members have been involved in several traffic incidents on the lane in which the topography (and often weather) have been a significant contributory factor. In 2007, my car was collided into on Bankside Lane by a car travelling from Dale Street, in an incident in which the driver misjudged the traffic travelling from four directions between double and single track roads. My car was badly damaged requiring over £2000 of repair work (not my liability), though fortunately I was unhurt. In 2015 during a sudden heavy snowfall, my son's car slid out of control on a descent of Maden Road, whilst avoiding a driver attempting 'a run' up the hill and other abandoned vehicles. His car was written off, though fortunately he was not seriously hurt.</p> <p>I strongly urge the council to reconsider its proposals and find the necessary development sites or solutions which do not involve any further increase in traffic through Bankside Lane. The area does not have the topography to support any developments which would further increase traffic flow.</p>		
1642	Jane	Trivett			Object	<p>If any one lives on Bankside Lane/Bacup and works for RBC they must surely know that the proposed new build sites make no sense at all. Local people know how steep the lane is and unless major road widening took place it will not work. Bankside Lane is totally unsuitable for any more traffic. The recent road resurfacing proved how difficult it is and the Highways people struggled to hastily finish the job even with road closures. Another 200 plus cars up the lane is ridiculous.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1656	K	Jeppesen			Object	<p>Having bern notified via social media about your proposals regarding the Bankside area in Bacup, I must strongly object to it.</p> <p>I am baffled that such an idea can be a serious one! A number of issues springs to mind, and are so obvious, that its hard to take this proposal serious. Firstly the situation about the traffical access to the higher part of Bankside Lane. Blind bend, steep incline/desent. Abnormally narrow footpaths,- or entirely non-existing footpaths, makes it high risk to use this part of the road as a pedestrian. Not to mention , having to ask your children to use them to catch their school bus or go to activities elsewhere.</p> <p>To my knowledge , we have only by luck ,not had any serious accidents with personal injuries, but there has been plenty of bumps and minor crashes, costing residents here extra expense. I would assume that a further 200 dwellings wil take with it, close to 200 more cars,- probaly 300 in my opinion, which would of course also mean considerable higher risk, using our road. I have not mentioned the roadconditions during wintermonths, when ice and snow , makes using Bankside Lane an absolute gamble.</p> <p>In these condotions, many cars are unable to get up the incline, although many "have a go",and therefore get stranded halfway up, abadoning their car, and soon the road looks like an unorganized car-park. And traffic coming downhill the opporsite way, often find it impossible to stop, or even stear due to the snow/ice.</p> <p>Further more, beeing able to stop at the junction with the busy Market Street at the bottom of the lane, is a hazardous gamble ,even more so. Personally, I have, on a couple of occasions "skated" right out onto Market Street, with only Lady Luck to look after me ! I have seen others do the same, and it can only be a question of time, before some major incident will occur.</p> <p>So it seems to me, that somebody in the council havent done their homework, and certainly not used Bankside Lane very often, because any increase in traffic here, is equivalent to asking for incidents/injuries to residents up here. I would think that the land in question, originally was graded "green field" for a reason !?</p> <p>Deer, fox and multiple othe wildlife, is seen here on a daily basis, the view over the valley too , improves our quality of life, and is a daily pleasure. We live in a nice and quiet part of Bacup, and have been looking forward to keep doing that, into our retirement ,- the older part of us anyway. Neighbouring estates of "affordable housing", as the PM is asking for, sounds to me, like housing for clientel, not nessecary with the same outlook on life values !</p> <p>All in all I'd wish you to reconsider these proposals, as they have clearly not been scrutified thoroughly, before they were published. Let the Rossendale council show , once and for all, that it takes its citizens safety and wellbeing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

into account , when making these kind of plans. We have for years , constabty been "awarded" with council tax rates , that hardly were second to none,- unfortunately in the expensive end of the scale, but at the same time only seen cuts and poorer services in return. (swimmingpools, bin collections and household waste centres ring a bell?) Do the right thing, and reinstate green field areas to be what they should rightly be : green fields.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1660	Rachel	Greenhalgh			Object	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed changes to previous green belt sites to building sites in Bacup. Under the Draft Local Development Plan, there are plans to allocate building land for housing in the Bankside Lane area (site references HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32). As a resident in the area (MadenRoad), I already know that Bankside Lane is not able to sustain the current levels of traffic and that to build the proposed potential 100 New homes would bring the road into crisis. As you are no doubt aware, Bankside Lane is very steep and narrow- at some points little more than single width. Add into this the fact that the narrowest points also have very poor visibility, meaning vehicles travelling in opposite directions frequently have to perform emergency stops to avoid a collision and often have to reverse to clear the way, creating a new hazard for other approaching drivers. I myself have been involved in such situations several times a week and have serious concerns about the increased risks presented by any proposed housing and the extra traffic they would create.</p> <p>As you are presumably aware, the pavements here are also very narrow and walking along them can be very hazardous as the passing cars often have to come very close to or even mount the pavement to avoid cars coming in the opposite direction. We have seen an increased volume of traffic already coming up the Lane to access the Maden playing fields and also more groups of families and children walking up to the football sessions there. I have huge concerns for their safety if the volume of traffic is significantly increased by new residential traffic too.</p> <p>My primary objection to the proposed plans are centred around the increased dangers of introducing more traffic to an already congested and very narrow access road, however I also believe that we should not be sacrificing our green belt land to provide housing. We are lucky to live in such a beautiful area and we should be doing all we can to protect and sustain the very features which attract people to our town. As we all know, Bacup has not seen the levels of regeneration and investment that some local towns have seen. Indeed the centre of town is currently underoccupied and full of empty buildings. Would our local plan not be better off considering how best to breathe life into these areas rather than eating into green belt land which should be left for all to enjoy and encourage a healthy lifestyle? there have been several studies published in recent years that highlight the importance of the natural world in combating the stresses of modern life and it's positive impact upon mental health. Surely this is a reason to protect our green belt land?</p> <p>Perhaps instead of building new housing around the edges of town, we could look at converting some of the empty commercial sites into apartments and low cost housing which would support those who really need to get onto the housing ladder. We have seen several large housing estates already built in Bacup, somebody which have struggled to sell all their housing stock. Do we</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----------------

need to introduce more? There are a large number of existing houses already for sale in the town and some of these have been on the market for some time. Surely building more new homes will only exacerbate this problem? We should be encouraging new people to come and live in our town, but who will want to buy in an area where the resale prospects are not attractive? I apologise for the length of this email but this is an issue I feel vey strongly about. I hope that you will give due consideration to my concerns, and I would appreciate a response from you to confirm the receipt of my objection.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1756	R	Prime			Object	<p>The above sites appertain to the bankside area of Bacup.</p> <p>Over the 50 years that we have lived at 48 Bankside Lane we have seen a huge rise in the amount of traffic using this lane from a mere handful of vehicles in the 1960s to hundreds more at the present time.</p> <p>Bankside Lane is a cul-de-sac and obviously all vehicles going up the lane have to come back by the same route.</p> <p>As well as private houses, there is an old peoples home, a golf club, an animal farm and a recreation ground.</p> <p>So there is a lot of extra traffic because of these business facilities plus ambulances, brewery wagons, horse and animal boxes, fire engines, taxis, delivery and post vans etc etc etc.</p> <p>There are times during day when, if you took a ride up here, you might only see a handful of parked cars, evenings and weekends it is a different story. Yesterday for instance (Friday) from our house I could see only 10 parked cars but today (Saturday) I counted 36 ad that is by just looking out of our front door. Goodness knows how many more are parked further along the lane.</p> <p>I know that there has been talk of connecting bankside lane to newchurch road. But that would be madness and create a "rat run". Don't add anymore traffic please, accidents on the lane are frequent when the first fall of snow comes.</p> <p>Cars try to ascend the hill, can't do and slide back into one another. Likewise on icy days the cars slide down and after end up crashing into the wall or each other.</p> <p>Here are a number of blind junctions namely:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> princess street lord street dale street police station row <p>junctions with bankside when going up or down the lane.</p> <p>Maden road onto bankside when going down to bacup.</p> <p>Bottlenecks: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> St mary's vicarage and the opposite houses. Joy cottage and the mount Cuckoo hall and 24/26 bankside <p>These areas especially the one at joy cottage and the mount where the gradient is very steep and narrow is exceptionally bad to negotiate at the best of times.</p> <p>My husband had a car accident a few years ago coming out of dale street where it is very difficult to see cars coming down the lane, fortunately it was not too bad.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1779	Andrew	Heathcote			Object	I would like to oppose any planning application for any additional housing estates on Bankside lane in Bacup. The road can't handle any more traffic, and I believe that this would have a very negative impact on current house prices.		
1790	David	Trivett		SHLAA16075 Land at Huttock Farm Bacup	Object	SHLAA16075 - Land at Huttock Farm Bacup. HS2.11 Split Greenfield and Brownfield site. Countryside adjoining the urban area. Currently Farm storage yard, ménage and grassland. Yield calculated 22 units. Access off Bankside Lane will require improvements. Bankside Lane is narrow and steep towards Bacup town centre.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1813		Brewster		Land at Huttock Farm, Bacup	Object	<p>We are objecting to the 4 proposed building sites on the Bankside lane area. We object to these plans on the grounds that the main Bankside lane road, which will have to be used to carry all the traffic for these proposed houses, is not adequate as the road is already struggling to accommodate the existing traffic.</p> <p>The stretch of road from Cuckoo Hall down past the church is very narrow, this will cause untold hazards with the volume of vehicles that are going to use the road when construction begins. Not to mention the extra permanent traffic that will be forced to use the road to access their homes. Any further volume of traffic is most certainly going to cause serious accidents and at the very worst, death.</p> <p>We have had an accident on this very stretch of road, so we talk from experience of how dangerous this stretch of road can be.</p> <p>When there is a funeral at the church the whole road is grid locked with cars being blocked in all directions, so with extra vehicles, this is going to make the grid lock even worse.</p> <p>We have a 20 miles per hour speed limit on Bankside lane, but no one seems to adhere to it and nobody seems to know who gives way to who! So, if locals don't know, do you think new residents will?</p> <p>What about when it snows? This stretch of road is absolutely treacherous. When a car is coming up the hill, and another is going down nobody dare stop, so it ends up with traffic both ways skidding all over the place and of course the whole road is blocked. Extra traffic is bound to cause more accidents and somewhere along the lines there WILL BE a death.</p> <p>The plans show that the majority of houses are four bedrooms, this means there will most likely be more than one car per household. So as the plans show, there are to be 200 homes meaning there will be a minimum of 400 hundred extra cars using Bankside Lane. Large parts of the road are only wide enough for one vehicle, and most existing residents can only park their cars on the road because they have no drive.</p> <p>Which brings us to the main point of discussion, Newchurch Road.</p> <p>We can be quite sure that should these houses be built the majority of buyers will be from outside the valley. This means they will be commuting to and from the valley to go to work, when we have ONE ROAD TO AND FROM RAWTENSTALL, to access the M66. This motorway is already chronically over congested as it is. WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM BURNLEY, WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM TODMORDEN, AND WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM ROCHDALE.</p> <p>When we have to have work done on the stretch of road FROM BACUP TO RAWTENSTALL, our main commuting road, to the M66, the backup of traffic is absolutely horrendous with waiting times up to one hour. I doubt we could cope with extra traffic on our ONE ROAD THROUGH TO RAWTENSTALL.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
						<p>So, the extra strain on our one main road is going to have an impact on the whole of the valley.</p> <p>Then we come to our amenities. Can our Health Centre cope with the extra work load? Are there even enough places in our schools?</p> <p>Then what about our green belt, we live in a beautiful valley, which the council should be trying to promote to tourists, instead of being hell bent on destroying this unique part of Lancashire.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1816		Anonymous			Object	<p>I'm writing to object against the proposal to build new houses on Bankside Lane in Bacup there are no way the road can cope with the extra cars will be coming up and down Bankside Lane as I can guarantee that there will be lots of blocked gullies and definitely a lot of potholes and the council cannot afford to keep resurfacing them time after time after year. Think about the bad weather that we get and Bankside Lane is an absolute nightmare to handle the snow icy weather. I heard from a word of mouth that the council are thinking of widening lodge lane to make it an access road who on earth came up with that idea if that road is not gritted properly then the car is going to lose control and cause a massive dangerous car accident. I live in Bacup and drive to Accrington to get to work Monday to Friday and have to leave 2 hours early so I don't get stuck in the tail back of traffic and don't have to leave my engine running to save pollution!</p> <p>Take a look around the valley there are plenty of trees that are over grown that need chopping down that are covering our day light, street/road signs, street lightning lampposts, speed cameras but also dangerous in strong winds that can come down anytime with them being years old and probably dangerous in strong winds that can come down anytime with them being years old and probably dangerous rotten! The trees can be made to good use for example to make fire wood, pencils and paper so there you are creating more jobs but more importantly you can build houses on areas where the trees have been or could be chopped down. You are focusing on the wrong area of Bacup for example New Line , in the fields behind the church next to stubby lee park look further up into the hills you have plenty of land to build on and you can build plenty of safe access roads that would be safer than up here on bankside lane.</p> <p>Think about the road itself on Bankside lane as you come up bankside lane it get narrow just after you pass dale street. The houses on the left hand side of the corner need to be knocked down because it is a serious hazard for cars coming up and down Bankside Lane.</p> <p>What about wildlife around the valley you are just going to push them out they also needs a place to lvie.</p> <p>Think about when drivers are driving down Bankside Lane there are cars parked on the double yellow lines next to the cash machine that makes it 10 times harder for use drivers that are trying to come out of bankside lane.</p> <p>How can the emergency services cope with coming up and down Bankside lane as the cars that car parked outside the first part of the houses don't park their cars properly causing a very tight narrow gap for cars to go through god know ow the emergency services would cope.</p> <p>The council are trying to cram as much in as they can and Bankside lane cannot handle it.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.011	Further comment
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Object	<p>BANKSIDE LANE, BACUP - HS2:11, 12, 13 and 32 proposes to allocate land which could result in 137 new dwellings off Bankside Lane which is an unclassified road approximately 1.1km in length varying in width and gradient with several pinch points and heavy on-street parking. To the west of its junction with Thistle Street, Bankside Lane provides the sole access to circa 150 dwellings.</p> <p>The existing layout on Bankside Lane is broadly reflected on the 1845 historic map and would not be considered acceptable under the current standards. The land to the west of Bankside Lane is at a higher level than the road which results in high retaining structures and there are buildings on both sides of Bankside Lane at several points which abut the road with no footway provision. Where there is footway provision, the widths are sub-standard along most sections.</p> <p>There is little opportunity for improvement works to the current road layout within the extents of the adopted highway.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would seek a secondary / emergency access to be provided where more than 100 houses are proposed off a sole access such as Bankside Lane. Therefore any development land allocated off Bankside Lane should provide a secondary vehicle access point onto the highway network. The topography of the land presents difficulty in providing a suitable route and within the land that is proposed for allocation it appears unlikely. The Highway Authority has serious concerns about these sites and the ability to provide a safe and suitable access in accordance with the NPPF and adequate permeability for traffic distribution in accordance with Manual for Streets.</p> <p>HS 2:11 – There is insufficient width at the proposed site access and visibility at the junction of the site access and Bankside Lane cannot be achieved.</p>		

Number of comments HS2.011

71

Reference HS2.012 Huttock Top, Bacup

443	Jim	Leach			Object	<p>Bankside Lane is already a hazardous road, access is frequently restricted to existing houses by car. There is existing a sign " Gritting Route, Problem access road " Further Housing and therefore Traffic would only add to the existing problems A Domestic Fire would,at present,be difficult for a Fire Engine to attend during the daytime, - at night ,when everyone is at home it would be impossible These areas should be returned to Green Belt status</p>		Not at Present
-----	-----	-------	--	--	--------	---	--	----------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
486	Susan	Ormerod			Object	<p>All of the above sites are in the Bankside Lane area of Bacup. All are Greenfield Sites and should be changed back to this status without delay.</p> <p>All of these sites are currently used by the local people and their children, in one form or another, as well as the local deer herds (of which there are two), foxes, badgers and a host of other wildlife, including the birds of prey from the Stacksteads area.</p> <p>Some of these sites are owned by local farmers to breed and train horses. The vehicle activity on Bankside, where there are three serious hazards on the approach from the town centre due to narrow roads and a blind bend on a steep incline, is already a danger with the local traffic. These three narrow sections are all within a 20 metre stretch and will not allow even two small vehicles to pass. This hazard has been increased by the "home delivery" method of purchasing goods for the already existing occupants and further population increases would inevitably mean increases of delivery wagons and vans.</p> <p>Any changes of road from the Stacksteads area would provide a "rat run" between the town centre and Stacksteads and any road up from an improved "Lodge Lane" would be a worse hazard than Bankside is at the moment. Almost certainly impassible in winter.</p> <p>The current parking situation on Bankside Lane is already causing concern as shown by the council notices which appeared some time ago. Access for the emergency services has already caused hold ups on five occasions know to myself during the past twelve months.</p> <p>In conclusion, these plans, if passed, will implement a serious deterioration in living standards for all existing occupants of the Bankside Lane area and an increased health risk factor for all who use the lane either in a vehicle or as a pedestrian.</p>		
487	Lorna Lucy	Doherty			Object	<p>We live at top end of Bankside Lane. We object most strongly to the proposed 4 new building sites off Bankside Lane. The beginning of Bankside Lane is extremely narrow with room for just one car with no possibilities to widen and very steep, and with no vision round a blind corner. The increase in traffic is definitely not an option due to danger particularly in winter with snow and ice.</p> <p>Also, I believe there is a proposal for Bankside Lane to be continued at the upper end which is now a dead end. This is also totally unacceptable due to the above reasons.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
488	Helen	Koczur			Object	<p>To even consider planning further homes on any part of Bankside Lane, Bacup is totally ludicrous.</p> <p>The lower part of Bankside Lane is exceptionally steep and narrow in 2 sections and cannot cope with any further traffic. On days that the Golf Club holds events, or football teams are playing on the recreation ground, access becomes impossible. In bad weather, the gradient together with the width restrictions leads to chaos and accidents, of which I have not only witnessed but suffered in the past. There is also limited pedestrian access at these dangerous sections. The route CANNOT cope with any further traffic. As these access problems are at the lower part of Bankside Lane ANY future housing expansion at any point further up the lane would affect this section.</p> <p>We recently had road improvement work which proved access problems. I dread to think what would happen to emergency services under these conditions as access will not be easy.</p> <p>The difficult access means that houses do not sell here, so why on earth build more? I do not see an increase in employment opportunities in the area so the occupants of any new build would travel out of the area for work. This would mean that the volume of vehicles would increase to a dangerous level. If some of the build is required to be for social housing, access for young families with prams and elderly would be impossible without transport.</p> <p>There has been a development of houses over in Weir. All have normal road access, not single track as on Bankside Lane, yet in bad weather the access problems cause the main Bacup to Burnley Road to be severely restricted with abandoned vehicles. Putting further houses off Bankside Lane would also cause a similar problem to the centre of Bacup.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
489	Denise	Duffy			Object	<p>I have lived in the Bankside Lane area some 47 years, in effect all of my adult life. The journeys up and down the Lane have become increasingly hazardous and dangerous and I am appalled that RBC is considering allocating 4 locations for new housing.</p> <p>> For a start the blind narrow bend around Ivy Cottage has always been hazardous and the increase in car numbers has made it doubly so over the years. Further traffic will only serve to exacerbate the conditions we experience daily.</p> <p>> Parking and especially double parking along the Lane and even on pavements has increased significantly. You only have to ask your own drivers (bins, gritting) of the difficulties they regularly face. Emergency services , especially Fire Engines, would also confirm their difficulties along the Lane.</p> <p>> As most home owners frequently have more than one car in their families, sometimes up to four cars once adult children start driving, the addition of garages does little to ease the situation. Apart from the fact that garages are often storage places rather than car shelters.</p> <p>> Although I have personally not been involved in an accident, accidents have happened on numerous occasions. The steepness of the lower Lane, especially in winter conditions, calls for careful negotiation. Again, additional traffic will exacerbate the residents safety concerns.</p> <p>Thank you in anticipation for forwarding this to whom ever it concerns</p>		
503		McKeown			Object	<p>I am against the proposed new housing off Bankside Lane as I am worried about road safety with poor visibility of oncoming traffic in areas and speeding vehicles. Also there would be gridlock at the bottom of Bankside Lane if there is to be additional housing because there are not two lanes of traffic which relies on drivers good faith on many occasions as you travel up the hill (there are many difficulties with this now).</p> <p>I am a resident Meadow Way. At present I have increasing issues with run off of rain water which already requires bailing out of water in winter. The new housing area, no longer being fields to absorb the rain water, will impact further on the massive drainage problem I am having to cope with.</p> <p>I would be very keen to know more about sewage system and how and which route the new system will follow as I have sewage pipe work under my side garden which serves about 24 houses.</p> <p>I am concerned about trucks during the building works and the additional dirt on the roads creating slippery areas for vehicles, damage to the road, and being additionally busy leading to increased chance of accidents.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
534	Romanii	Fitton	-		Object	I most certainly want to object to anymore houses being built on or around bankside lane in bacup. The street is congested with cars and wouldn't be able to cope with more vehicles coming up and down it every day. We also love the little bit of green land we have left and don't want it spoiled by any more houses being built.	-	
539	Simon	Midgley	-	HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32	Object	This site would be accessed from Bankside Lane which is already difficult to navigate at peak traffic periods: it is narrow and is accessed from Market Street via a very steep and narrow hill section. In normal conditions this needs extreme care when navigating, in winter snow and ice this access is dangerous and often impassable. Additional traffic generated by housing on these sites (HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32) would make a dangerous situation even worse. Cars are parked on both side of Bankside Lane narrowing it to one car's width in many sections: there is nowhere else for the cars to park. - - Development on sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32 would also be "skyline" development which residents were told would not be permitted. This would destroy the green character and visual amenity of this part of Bacup - forever. - - Currently farmland, these sites soak up precipitation helping to reduce flood risk which development would increase.		Bankside Lane is an inappropriate area for housing development for the reasons already outlined above. It is important that we do not lose this green space on the Valley side.
540	BRETT	HARRIS	-		Object	BANKSIDE LANE CAN NOT SUPPORT MORE TRAFFIC IT IS ALREADY STRUGGLING WITH THE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC.	-	
543	Thomas	Hammant	-		Object	Objections fall in line with comments for HS2.12 Road Safety and Greenbelt land usage.		Whilst I understand the need to balance new housing in the area, building on land which is currently used as both a farm and/or public access land is against all previous council policies and should not be entered into lightly. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
545	Lisa	Hartley	-		Object	Greenfield site and should remain as such - full of wildlife e.g. 2 deer herds, foxes, badgers and birds of prey. Landowners train and breed horses on this land. - Bankside already extremely congested with traffic- not enough parking facilities now - council have had to put notices up asking people to park more consideratly as emergency services (fire engines) and council services (gritters) have been unable to pass through. - Bankside has 3 very narrow points where only one vehicle can pass at once and these areas are extremely close together in proximity incorporating blind bends as well - more houses would cause more cars causing chaos and accidents. Any through road to stacksteads that might be made would lead to bankside being used as a racing track for cars to pass through from stacksteads trying to avoid the busy main road! This in itself would be extremely dangerous as more houses Lead to more people living on bankside -probably children - resulting in more road traffic accidents and fatalities! We have enough at the moment we don't need anymore. - It would be a nightmare waiting to happen. - Building houses would cause further chaos with wagons attempting to make their way through when there is so little room - home shopping vehicles struggle at moment and are sometimes unable to gain access all the way across bankside! -		Please re think your plans as they will have very serious consequences for both the public and wildlife of bankside!
557	michael	hudson	-		Object	first the bankside lane cannot support any more traffic its a 20 mph zone but traffic goes a lot faster,the road floods a lot. most of that from old newtownroad waters running all the time.the inferstructure cannot cope with any more houses or veicles your concerned resident [...].		i think there is plenty of brown sites around this area that could be used.and empty proerties around not being used.
558	Terry	Nightingale	-		Object	I wish to object to the proposals as follows - - 1. lack of suitable access to to the proposed sites .There is no suitable access to any of these sites with all traffic having to access and exit onto Bankside Lane (see also point 4) - - 2. risk of flooding to properties on Bankside Lane if housing built on green field site to rear. During periods of wet weather rainwater cannot now drain away and as such runs down through these properties gardens onto Bankside lane . increased building will further increase the risk of flooding for these properties - - 3. in addition to the flood risk there will be the increased sewerage demands onto the existing sewerage system on Bankside Lane /Close - - 4. A huge increase in vehicular traffic on an already overcrowded one way in and out Lane . - during winter months lack of available parking / inconsiderate parking on lower Bankside Lane regularly prevents LCC Gritters from being able to access this area . An increase in housing will inevitably bring increased fire risk . - - 5. There will be an environmental impact on wioldlife in the area . Land in the area is frequented by deer and many other types of wildlife . -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
581	B	Woodrup			Object	<p>We are writing to object to the proposed plans to change areas of previous green belt sites to building sites of potentially 100 new houses. These are our concerns.</p> <p>The bottom of Bankside Lane has three bottle necks very steep and narrow and a bad bend only room for one car, a very narrow pavement on one side. Children will be walking down and up to get to school. The school run will be dangerous the road is already overloaded. In winter people try to park at the bottom of the lane in the morning, ready to go to work, because the road is always gritted. The road is sometimes so icy. It's frightening to drive down, as you could easily crash into the wall or another vehicle parked or moving. I dread to think what could happen with more pedestrians (children).</p> <p>I am also concerned about the fire engines and ambulances and gritter trying to drive up and over bankside lane, especially after 7PM when most residents are home and their vehicles are all parked on the roadside's and pavements. This is a concern now. It's going to be really bad if another 100 houses are to be built. Most households have two cars.</p> <p>What about our wildlife. Bats, hedgehogs, deer, rabbits, badgers, toads and frogs.</p> <p>What about our beautiful countryside and outdoor spaces that we and our children and grandchildren really enjoy.</p> <p>We hope you seriously consider our concerns and objections.</p> <p>It has been mentioned to me that previously planning to build houses was turned down by the ministry of transport. Because of the bottlenecks at the bottom of bankside lane.</p> <p>There's also the question of policing all these extra residents and homes.</p>		
582	G	Pearson			Object	<p>Dear Sirs I will raise my objections to this Development due to the following reasons..</p> <p>The lane is already over loaded with vehicles from the existing houses, the Council has placed notices on the lampposts about the problem of gritting the lane due to traffic.</p> <p>My wife had a vehicle accident Two years ago as a vehicle reversed into her vehicle due to cars parked on Bankside lane.</p> <p>The road itself in a bad state of repair due to traffic movement.</p> <p>When your refuse teams come to collect they complain of the problems of traffic on the Lane.</p> <p>When the Animal farm is allowed to have functions on such as Halloween there are even worse traffic problems.</p> <p>The Green areas currently enjoyed by the locals and their children will be affected and even lost .</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
584	Craig	Ovenden	Next Century Property Services Ltd		Object	<p>I'm am led to believe that a new draft local development plan includes a proposal to allocate land for housing at 4 locations off Bankside lane? As a long term resident of Bankside lane I would object to the proposal on several counts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The lane is already extremely busy and access is always restricted down to a single track lane, if the proposal involves further vehicle access the road would need to be made wider. 2) The lane is in a poor state of repair, adding more traffic would create further ongoing maintenance. 3) We live right at the top of the lane, on refuse collection days, dependent on what time the collection takes place it can take me an extra 10-15 minutes to travel down the lane, the collection drivers are always really obliging and pull over when possible, however due to the amount of parked cars and traffic travelling in the opposite direction I often have to follow behind the vehicle right to the bottom, further housing would only compound the problem. 4) The bend in the road towards the bottom and the further narrowing of the road is a bottle neck often leading to vehicles waiting at the bottom to let oncoming traffic up and down the lane, this sometimes backs up as far as the main road, further housing/vehicular access would cause a danger at the junction with Newchurch road as vehicles que to access the lane. <p>Please can you consider these points before any decision is made to allocate the land for housing.</p>		
586	Sandra	Robinson			Object	<p>This email is in regards to the proposal for housing at 4 locations off Bankside Lane, I am a resident of Bankside Lane,I feel that there is too much traffic at the moment on this narrow road,I am lucky to have off road parking,however most do not which then causes problems for pedestrians.</p>		
592	Jean & Peter	Hannan			Object	<p>I am submitting our opposition to the proposed building plans within the Bankside Lane area. Bankside Lane is already overloaded and congested with motor vehicles and we feel that added traffic will cause untold problems. Inadequate parking facilities already add to this problem and we feel very strongly that the above proposals will potentially cause accidents and traffic delays.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
608	A J	Doherty			Object	<p>Email received 29/09/2017: Dear Sirs I attended the road show at Futures Park on 21st September and saw the four sites you proposed for building upon. I object most strongly to all of them. Bankside Lane has a very narrow access from A 681 with room for one car only at the turning. A very steep incline for some yards and then at Dale Street the road narrows even more, again with room for one car only. The incline is even steeper. Near the end, there is a treacherous incline and turn. Parked cars line the whole of Bankside Lane already. In winter, in spite of efficient gritting by the Council, snow and ice can stop traffic. If the proposed building takes place, In the short term, many heavy vehicles would create chaos to our local traffic. Long term, the traffic would double making access a nightmare. I commend the services of Rossendale Council for their efficient rubbish collection and gritting in winter. I am sure they will tell you how difficult it is already to access Bankside Lane. In the case of an emergency - ambulance or fire - we would be put at great risk of delays. Perhaps we could call a helicopter...</p> <p>Email received 30/09/2017: Bankside Lane Bacup proposed building sites I attended the road show on 21st September 2017 at Futures Park, Bacup I object to any of the proposed building sites because Access is extremely restricted. The entrance to Bankside Lane from A 681 is very narrow and cannot be widened. The road is very steep. It continues between a house to the left and high bank to right leaving room for just one vehicle round a blind bend. The road here is also very steep and cannot be widened. Near the end of Bankside Lane there is another very steep incline, round two corners. The whole of Bankside Lane is congested with parked vehicles. If the proposed building takes place, access will be a nightmare. Already it is amazing that local authority vehicles - refuse collection and gritting in winter - manage so efficiently, but it would be almost impossible to continue were traffic to double.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
						<p>Winter snow and ice make the road dangerous and sometimes impassable. In the short term: probably over several years, heavy vehicles would block access.</p> <p>In the long term: four building sites would probably increase traffic to double what it is now.</p> <p>Ambulance , Fire Services and Police must have easy access and these would be put at risk.</p> <p>What do you suggest? Hire a helicopter?</p> <p>Lastly, you are intending to build on virgin moorland, destroying forever the natural beauty and wildlife it supports.</p>		
611	Christine	Hudson			Object	<p>I am writing in regard to the building of 183 houses in all off Bankside Lane. I drive up and down Bankside Lane most days (week and weekend) and it does get very congested at times with lorries and cars, the lane is not very wide and people who live here have to park both sides of the lane which only leaves enough space to get through.</p> <p>The very narrow park of Bankside Lane, as you go up the hill leaves only enough space for single traffic. A lot of people get very frustrated and angry putting it mildly. People forget it is a 20 mile limit so there is often a near miss.</p> <p>If the houses are going to be built 183 in all they will all have to use Bankside, so that means there will be an extra 30 cars. There would be heavy lorries and vans whilst they are being built. Most households are 2 car families hence 380 cars extra.</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>When we have heavy rainfalls which is often. We get a lot of water coming down from old newchurch road and onto the lane. In the last 5 years we have had flash flooding.</p> <p>One day we were sitting in our front lounge and our wheelie bins were floating about in the front garden. We opened our garage doors front and back and it was like a river running down the garden. All our plants were lost as they were in a pile of mud at the bottom of the garden.</p> <p>If these houses are going to be built, there will have to be better drainage. Also we have some lovely open green spaces around Bacup, that we all enjoy and cherish.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
615	Elaine	Garrard			Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed housing development sites referenced HS1.11, HS2.12, HS2.13 and HS2.32 which are listed in the housing allocations section of the above plan.</p> <p>The reason for my objection is that vehicles travelling to Bacup Town Centre from each of these sites will need to use Bankside Lane. This will add to the existing traffic which already presents a significant safety hazard for me personally at the steep and narrow section between its junctions with Maden Road and Market Street.</p> <p>I am disabled and have to travel to Bacup from my house via Bankside Lane either by car or whenever possible by mobility scooter. However, because the width of the pavement is very narrow I have to drive my scooter on the roadway and this means choosing the times of my journeys carefully to avoid peak congestion when I would be dangerous for me to use the road. In particular there are two sections of Bankside Lane which narrow to a single lane and where I cannot take evasive action if a hazard incident occurs. I consider therefore that by allowing additional developments along Bankside Lane and hence additional traffic hazards, the council will discriminate unfairly against me and also other disabled road users.</p> <p>On this basis I ask you to remove the above housing sites from the Local Plan unless the pavement or road widths can be improved to an acceptable standard.</p> <p>I attach a photograph which illustrates the difficulties.</p>		
621	David	Carey	-		Object	<p>Bankside Lane is a cul de sac which already has a lot of traffic going up and down, and parking is on road for the most part, making it very difficult bearing in mind the amount of people who already live on bankside lane, to pass. To add an extra 100 houses and the additional traffic this would cause would make it intolerable for existing house owners. - The added pressure of extra traffic would also affect our children, as there is no place on Bankside Lane to play bar on small play area, and for the most part children ride their bikes and play in front of their houses, this would be an additional safety risk. - It would also ruin the countryside feel we have and make it impossible to walk our dogs as you are planning on taking all our recreational grounds from us. - In the winter we have a lot of bad weather and the gritter's find it hard to get up and grit the Lane, it will be worse with the amount of traffic added. - Again no thought has gone into the additional traffic and the impact on the people living on bankside Lane. - - I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! - -</p>		Not at this time

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
648	Robert	Ormerod	-	HS2.11. hS2.12 HS2.13 HS2.32	Object	<p>These four sites are all Greenfield sites. After the council has done a good job at improving this type of site in Bacup it would be absurd to destroy the fields which complement all the wooded areas of our town. The countryside of Rossendale looks bad enough with all the wind farms without destroying the remaining countryside of Rossendale. Our fields and woods are just returning to being used by the local wildlife and wildlife needs open spaces as well as enclosed spaces to live and prosper. - The traffic on Bankside is already becoming dangerous and unacceptable with the one narrow road and the increases of traffic. Nearly all residents now have more than one vehicle and delivery traffic, usually large vans or wagons, have increased tenfold whilst the road has been left to deteriorate. The slow signs, road centre signs and markings are now almost completely gone and the road, which we were all told was due for replacement surfacing was actually patched up, once again, and still has many holes, dips and bumps. This is especially on the blind steep bend from the town centre. Unless the access situation is addressed the many unreported non injury collisions will soon become serious injuries or fatalities. -</p>		Please take these plans away from from the overcrowded area

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
661	CA and VJ	Jennings	Home Owner	HS2.32	Object	<p>I am contesting these housing developments on several grounds. - - My issues and concerns will be submitted, in writing by the closing date of 9th October 2017.</p> <p>Letter received 06/10/2017: The statement "Improving the lives of people in the Borough" is central to the Borough's current "mantra" regarding their fundamental philosophy and how it is applied in all Departments, and in all the things that they do. However, I feel that some of the current proposals as outlined in the above DLP could fall far short of the Council's altruistic intentions. These are our concerns in respect of the Fernhill Crescent, Fernhill Drive and Bankside Lane development proposals:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation - there is an extensive line of "mixed" trees which decorate the hillside from the end of Bankside Lane above Fernhill Crescent and Osborne Terrace. As far as I understand it, we all have a shared commitment to protect and preserve trees and the landscapes on which they reside. From the above plans, it seems that there is the potential for the removal of some of this tree-line on site HS2.32. This would have a huge and negative impact on the aesthetic outlook onto that hillside, and the potential for land slip, soil erosion, water-runoff and flooding on lower levels • Protecting the Environment - there are many issues here that would negatively affect several aspects of the local environment. Some of which resulting from over-capacity and over-crowding caused by the over-expansion in this area by these proposed developments (particularly along Bankside Lane) • Preserving the local Character - the area around an incorporating site HS2.32 is particularly attractive (especially to the West of Bankside lane) and is an asset to the local area and its residents. It offers countryside walks along heritage sites and long established pathways (ideal for walkers, dog-owners, explorers in general and "kids" of all ages) • Infrastructure - this aspect has never been something to celebrate in the Rossendale Valley area: mostly due to the uncompromising geography of the area rather than the incompetence of the local authorities. However, focusing on one point only, transport through the Valley is often difficult, and sometimes almost impossible at certain times of the day. Therefore, the addition of around 200 units along Bankside Lane would severely impact on both movement and parking. AND, the thought of possibly an additional 350 vehicles exiting onto the Bacup/Rawtenstall road and heading through the valley, doesn't bare thinking about!! AND, what about the winter if it's like the Fernhill area, some of it, or all of it, will not be gritted!! • Impact - in my opinion, the impact from these proposals would be many and 		To be submitted before 9th October 2017.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
						<p>wide ranging, but some would militate against the "improvement of lives"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of Wild-life Habitats - the treed areas and adjacent open fields and moorland, are homes for thriving wild-life. In addition to the usual populations of wildlife, we have seen deer, foxes, squirrels, birds of prey and colonies of bats. The retention of range of wild-life would be threatened by the proposed invasion of their "space" • Ecological/Biological Considerations - these extensive developments could severely compromise the 'health', stability and integrity of the land, its trees; also its top-soil and sub-soil and the life forms that inhabit them • Local Heritage Preservation - there are some historical mule tracks, bridal paths & walkways and access routes into Yorkshire in this area, and we have a duty to protect and preserve them • Land Integrity - we have been aware for many years that the land above part of Fernhill Crescent has been subject to land-slip over the years. In fact, we were told by an authoritative figure that the extent of the problem had been measured over time. This weakness in the land caused our builder to reinforce the retaining walls in the back gardens of Nos 22, 24 and 26. Indeed, the retaining wall at No 26 actually collapsed. <p>Interestingly, the field behind these and other FC properties seems to show evidence of land-slip, whereas the adjacent wooded field seems not to suffer this problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic Balance - given the attractiveness (in all respects) of this residential area, we would suggest that the proposed plans could severely impact upon the "wholesomeness" of this area, and have a negative effect upon the valuation of properties. Which would be, at least, unfair!!! • Practicality and Compatibility - in conclusion, and looking at just one aspect, when we factor-in access roads, traffic congestion and general disruption over time, and deterioration in the quality of people's lives, is it appropriate or acceptable to further pursue the Fernhill proposals?!? <p>Finally, who is it in the best interests of</p>		
667	Helen	Phythian	N.A.	HS2.11,HS2.12,H Object S2.13 and HS2.32		<p>I wish to object on the grounds that the proposed 100 houses will have at least two cars for each dwelling, this will mean a daily increase of journeys by at least four hundred trips on what is, in two places on Bankside Lane a single track road. - If the developers were to continue the road through to Stacksteads prior to start of the proposed development which would give an option to all residents, then maybe the plans would be viable. At the moment if Bankside Lane is left as is, the resulting traffic jams would increase the risks of accidents and also increase pollution,(drivers trying to pass the two single lane place , one of which is a blind bend as well as single lane, would be revving their cars to restart on an exceptionally steep hill).</p>		<p>overall I understand that the Government is laying down numbers for each area, instead of cramming in houses in every available green space left in Rossendale would it not be better to take a flat area of land and build a new village with all required facilities</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
679	leslie	hargreaves	-	h52.11.12.13. andh52.32	Object	Bankside lane is already completely saturated with cars having to park on the pavements and at times heavy commercial cannot get through ie road gritters and refuse vehicles.This is worse when vehicle that normally park on maden road have to park on bankside lane due to winter conditions i.e. ice and snow. Approximately 50 years ago excavation was started for house building was started on the two fields between lodge land and so called bonks area which was stopped because the area in what they call shifting sand. Acces to bankisde lane is tottally in adequate and I totally object to this proposal as we already have our share of accidents on this road		-
714	Marie	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	1) Bankside Lane is already very busy. There's already too many cars going up, down and along Bankside. Adding another 100 or more houses and therefore cars will just add to the congestion. 2) Bankside Lane has tight and narrow bends. Add more traffic to the mix and there will easily be some serious accidents especially in the winter when it snows. 3) Vehicles are already parking on pavements to allow other cars to get past. In case of an emergency (fire or ambulance) the emergency vehicles would already have trouble getting to the destination. Adding those extra cars would make it impossible. The gritter has problems now! 4) The proposed land is home to lots of wildlife including deer, badgers and foxes. Why should we disrupt their habitat? Where would they go? It's not fair on them when they cannot speak up for themselves. 5) 50 years ago they evacuated Bankside because the field was on shifting sands. 6) the local schools are already full, getting a doctors appointment is already difficult without getting extra residents and the same with the dentists. The proposed building seems unrealistic, unreasonable and unsustainable. -		I thought the idea was to build houses on brown sites not green sites. There's plenty of unused, rundown, empty, derelict properties in and around bacup, why not use them? Why take our countryside when there's perfectly good other land to use. Don't ruin it for future generations.
715	Jennifer	Hargreaves	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	Conversion on Bankside at moment, in the snow when vehicles can't get up the Lane this is what happens. The residents who live on Maiden Road and Rode Street occupy both sides of Bankside. - Ordinarily care are parked on both sides of the Lane a lot on pavements so that ambulances, fire engines can get through! - The gritter has problems as well the Council even put a sign up!! - - Loved on Bankside 52 years, all my married life , and about 50 years ago they tried excavating and stopped because of shifting sand. - - There isn't the infrastructure to accommodate this development as the road down the valley to Rawtenstall , and the road to Rochdale are a nightmare at peak times! - - Schools are full. - - Doctor's appointments are very difficult as it is without extra residents. - - I am completely against this proposal.		Thought the idea Jake Berry agreed to was to build on Brown Sites not Green sites. - - - There are plenty of derelict, empty properties in this area without taking our countryside from us!!! - - I'm thinking of my children and grandchildren.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
718	Joanne	Leyland	-	HS2.11 HS2.13	HS2.12 HS2.32	Object	I've lived on bankside lane for 20 years and I'm strongly objecting for the planning proposals of houses being built it's already overflowing with cars as, most my neighbours and myself have 2 or 3 cars each and every one falls out all the time over parking as it is now so for more familys to be moving will just cause more problems, the roads are to narrow in many places it really will not work. Over the years I've lived here my 2 daughter's along with there friends who also live on bankside lane have grown up playing on the lane and it's so dangerous with the amount of cars going up and down it's an accident waiting to happen	It's just not acepticable to be building more houses with only a narrow road leading up to bankside lane and an average of 200 extra cars it will be an awful place to live and I love living here
729	Stanley	Horsfall				Object	Email received 30/09/2017: I would like to protest again at some of the the plan for bankside lane Email received 02/10/2017: I want to oppose the plan as the traffic on bankside is already congested	
759	Martin	Stansfield	-			Object	The width of the roads and the bends on Bankside Lane are already an accident to happen and cant support any oncrease in traffic,	have the same objection to the other 3 sites on bankside lane
769	Trevor	Bartram				Object	Access to all of the above sites is via Bankside Lane which is struggling to cope with the amount of traffic now using it. Another 150 houses, as proposed, would mean potentially a further 300 vehicles, which would add to an already congested road, there being only one way in and out of the town. - - With regard to the whole of Bacup a house building project of this scale will bring problems with Primary Schools, which are already full, doctors and roads. -	-
770	Jacqueline	Stansfield	-			Object	The road is too narrow and bendy for extra traffic. Near misses everyday sooner or later there will be a serious accident.	I do not think any of the other sites should be built on bankside lane for the same reason.
774	Stanley	Horsfall	-			Object	Bankside lane is already congested with traffic and and cannot take the extra that the plan would cause	
778	Irene	Prokopowicz	-			Object	I strongly object as there is a need to keep the green area as it supports wild life Badgers, Foxes , Field mice , bats and sometimes deer. Our quality of would take a nose dive the planned 30 houses meaning 60 cars possible light pollution from street lights garden security lights and just more noise. I am deeply concerned about all the issues above we have lived in this house for 43 years so we hope desperately that this pla does not be accepted .	The large amount of traffic the will increase on bankside lane with all the planned builds not child friendly
780	George	Prokopowicz	-			Object	Object on the grounds of increased traffic in an already congested road access which could affect emergency vehicles Also have concerns in increased pollution.The diversity of wild life would be affected I feel quality of life of people living in the area in question would have a negative impact Hope this plan will be regeted	To much traffic on bankside lane already

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
785	Robert	Astbury	-		Object	Bankside Lane does not have a suitable road to support the additional through-traffic created by additional housing, there are several narrow parts of the road on steep inclines that do not allow two way traffic and these are heavily congested at peak times. Additional housing on Bankside lane (and the connecting side roads) will make access very difficult and impede the access for emergency vehicles. when large vehicles such as lorry's or bin men are on this road; you are unable to pass them and it is difficult to find a place to park for them to pass you, additional housing will only further amplify these access problems. problems will also occur during winter months when some roads are inaccessible due to snow and normally residents park on the lower roads for safety, this will be more dangerous due to increased vehicles needing to do the same with no additional flat parking spaces provided. The development will get rid of a thriving petting farm which brings in much needed tourism to Bacup. local town development is in dire need of renovation and adding more houses will not improve the local community and will only add more strain to local services.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
848	LORRAINE	WINNARD	-		Object	<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>		<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
								Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.
853	Ian	Read	-	HS2.5 HS2.32 HS2.13 HS2.11 HS2.12	Object	Fernhill Drive is not capable of taking any more traffic, The main Bacup to Rawtenstall carriageway is at it's capacity for traffic. - The site HS2.5 is not a suitable site for hosing and will cause problems on Fernhill Drive. - The site HS2.5 will interfere with the views of the existing houses		Bacup is full and no other housing should be built until the infrastructure in Bacup is improved ie Road to Rawtenstall.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
906	Graham	Smyth	-		Object	<p>Grounds for objection as follows: - - 1. Access: Bankside Lane is narrow, winding & steep with two blind bends, and already heavily used by vehicles. The bends are dangerous, the more so in winter, and such dangers would grow with any increase in traffic. Additionally there are already access problems for larger vehicles (eg. gritter lorries, emergency services) on Bankside Lane because of its narrow width, compounded by on-street parking on both sides (many houses - notably terraces - have nowhere else to park); again the problem would be compounded by more vehicles using the Lane. Access for construction traffic would also be problematic. Opening access from the other end would not be a solution - creating another very steep way, and a potential 'rat run' for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the main road through the valley. - - 2. Infrastructure: there are issues more generally in significantly adding further to housing in Bacup, given the limited scope to improve the already clogged route down the valley to Rawtenstall / the A56/M66 etc. It is likely that many taking new housing in Bacup would be commuting in and out, reducing traffic flow further. - - 3. Capacity: Bacup is already at capacity in important areas such as schools, health services, dentists and extended services and lacks the capacity to absorb lots more households. - - 4. Flooding dangers – from HS 2.11 in particular, to houses immediately below it, at a much lower level, and to the terrace adjacent to it (60-68) which already often suffers from ground water rising into cellars. - - 5. Landscape – would be impacted. These sites, notably HS 2.11 are at a high level, visible from many points so building would visibly add to the erosion of the countryside amenity in Bacup. It would also impact on wildlife in the area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
907	Carol	Mitchell	-	HS2.11 in particular and also HS 2.12, 2.13 and 2.32	Object	<p>Grounds for objections as follows: - - 1. Access: Bankside Lane is narrow, winding and steep with two blind bends, and already carrying more traffic than is ideal. The dangerous inherent in the bends would increase with growth in traffic; they are also particularly prone to accidents in wintry conditions, which again would be exacerbated. The Lane is narrow throughout its length and now regularly parked up on both sides, creating access problems for larger vehicles (such as gritter lorries, fire engines etc); many householders have nowhere else to park other than the road. The addition of more vehicles (not to mention construction vehicles) having to use the Lane will significantly increase difficulties passing through. If it were intended to create access from the other end, this would create another steep and a potential 'rat run' for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the main road through the valley – hence adding further to problems. - - 2. Other access issues: adding to the housing stock in Bacup more generally is also problematic, given the limited scope to improve the already clogged route down the valley towards Rawtenstall and the motorway – particularly given the likelihood that the majority of any new housing would be taken by people relying on commuting for employment. - - 3. Capacity: Bacup is already at capacity in important areas such as schools, health services, dentists and extended services and lacks the capacity to absorb many more households. - - 4. Flooding dangers: the field at HS 2.11 is well above the level of houses below it, raising potential flooding hazards to them from building. Interference to thw water table could also pose risks to the adjacent terrace (60-68) which already frequently suffers from ground water rising into the cellars. - - 5. Landscape: the elevation of the area around Bankside Lane also means that there would be an adverse impact on landscape as viewed from various points around and above the town. - -</p>		No
1003	john	dempsey	-	HS2.1 HS2.12 HS2.13 HS2.32	Object	<p>There are 3 separate places at the bottom of Bankside Lane, where the lane narrows to a single track. This means that you always have to stop to allow someone through, no matter what of day. Another 200 or so cars having to use this lane daily, would put an enormous amount of strain on the already stretched and limited road space. - This is an area where there are a lot of families and the extra traffic would be an accident waiting to happen, as many of the children play on or near the road. - One of the areas at the back of the semi detached houses is also an area where various wildlife roam and live. There are foxes, badgers and deer that are regularly seen in this area, making their way in or out of the wood.</p>		Only that we as a resident of Bankside Lane are totally opposed to the redevelopment of this area. We feel that it would spoil a green belt area of Bacup that leads onto the local countryside.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1023	Dave	Harding	-		Object	<p>The suggestion that further housing development is suitable on Bankside Lane is bordering on ridiculous. By the council's own admission, this road is already a "Problem Street for access" with vehicles double parking and the road itself being only wide enough for 1 vehicle to use at one time - in particular near the church and indeed pretty much all the way up to the proposed site HS2.11 and HS2.12. - Further housing would not improve the access and traffic density on this tiny lane - it would make it considerably worse. - - In addition to this, the increased noise and air pollution the extra properties would bring would be considerable - both during and after the building process.</p> <p>Rossendale Council showcase on their website a "clean and green Rossendale". Hardly clean or green if we use all our green spaces for building sites. - - The amenities also need to be improved before building many, many more houses. - - e.g. the options available for children going to secondary school in Bacup are extremely poor. The majority of "good" schools are oversubscribed, so children in Bacup are now being given the choice of a school in "Special Measures" - Fearn. As a parent of a child not far off secondary school, I'm considering moving out of the area - I certainly wouldn't consider moving in. - - The congestion on the main roads is ridiculous at rush hour times & quite simply, there isn't the demand for this many houses in Bacup. The development on New Line / Rockcliffe Rd area has never been finished - purely down to lack of interest from buyers. - - There are many suitable brownfield properties in the area that would be ideal for the right redevelopment however developers like the easy option... - - I'm not against change, however one of the biggest "selling points" of Rossendale are its green and open spaces. Remove these & it's one less reason for living round here. There aren't many left...</p>		<p>The council should be looking at attracting people to the area by improving amenities, transport, education, shopping etc. Bacup in particular is becoming a joke. No Police Station, public transport is poor, schools are oversubscribed and / or failing miserably, the town centre looks rundown and scruffy etc. Hardly an area that is desirable.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1033	Ewan	Rowland		HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32	Object	<p>The additional houses proposed for the above sites will: - * increase traffic to and from Bankside Lane. The road is narrow and steep at key places along the route which allows only one car at a time to pass at specific points on the route. Driver's visibility is restricted by bends and rises in the road causing blind spots for drivers. Because of the narrowness at specific points, cars, vans and lorries have to swing across the road to pass buildings. - *there will also be an increase in traffic such as delivery vans/lorries and their service vehicles. - * houses opposite The Laurels Care Home at the junction of Maden Road and Bankside Lane have no off road parking and therefore park half on the road and pavement further restrict visibility for up hill and down hill traffic. Vehicles moving off the junction from Maden Road have very limited sight of cars coming down Bankside Lane at this narrow point and are forced to creep out onto Bankside Lane in order to safely access Bankside Lane. This also affects up hill traffic at this point forcing them to stop or slow down. - *vehicles joining Bankside Lane from Dale Street also have limited sight of approaching traffic at its junction and have to creep into the road until drivers have clear sight of up hill or down hill traffic. The road is only one car wide at this junction. - *the problem is compounded by traffic parking close to this junction for those attending services at St Mary Church, Dale Street. - *during the football season especially at weekends there is a high volume of traffic going to Maden Recreation Ground which causes congestion before and after football matches. The park is also popular with families and dogwalkers, most of whom arrive in cars, throughout the year. - *farm vehicles frequently use Maden Road via Bankside Lane on a regular basis which adds to congestion creating further potential hazards for other vehicles and pedestrians using Bankside Lane. - * Pedestrians have to cross the road at pinch points along Bankside because pavements stop due to the narrowness of the road. - * most households have two cars and the proposal to build an additional 140 houses on Bankside Lane will increase traffic by a potential 280 cars. The current access to these developments is inadequate for this amount of daily traffic. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1142	CHRISTINE	JACKSON	-		Object	<p>ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN - BACUP AREA. - Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup, which is recognised as the best preserved millll town in the County. - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane),HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) and HS2.4 (land off Moorland Terrace) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that the majority of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there, it is also on the skyline, building on here would have a huge impact on the views for miles around.</p>		
1242	David	Greenhalgh	-	HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	<p>My objection is that Bankside lane is not capable of taking any more traffic and that extra housing with access onto this road will not only increase congestion even further on this already busy road, but will also be a potential safety hazard as there are already several narrow single car sections on this road, which have blind spots, due to housing and steepness of the road.</p>		
1267	Steven	Fielding	-		Object	<p>The access road of Bankside Lane is already conjested and way to narrow for cars to pass one another. I think it would be rediculous to build more houses leading to potentially another 200 cars having to use Bankside Lane. - -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1270	Beverley	Walsh	-		Object	It is overpopulated now and the road was never meant to take heavy use of traffic. Tight narrow bends and doubled park cars. Pavements are narrow and not fit for families with buggies and the disabled using their disabled scooters. There already have been numerous accidents on this road. Access for emergency vehicles is already very difficult. - Wildlife will be destroyed foxes, deers and badger sets etc will disappear. More houses are unsustainable as we have very limited facilities in Bacup. E.g. Primary schools are oversubscribed. The road from Bacup to Rawtenstall will be permanently gridlocked.		
1271	Demi	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	I object to the plans to build houses on bankside lane for many reasons: - 1) Bankside lane is already congested - everyone already parks on the pavements and it's already quite difficult for gritters, fire engines and larger vehicles to get through. We do not need any more traffic added to this! As this will cause a huge amount of problems, not just for the residents but for the local council and the firebrigade. - 2) There are many narrow bends up Bankside lane therefore adding more cars would definitely be a health and safety issue with the only places left to park being near these bad bends causing collisions especially during the winter. - 3) The sites you are proposing to build on are are habitats of many different animals ranging from deer to foxes and badgers! These animals would lose their homes which would lead to them dying out in this area as they struggle to survive. We don't want to lose any more of our precious wild life which has lived there undisturbed for many years! - 4) Building on some of these sites would also mean cutting down trees and getting rid of the wonderful country side the valley prides itself in so dearly! We need to look after areas like these and not build houses on them. There are many sites way more suitable for new housing that will not cause damage to the environment in the same way - what about old buildings that are no longer used? Why do we not use these first, this would cause so much less damage to the country side! - Building more houses on bankside would not only mean finding more space for houses but also finding a second route up Bankside to allow for more traffic. Bankside lane does not have the space to do this! It would be almost impossible to do this without causing a huge amount of damage and a huge amount of time, effort and money that could be better spent! Overall I think that building up Bankside would be a very big mistake, one which can be avoided!		
1279	Stephen	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	1) Bankside lane is already congested . It has many narrow parts that will become dangerous if more cars use the lane. - 2). Emergency services would have trouble getting past extra parked cars. - 3) It would have an affect on the wildlife eg deer foxes badgers if the fields disappear .		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1291	Alan	Mickleburgh	-		Object	The local and area infrastructure in Rossendale, and Bacup in particular, is insufficient to support the proposed housing developments. Roads, Public Transport, Schools, Police, NHS Services (GP' s and Dentists) will all suffer a major impact from the proposed developments. I am particularly concerned about the proposals for the Bankside Lane area. - - - Bankside Lane has only one access and departure route, via Market Street. Access is particularly difficult at peak times. - - - There are four single lane sections on Bankside Lane which creates congestion problems at any time. - - - Many households have more than one vehicle, and with restricted availability off road parking, vehicles are often double parked on both sides of the road with two wheels on the footpath. - - - Even at non-peak times, larger vehicles have considerable difficulty negotiating Bankside (eg. Trade deliveries, Council and Emergency Services). - - - Pavements are narrow, particularly where vehicles are double parked, creating major problems for pedestrians and the disabled. - - - Drainage is already a concern, with the amount of water draining from the higher ground. If these developments are approved, the excess water will be unable to be absorbed by the surrounding land and will potentially lead to flooding.		The proposed developments need a major rethink. I am aware that these proposals are a result of Central Government policy, but insufficient thought has been given to the impact on local infrastructure, and too many of the planned developments involve the loss to the community of valuable 'greenfield' sites, rather than using existing 'brownfield' sites.
1296	Sharon	Mickleburgh	-		Object	The reasons for my objection are:- - 1. There is no reasonable access as there is only one road (Bankside Lane) for both in and out. - 2. There are 4 extremely narrow sections on Bankside Lane. In some cases it is only wide enough for one car. - 3. The footpath is extremely narrow for pedestrians to use without increasing the amount of both people and Cars. - 4. It is virtually impossible to get out of Bankside Lane onto Market Street at peak times due to the amount of traffic on the main road. - 5. Turning left from Market Street onto Bankside Lane is very difficult if there is already a car waiting to get out Of Bankside Lane into Market Street as the road entrance is very narrow there. - 6. Some of the houses on Bankside Lane already suffer from water draining down from the fields due to lack of sufficient drains without more houses being built. - 7. I am concerned about the proposed expansion of housing in Bacup as the increased population will cause Problems for NHS facilities (doctors and dentists), schools, roads, public transport and policing. - 8. The Green Areas must remain to protect the environment and the wildlife around us. There are also quite a Number of bats around this area and other species that need protecting		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1343	Jane	Jones	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32	Object	Development at these sites would attract higher volumes of traffic travelling along Bankside Lane over a more concentrated period of time during the busy morning and early evening periods. This road has limited capacity and the increased levels of traffic could lead to traffic congestion and highway safety issues in this area having a detrimental effect on road safety on Bankside Lane and the busy A681 Market Street junction. - - There are already problems with access for council refuse vehicles due to the parking of residents vehicles along both sides of a narrow road, this has led to the placing of warning notices by the council informing residents that access for emergency vehicles including snow ploughs and gritting trucks is impeded by the number of inconsiderately parked vehicles. - - The vehicular access and car parking arrangements for any new developments would have an unacceptable impact on existing residents in terms of noise and safety, creating a traffic hazard and generating an undue environmental impact, exacerbating existing parking problems and resulting in excessive levels of on-street parking which would adversely affect local residents and the efficiency and safety of the highway network. - The introduction of in excess of 140 new homes; each with an average of 2 – 3 cars per household would produce approximately 300 – 350 additional vehicles per day using Bankside Lane, a road which has single lane pinch point access due to the existing narrowing of the road at its steepest point; which has a gradient of approximately 17%. During the winter months; weather conditions of ice and/or snow constantly prevent 2 wheel drive vehicles from driving up this hill, and lead to accidents when drivers are unable to control vehicles whilst attempting to descend when snow and ice have made this route impassable. -		I am fully aware that there is a need for more housing across Bacup and the whole of Rossendale, but meeting these requirements and government targets for the building of new homes should not be the sole focus of the council. - Understanding the current issues within local residential areas such as limited access due to road lay out, road safety concerns especially when there is an marked increase in the number of vehicles joining the main road from a street with an obstructed view due to the existing buildings (Bank on A681, parking on double yellow lines) should be given the highest priority.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1352	Alicia	Campbell Astbury	-	HS2.13, HS2.32, HS2.11, HS2.12	Object	<p>I have many concerns about the area being developed further for houses. The access road via Bankside Lane is both steep and heavily congested with parked vehicles, with additional traffic there will be issues with passing places being available, as this is already an issue at peak times. - During winter months people at the top of the road leave their cars further down the street, if more cars were to do this the road would be inaccessible. - Bats are known to the area proposed, so how will the new development impact our local wildlife? - Will additional housing cause any issues with rain run off from paving over a large mass of land on top of a hill? Will it cause water-logging of neighbouring properties or any drainage issues? - Land proposed is alongside public right of ways, will new pathways be made available to the local people; children use these paths to get to the recreational ground, which is a safer route as the roads are hazardous with tight bends and lack of pavements on some sections or cars mounting the kerb on others making them inaccessible. - My main concern is the additional traffic on the road and possibly parked cars to emergency services being able to gain access through the street? Many homes on this stretch do not have a drive and the number of cars on the street is excessive and difficult to navigate. Also there are two sections where the road narrows significantly and one of these is steep with a blind corner, additional traffic will add to the danger. - Will extra traffic entering the street cause delays to the main highway as the road isn't wide enough to allow traffic to pass when turning right into Bankside close? - How easy is it for heavy goods vehicles to access the street, especially significant numbers for a development, will this cause delays to residents?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1375	Margaret	Priestley	-		Object	<p>I have examined the plans and I know the sites well. I wish to object strongly to all the development of houses on or adjacent to Bankside Lane. - - The proposed siting of the developments is particularly ill-considered due to access, - Bankside Lane already has a high volume of traffic to the residential properties in the area. - - There is little pavement for pedestrians, the addition of extra traffic would create a safety hazard for them also. The pavements these days are a safety issue due to the amount of leaves from overhanging trees which the council no longer seem to cut back and maintain causing a buildup of slippery moss on the pavement surfaces. - Access is particularly hazardous in the winter months. The area is not always gritted, resulting in cars being abandoned along Bankside Lane as it becomes inaccessible. This leads to a knock-on effect resulting in access issues higher up Bankside Lane itself. - I therefore fail to see the advantage of building more houses in an already built up and inaccessible locations - In November 2013 due to the untreated surface I myself skidded into the wall just below the golf club during winter weather. - The other issue I would like to mention with Bacup itself< and forward thinking, is the lack of infrastructure with respect to banking. Two of the towns banks were closed last year with I think no objections from the council or at least no fight to keep them open that I am aware of. When the banks go people go out to other areas (e.g. Rawtenstall, Burnley, Rochdale, Bury) This will be the case with new residents, most of whom, if in employment, will be working out of the valley making Rossendale yet more of a commuter belt than it already is. Anyone travelling from Bacup via Rawtenstall or From Bacup to Rochdale can testify to this and know that anymore commuter traffic will be disadvantageous and effects all roads in the valley. People work outside the valley will conduct personal outside of Bacup.. - Therefore, I ask that Rossendale Borough Council refuse planning relating to the building of houses on Bankside Lane..</p>		<p>The redevelopment of the old cinema site on Burnley Road needs to be looked into, the building is currently in a dilapidated condition and will only become more of a danger. I can see this hanging on for years and eventually like Smiths Engineering in Whitworth having to be demolished probably at the councils expense under compulsory purchase!</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1429	Nina	Byers	-		Object	<p>1) There would be a minimum of 200 extra cars using Bankside Lane if these houses were to be built! This would cause major problems with traffic building up at peak times (morning, evening, beginning and end of school times) in both Bankside Lane and Market Street. That corner is particularly tight, especially if there is a car waiting to come out of Bankside Lane. Then imagine a queue of traffic in the narrow, single track areas of Bankside Lane (of which there are 4) and you can see that traffic could easily come to a standstill on Market Street! Sometimes it is very difficult to turn right onto Market Street if there is a lot of traffic. - - 2) There is only one way to access these proposed development sites, via Bankside Lane. There are 4 stretches of the road which are only wide enough for one car. These stretches of road also happen to be on the steepest part of the road with blind bends. In bad weather conditions and at peak times this already causes problems without any extra traffic . There are also several further stretches of road which are only wide enough to get a car through due to people who already live on Bankside Lane needing to park their cars on the road due to them not having off road parking available! - - 3) The pathways for pedestrians are very narrow and non-existent in some places too! For example, by Cookoo Hall the path is very narrow! This is also made worse by cars being forced to park partially on the path and bins being stored on the path as there is no sensible alternative due to many houses being built much higher than the road! This makes it difficult for all pedestrians but especially the disabled elderly and parents with prams and young children! - - 4) Surface water run off will cause problems. I live on Bankside Lane, in front of and below Animal Quackers. There is already a lot of water running down from the fields behind us into our garden, which becomes very waterlogged and completely unusable! Our house is also down a flight of stairs which during heavy rainfall resemble a waterfall. I know that some of my neighbours have experienced some flooding into their house as a result of this. If that land was built on then this surface water would increase! This could result in possible flooding due to insufficient drainage. - - 5) There are already problems with the sewers, certainly with my neighbours, several houses either side have regular blockages which need unblocking using rods. Where would the sewerage drain to from the new housing? Would they also run through the same pipes? - - 6) These are all areas of natural beauty and support a lot of wildlife! There are also a lot of bats in the area which are protected.</p>		<p>The infrastructure of the area would be compromised. - - There is no police station - Not enough schools, no high school - Only one doctors surgery in Bacup - Only one Supermarket - Public transport. - No bus route on Bankside Lane as too narrow and steep. - All roads leading out of Bacup are narrow, some are steep and extremely busy at peak times</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1544	Enid & Kenneth	Burke		SHLAA16076	Object	<p>We strongly object to the proposed plans to change previous Green Belt sites to building sites mainly on the narrowness and steepness of the pavements and roads. Presently the volume of traffic is overloaded because most households have 2 or more cars. Visitors to the Golf Club, Football Pitches and Petting Farm add to the problem, especially at weekends when the volume of cars and work vehicles doubles. Last winter the council gritting vehicles could now operate in parts because of parked cars/vans. We have also witnessed a number of near "misses" on the bad bend near to the Laurels Nursing Home.</p> <p>The use of outdoor space is essential for our grandchildren and children, to lose this is not acceptable.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1576	David	Thompson			Object	<p>I object to the proposed housing development sites referenced HS2:11, HS2:12, HS2:13 and HS2:32 listed in Chapter 1 (HS2) of the above plan. My concern is that the connectivity of each of these sites to essential facilities in Bacup Town Centre is unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <p>There are only two routes from the sites to the Town centre, one of which is lodge lane and the other is Bankside lane.</p> <p>Lodge lane is to the South and East of the four sites, and is closed to motor vehicles as a through road. It has a very steep slope with an average gradient of 15% (1 in 7) and therefore does not comply with any national or regional planning guidance as being acceptable for use by pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists. It would therefore be improper to suggest lodge lane as a route from the sites to Bacup Town Centre.</p> <p>This means that Bankside lane is the only acceptable access to the Town Centre for all highway users. However Bankside lane has a particularly steep section for a length of 242 metres between its junctions with Market Street and Maden Road and I believe it to be unsatisfactory as a means of access to the proposed housing developments as evidenced in the following disclosures attached to this letter:</p> <p>Disclosure 1.</p> <p>a. Non Compliance with the Lancashire County Council Code of Practice on Mobility , Inclusive Mobility' Section 3 Footways</p> <p>b. Non Compliance with the Lancashire County Council Transport and Design Guidance 'Creating Civilised Streets' Section 5.5 Connected Streets</p> <p>c. Non Compliance with the Department for Transport 'Manual For Streets' Section</p> <p>7.6 Visibility Requirements. (Note this section includes calculations that have safety implications for highway users and I request that it is submitted to LCC Highways Engineers for verification).</p> <p>Disclosure 2.</p> <p>Breach of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan Policies:</p> <p>ENV1 - High Quality Development in the Borough</p> <p>ENV2 - Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Disclosure 3.</p> <p>Prior refusal of a planning application for development off Bankside Lane.</p> <p>On the basis of the above submissions I request that the proposed housing sites HS2:11, HS2:12, HS2:13 and HS2:32 be removed from the Rossendale Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1586	Adrian	Boyden			Object	Has a resident of Bankside Lane my concerns are of increase in traffic on this busy lane , more accident s and near misses especially on the blind bend . There are no other access routes for residents so to add more traffic is irresponsible.Also how do you propose to get wagons . Machinery .Etc to building sites ? Without causing chaos on a now fragile road .Shows the plans having been thought about properly .		
1588	Alison	Whittaker			Object	<p>I strongly object to these proposed plans to change areas,of previous Green Belt Sites,to building sites.The visual impact of the development will greatly effect my property,building work at the front of my property has already caused loss of existing views and is out of character in terms of its appearance. The proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood, the green spaces and rural views would be lost changing the landscape of a quiet rural area to an over populated housing estate. There would be significant loss of the open aspect of the current residential properties. The enjoyment of the current views, design and landscaping is an important residential amenity, and the loss of these features would have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of the existing properties.</p> <p>The new development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing properties adversely impacting on the character and appearance of the communityin particular the green spaces that is valued open space enjoyed by local residents. Furthermore there is a requirement to enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats and rural lands. Further housing development would result in overlooking, unacceptable high density, overshadowing and loss of natural light. Further over development would be overbearing and result in an adverse effect on the residential amenity of the current neighbourhood. Designs that are inappropriate in there context and fail to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions should not be approved.</p> <p>Unacceptable over development on Bankside lane would adversely affect highway safety and cause great problems for road users,the lane is just too narrow, steep with a blind bend that is already hazardous for road users. The current infrastructure is insufficient to support further increased vehicular access.Please can this concern be referred to qualified engineers for technical clarity.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1620	Jennifer	Cudworth			Object	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the plans mentioned above.</p> <p>My primary cause for objection is on the grounds of safety. Any proposal to build more houses using Bankside Lane as vehicular access is quite frankly dangerous. Bankside Lane already suffers badly with traffic issues - access to the proposed sites is via a steep, narrow road which is reduced to a single-track for the vast majority by parked vehicles. There have been numerous traffic collisions on Bankside Lane due to poor visibility caused by parked vehicles, and "near misses" are almost a daily occurrence. (The problem is exacerbated in bad weather as the gritter encounters difficulties passing the many parked vehicles, meaning there are often delays in treating the road at the top end of Bankside Lane. In addition there are the emergency services to consider - just a few weeks ago, a fire engine was forced to undertake a dangerous manoeuvre to negotiate a corner that was obstructed by parked vehicles, endangering the crew and causing damage to a resident's grass verge).</p> <p>The proposed building works would add to this situation not only short- to medium-term while large construction vehicles access the site, but also long-term due to the increased number of private vehicles requiring daily access to homes. The element of danger to pedestrians, animals and motorists would be greater still if an access route were to be constructed from the Stacksteads end, as this would inevitably be used as a "rat run" for people travelling between Bacup and Stacksteads and wanting to avoid congestion at Lee Mill. Secondly, the fields currently occupied by Huttock Top Farm, and the area of rough land known locally as "Old Joey's", between the top end of Bankside Lane/Rooley View to one side and Osborne Terrace/Hill Crest to the other, are both habitat to a multitude of wildlife including deer and bats. Both areas are affected by the proposed plans. The destruction of natural landscape and the pollution (noise and environmental) brought about by the construction would drive out the wildlife that residents enjoy sharing our green spaces with. Furthermore, Bacup been cited by English Heritage as the best preserved cotton town in England. The construction of new homes would affect the general appearance of the area to the detriment of Bacup's Heritage status. Also to build on the land locally known as "Old Joey's" (see above) would impact upon the skyline of the Rossendale Valley.</p> <p>In view of the above I would urge you to reject the proposals and keep Bankside Lane a safe place for its residents and wildlife.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1636	Kevin	Woods			Object	<p>I am responding to the proposed local plan to develop 4 building sites (100 new houses) off the Bankside Lane area of Bacup. I strongly oppose the plans as the topography of area is not suitable for further development which increases traffic flow, and should be changed back to green belt site.</p> <p>The reason I consider the area to be unsuitable for this development is that the access via Bankside Lane is too narrow and too steep to support development which increases traffic flow. Bankside Lane is single track in parts with both single and dual road junctions joining. The volume of traffic with existing demands is already a significant risk to safety.</p> <p>Each year for the past 20 years living on Maden Road we have been cut off from vehicular transport/ access at least once, when snow falls. Not all residents are able/ willing to buy a 4-wheel drive vehicle and so many become stranded each year. The consequences of this extend beyond personal inconvenience to being unable to get to work, to access emergency services or to discharge caring responsibilities for elderly relatives. Sometimes, due to the hazard of abandoned vehicles, the lane becomes impassable even with a 4 wheel drive vehicle.</p> <p>Since I have lived on Maden Road (above Bankside Lane) myself and family members have been involved in several traffic incidents on the lane in which the topography (and often weather) have been a significant contributory factor. In 2007, my car was collided into on Bankside Lane by a car travelling from Dale Street, in an incident in which the driver misjudged the traffic travelling from four directions between double and single track roads. My car was badly damaged requiring over £2000 of repair work (not my liability), though fortunately I was unhurt. In 2015 during a sudden heavy snowfall, my son's car slid out of control on a descent of Maden Road, whilst avoiding a driver attempting 'a run' up the hill and other abandoned vehicles. His car was written off, though fortunately he was not seriously hurt.</p> <p>I strongly urge the council to reconsider its proposals and find the necessary development sites or solutions which do not involve any further increase in traffic through Bankside Lane. The area does not have the topography to support any developments which would further increase traffic flow.</p>		
1642	Jane	Trivett			Object	<p>If any one lives on Bankside Lane/Bacup and works for RBC they must surely know that the proposed new build sites make no sense at all. Local people know how steep the lane is and unless major road widening took place it will not work. Bankside Lane is totally unsuitable for any more traffic. The recent road resurfacing proved how difficult it is and the Highways people struggled to hastily finish the job even with road closures. Another 200 plus cars up the lane is ridiculous.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1656	K	Jeppesen			Object	<p>Having bern notified via social media about your proposals regarding the Bankside area in Bacup, I must strongly object to it.</p> <p>I am baffled that such an idea can be a serious one! A number of issues springs to mind, and are so obvious, that its hard to take this proposal serious. Firstly the situation about the traffical access to the higher part of Bankside Lane. Blind bend, steep incline/desent. Abnormally narrow footpaths,- or entirely non-existing footpaths, makes it high risk to use this part of the road as a pedestrian. Not to mention , having to ask your children to use them to catch their school bus or go to activities elsewhere.</p> <p>To my knowledge , we have only by luck ,not had any serious accidents with personal injuries, but there has been plenty of bumps and minor crashes, costing residents here extra expense. I would assume that a further 200 dwellings wil take with it, close to 200 more cars,- probaly 300 in my opinion, which would of course also mean considerable higher risk, using our road. I have not mentioned the roadconditions during wintermonths, when ice and snow , makes using Bankside Lane an absolute gamble.</p> <p>In these condotions, many cars are unable to get up the incline, although many "have a go",and therefore get stranded halfway up, abadoning their car, and soon the road looks like an unorganized car-park. And traffic coming downhill the opporsite way, often find it impossible to stop, or even stear due to the snow/ice.</p> <p>Further more, beeing able to stop at the junction with the busy Market Street at the bottom of the lane, is a hazardous gamble ,even more so. Personally, I have, on a couple of occasions "skated" right out onto Market Street, with only Lady Luck to look after me ! I have seen others do the same, and it can only be a question of time, before some major incident will occur.</p> <p>So it seems to me, that somebody in the council havent done their homework, and certainly not used Bankside Lane very often, because any increase in traffic here, is equivalent to asking for incidents/injuries to residents up here. I would think that the land in question, originally was graded "green field" for a reason !?</p> <p>Deer, fox and multiple othe wildlife, is seen here on a daily basis, the view over the valley too , improves our quality of life, and is a daily pleasure. We live in a nice and quiet part of Bacup, and have been looking forward to keep doing that, into our retirement ,- the older part of us anyway. Neighbouring estates of "affordable housing", as the PM is asking for, sounds to me, like housing for clientel, not nessecary with the same outlook on life values !</p> <p>All in all I'd wish you to reconsider these proposals, as they have clearly not been scrutified thoroughly, before they were published. Let the Rossendale council show , once and for all, that it takes its citizens safety and wellbeing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
						<p>into account , when making these kind of plans. We have for years , constabty been "awarded" with council tax rates , that hardly were second to none,- unfortunately in the expensive end of the scale, but at the same time only seen cuts and poorer services in return. (swimmingpools, bin collections and household waste centres ring a bell?) Do the right thing, and reinstate green field areas to be what they should rightly be : green fields.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1660	Rachel	Greenhalgh			Object	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed changes to previous green belt sites to building sites in Bacup. Under the Draft Local Development Plan, there are plans to allocate building land for housing in the Bankside Lane area (site references HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32). As a resident in the area (MadenRoad), I already know that Bankside Lane is not able to sustain the current levels of traffic and that to build the proposed potential 100 New homes would bring the road into crisis. As you are no doubt aware, Bankside Lane is very steep and narrow- at some points little more than single width. Add into this the fact that the narrowest points also have very poor visibility, meaning vehicles travelling in opposite directions frequently have to perform emergency stops to avoid a collision and often have to reverse to clear the way, creating a new hazard for other approaching drivers. I myself have been involved in such situations several times a week and have serious concerns about the increased risks presented by any proposed housing and the extra traffic they would create.</p> <p>As you are presumably aware, the pavements here are also very narrow and walking along them can be very hazardous as the passing cars often have to come very close to or even mount the pavement to avoid cars coming in the opposite direction. We have seen an increased volume of traffic already coming up the Lane to access the Maden playing fields and also more groups of families and children walking up to the football sessions there. I have huge concerns for their safety if the volume of traffic is significantly increased by new residential traffic too.</p> <p>My primary objection to the proposed plans are centred around the increased dangers of introducing more traffic to an already congested and very narrow access road, however I also believe that we should not be sacrificing our green belt land to provide housing. We are lucky to live in such a beautiful area and we should be doing all we can to protect and sustain the very features which attract people to our town. As we all know, Bacup has not seen the levels of regeneration and investment that some local towns have seen. Indeed the centre of town is currently underoccupied and full of empty buildings. Would our local plan not be better off considering how best to breathe life into these areas rather than eating into green belt land which should be left for all to enjoy and encourage a healthy lifestyle? there have been several studies published in recent years that highlight the importance of the natural world in combating the stresses of modern life and it's positive impact upon mental health. Surely this is a reason to protect our green belt land?</p> <p>Perhaps instead of building new housing around the edges of town, we could look at converting some of the empty commercial sites into apartments and low cost housing which would support those who really need to get onto the housing ladder. We have seen several large housing estates already built in Bacup, somebody which have struggled to sell all their housing stock. Do we</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
						<p>need to introduce more? There are a large number of existing houses already for sale in the town and some of these have been on the market for some time. Surely building more new homes will only exacerbate this problem? We should be encouraging new people to come and live in our town, but who will want to buy in an area where the resale prospects are not attractive?</p> <p>I apologise for the length of this email but this is an issue I feel vey strongly about. I hope that you will give due consideration to my concerns, and I would appreciate a response from you to confirm the receipt of my objection.</p>	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1756	R	Prime			Object	<p>The above sites appertain to the bankside area of Bacup.</p> <p>Over the 50 years that we have lived at 48 Bankside Lane we have seen a huge rise in the amount of traffic using this lane from a mere handful of vehicles in the 1960s to hundreds more at the present time.</p> <p>Bankside Lane is a cul-de-sac and obviously all vehicles going up the lane have to come back by the same route.</p> <p>As well as private houses, there is an old peoples home, a golf club, an animal farm and a recreation ground.</p> <p>So there is a lot of extra traffic because of these business facilities plus ambulances, brewery wagons, horse and animal boxes, fire engines, taxis, delivery and post vans etc etc etc.</p> <p>There are times during day when, if you took a ride up here, you might only see a handful of parked cars, evenings and weekends it is a different story. Yesterday for instance (Friday) from our house I could see only 10 parked cars but today (Saturday) I counted 36 ad that is by just looking out of our front door. Goodness knows how many more are parked further along the lane. I know that there has been talk of connecting bankside lane to newchurch road. But that would be madness and create a "rat run". Don't add anymore traffic please, accidents on the lane are frequent when the first fall of snow comes.</p> <p>Cars try to ascend the hill, can't do and slide back into one another. Likewise on icy days the cars slide down and after end up crashing into the wall or each other.</p> <p>Here are a number of blind junctions namely:- princess street lord street dale street police station row junctions with bankside when going up or down the lane. Maden road onto bankside when going down to bacup.</p> <p>Bottlenecks: - St mary's vicarage and the opposite houses. Joy cottage and the mount Cuckoo hall and 24/26 bankside</p> <p>These areas especially the one at joy cottage and the mount where the gradient is very steep and narrow is exceptionally bad to negotiate at the best of times.</p> <p>My husband had a car accident a few years ago coming out of dale street where it is very difficult to see cars coming down the lane, fortunately it was not too bad.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1776	Lew	Wright		SHLAA16076	Support	<p>We wish to add our support to the proposal allocate the area of land owned by Mr & Mrs X for residential development.</p> <p>The land has residential properties to the North and West boundaries and Market St to the East. The land is well situated for residential development. The land is almost surrounded by existing residential development. The gradient of the land is such that with careful landscaping any development will not be a prominent feature from the surrounding area. Access is via Bankside Lane, which in places is narrowed, the additional vehicle movements generated from a minor development will be negligible. There are good Public Transport links within Bacup Town Centre, which is within ten minutes' walk from the site. There are a number of public foot paths within close proximity to the site affording access to Market St. We have made a pre app application to your planning dept. on behalf of Mr & Mrs Kay which has received a favourable response.</p>		
1779	Andrew	Heathcote			Object	<p>I would like to oppose any planning application for any additional housing estates on Bankside lane in Bacup. The road can't handle any more traffic, and I believe that this would have a very negative impact on current house prices.</p>		
1790	David	Trivett			Object	<p>SHLAA16076 - Huttock Top Bacup. HS2.12 Greenfield Designated Greenlands. Urban Boundary. Currently Farmland, grassland, wooded area ,ménage and stables. Yield calculated 66 units. Access off Bankside Lane. Bankside Lane which is narrow and steep towards Bacup District Centre.</p> <p>The above proposed development has conflicting information about the calculated yield, site area and designation. The Policies Map shows the area marked HS2.12 with a yield calculated at 30 units with the balance of the site shown as proposed green infrastructure. This suggests the green infrastructure forms part of the flexible approach for the future maybe?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
1813		Brewster		Huttock Top	Object	<p>We are objecting to the 4 proposed building sites on the Bankside lane area. We object to these plans on the grounds that the main Bankside lane road, which will have to be used to carry all the traffic for these proposed houses, is not adequate as the road is already struggling to accommodate the existing traffic.</p> <p>The stretch of road from Cuckoo Hall down past the church is very narrow, this will cause untold hazards with the volume of vehicles that are going to use the road when construction begins. Not to mention the extra permanent traffic that will be forced to use the road to access their homes. Any further volume of traffic is most certainly going to cause serious accidents and at the very worst, death.</p> <p>We have had an accident on this very stretch of road, so we talk from experience of how dangerous this stretch of road can be.</p> <p>When there is a funeral at the church the whole road is grid locked with cars being blocked in all directions, so with extra vehicles, this is going to make the grid lock even worse.</p> <p>We have a 20 miles per hour speed limit on Bankside lane, but no one seems to adhere to it and nobody seems to know who gives way to who! So, if locals don't know, do you think new residents will?</p> <p>What about when it snows? This stretch of road is absolutely treacherous. When a car is coming up the hill, and another is going down nobody dare stop, so it ends up with traffic both ways skidding all over the place and of course the whole road is blocked. Extra traffic is bound to cause more accidents and somewhere along the lines there WILL BE a death.</p> <p>The plans show that the majority of houses are four bedrooms, this means there will most likely be more than one car per household. So as the plans show, there are to be 200 homes meaning there will be a minimum of 400 hundred extra cars using Bankside Lane. Large parts of the road are only wide enough for one vehicle, and most existing residents can only park their cars on the road because they have no drive.</p> <p>Which brings us to the main point of discussion, Newchurch Road.</p> <p>We can be quite sure that should these houses be built the majority of buyers will be from outside the valley. This means they will be commuting to and from the valley to go to work, when we have ONE ROAD TO AND FROM RAWTENSTALL, to access the M66. This motorway is already chronically over congested as it is. WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM BURNLEY, WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM TODMORDEN, AND WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM ROCHDALE.</p> <p>When we have to have work done on the stretch of road FROM BACUP TO RAWTENSTALL, our main commuting road, to the M66, the backup of traffic is absolutely horrendous with waiting times up to one hour. I doubt we could cope with extra traffic on our ONE ROAD THROUGH TO RAWTENSTALL.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.012	Further comment
						<p>So, the extra strain on our one main road is going to have an impact on the whole of the valley.</p> <p>Then we come to our amenities. Can our Health Centre cope with the extra work load? Are there even enough places in our schools?</p> <p>Then what about our green belt, we live in a beautiful valley, which the council should be trying to promote to tourists, instead of being hell bent on destroying this unique part of Lancashire.</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Object	<p>BANKSIDE LANE, BACUP - HS2:11, 12, 13 and 32 proposes to allocate land which could result in 137 new dwellings off Bankside Lane which is an unclassified road approximately 1.1km in length varying in width and gradient with several pinch points and heavy on-street parking. To the west of its junction with Thistle Street, Bankside Lane provides the sole access to circa 150 dwellings.</p> <p>The existing layout on Bankside Lane is broadly reflected on the 1845 historic map and would not be considered acceptable under the current standards. The land to the west of Bankside Lane is at a higher level than the road which results in high retaining structures and there are buildings on both sides of Bankside Lane at several points which abut the road with no footway provision. Where there is footway provision, the widths are sub-standard along most sections.</p> <p>There is little opportunity for improvement works to the current road layout within the extents of the adopted highway.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would seek a secondary / emergency access to be provided where more than 100 houses are proposed off a sole access such as Bankside Lane. Therefore any development land allocated off Bankside Lane should provide a secondary vehicle access point onto the highway network. The topography of the land presents difficulty in providing a suitable route and within the land that is proposed for allocation it appears unlikely.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has serious concerns about these sites and the ability to provide a safe and suitable access in accordance with the NPPF and adequate permeability for traffic distribution in accordance with Manual for Streets.</p> <p>HS 2.12 – The visibility at the site access and Bankside Lane cannot be achieved and there is insufficient road space to provide a suitable swept path for a large vehicle e.g refuse wagon. There is on-street parking present and the Highway Authority would not support the introduction of parking restrictions on Bankside Lane at this point as there are residents who have no alternative off-street parking provision.</p>		

Number of comments HS2.012

71

Reference HS2.013 Land south of Huttock Top Farm, Bacup

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
443	Jim	Leach			Object	Bankside Lane is already a hazardous road, access is frequently restricted to existing houses by car. There is existing a sign " Gritting Route, Problem access road " Further Housing and therefore Traffic would only add to the existing problems A Domestic Fire would,at present,be difficult for a Fire Engine to attend during the daytime, - at night ,when everyone is at home it would be impossible These areas should be returned to Green Belt status		Not at Present
486	Susan	Ormerod			Object	<p>All of the above sites are in the Bankside Lane area of Bacup.</p> <p>All are Greenfield Sites and should be changed back to this status without delay.</p> <p>All of these sites are currently used by the local people and their children, in one form or another, as well as the local deer herds (of which there are two), foxes, badgers and a host of other wildlife, including the birds of prey from the Stacksteads area.</p> <p>Some of these sites are owned by local farmers to breed and train horses.</p> <p>The vehicle activity on Bankside, where there are three serious hazards on the approach from the town centre due to narrow roads and a blind bend on a steep incline, is already a danger with the local traffic. These three narrow sections are all within a 20 metre stretch and will not allow even two small vehicles to pass. This hazard has been increased by the "home delivery" method of purchasing goods for the already existing occupants and further population increases would inevitably mean increases of delivery wagons and vans.</p> <p>Any changes of road from the Stacksteads area would provide a "rat run" between the town centre and Stacksteads and any road up from an improved "Lodge Lane" would be a worse hazard than Bankside is at the moment.</p> <p>Almost certainly impassible in winter.</p> <p>The current parking situation on Bankside Lane is already causing concern as shown by the council notices which appeared some time ago. Access for the emergency services has already caused hold ups on five occasions know to myself during the past twelve months.</p> <p>In conclusion, these plans, if passed, will implement a serious deterioration in living standards for all existing occupants of the Bankside Lane area and an increased health risk factor for all who use the lane either in a vehicle or as a pedestrian.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
487	Lorna Lucy	Doherty			Object	<p>We live at top end of Bankside Lane. We object most strongly to the proposed 4 new building sites off Bankside Lane. The beginning of Bankside Lane is extremely narrow with room for just one car with no possibilities to widen and very steep, and with no vision round a blind corner. The increase in traffic is definitely not an option due to danger particularly in winter with snow and ice.</p> <p>Also, I believe there is a proposal for Bankside Lane to be continued at the upper end which is now a dead end. This is also totally unacceptable due to the above reasons.</p>		
487	Lorna Lucy	Doherty			Object	<p>We live at top end of Bankside Lane. We object most strongly to the proposed 4 new building sites off Bankside Lane. The beginning of Bankside Lane is extremely narrow with room for just one car with no possibilities to widen and very steep, and with no vision round a blind corner. The increase in traffic is definitely not an option due to danger particularly in winter with snow and ice.</p> <p>Also, I believe there is a proposal for Bankside Lane to be continued at the upper end which is now a dead end. This is also totally unacceptable due to the above reasons.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
488	Helen	Koczur			Object	<p>To even consider planning further homes on any part of Bankside Lane, Bacup is totally ludicrous.</p> <p>The lower part of Bankside Lane is exceptionally steep and narrow in 2 sections and cannot cope with any further traffic. On days that the Golf Club holds events, or football teams are playing on the recreation ground, access becomes impossible. In bad weather, the gradient together with the width restrictions leads to chaos and accidents, of which I have not only witnessed but suffered in the past. There is also limited pedestrian access at these dangerous sections. The route CANNOT cope with any further traffic. As these access problems are at the lower part of Bankside Lane ANY future housing expansion at any point further up the lane would affect this section.</p> <p>We recently had road improvement work which proved access problems. I dread to think what would happen to emergency services under these conditions as access will not be easy.</p> <p>The difficult access means that houses do not sell here, so why on earth build more? I do not see an increase in employment opportunities in the area so the occupants of any new build would travel out of the area for work. This would mean that the volume of vehicles would increase to a dangerous level. If some of the build is required to be for social housing, access for young families with prams and elderly would be impossible without transport.</p> <p>There has been a development of houses over in Weir. All have normal road access, not single track as on Bankside Lane, yet in bad weather the access problems cause the main Bacup to Burnley Road to be severely restricted with abandoned vehicles. Putting further houses off Bankside Lane would also cause a similar problem to the centre of Bacup.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
489	Denise	Duffy			Object	<p>I have lived in the Bankside Lane area some 47 years, in effect all of my adult life. The journeys up and down the Lane have become increasingly hazardous and dangerous and I am appalled that RBC is considering allocating 4 locations for new housing.</p> <p>> For a start the blind narrow bend around Ivy Cottage has always been hazardous and the increase in car numbers has made it doubly so over the years. Further traffic will only serve to exacerbate the conditions we experience daily.</p> <p>> Parking and especially double parking along the Lane and even on pavements has increased significantly. You only have to ask your own drivers (bins, gritting) of the difficulties they regularly face. Emergency services , especially Fire Engines, would also confirm their difficulties along the Lane.</p> <p>> As most home owners frequently have more than one car in their families, sometimes up to four cars once adult children start driving, the addition of garages does little to ease the situation. Apart from the fact that garages are often storage places rather than car shelters.</p> <p>> Although I have personally not been involved in an accident, accidents have happened on numerous occasions. The steepness of the lower Lane, especially in winter conditions, calls for careful negotiation. Again, additional traffic will exacerbate the residents safety concerns.</p> <p>Thank you in anticipation for forwarding this to whom ever it concerns</p>		
503		McKeown			Object	<p>I am against the proposed new housing off Bankside Lane as I am worried about road safety with poor visibility of oncoming traffic in areas and speeding vehicles. Also there would be gridlock at the bottom of Bankside Lane if there is to be additional housing because there are not two lanes of traffic which relies on drivers good faith on many occasions as you travel up the hill (there are many difficulties with this now).</p> <p>I am a resident Meadow Way. At present I have increasing issues with run off of rain water which already requires bailing out of water in winter. The new housing area, no longer being fields to absorb the rain water, will impact further on the massive drainage problem I am having to cope with.</p> <p>I would be very keen to know more about sewage system and how and which route the new system will follow as I have sewage pipe work under my side garden which serves about 24 houses.</p> <p>I am concerned about trucks during the building works and the additional dirt on the roads creating slippery areas for vehicles, damage to the road, and being additionally busy leading to increased chance of accidents.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
534	Romanii	Fitton	-		Object	I most certainly want to object to anymore houses being built on or around bankside lane in bacup. The street is congested with cars and wouldn't be able to cope with more vehicles coming up and down it every day. We also love the little bit of green land we have left and don't want it spoiled by any more houses being built.		-
539	Simon	Midgley	-	HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32	Object	This site would be accessed from Bankside Lane which is already difficult to navigate at peak traffic periods: it is narrow and is accessed from Market Street via a very steep and narrow hill section. In normal conditions this needs extreme care when navigating, in winter snow and ice this access is dangerous and often impassable. Additional traffic generated by housing on these sites (HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32) would make a dangerous situation even worse. Cars are parked on both side of Bankside Lane narrowing it to one car's width in many sections: there is nowhere else for the cars to park. - - Development on sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32 would also be "skyline" development which residents were told would not be permitted. This would destroy the green character and visual amenity of this part of Bacup - forever. - - Currently farmland, these sites soak up precipitation helping to reduce flood risk which development would increase.		Bankside Lane is an inappropriate area for housing development for the reasons already outlined above. It is important that we do not lose this green space on the Valley side.
540	BRETT	HARRIS	-		Object	BANKSIDE LANE CAN NOT SUPPORT MORE TRAFFIC IT IS ALREADY STRUGGLING WITH THE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC.		-
543	Thomas	Hammant	-		Object	Additional Housing off Bankside Lane would not be appropriate for a number of reasons. - 1. Road Safety - Bankside Lane is already an overpopulated route, with a large number of houses subject to a single route up to the housing, with a particularly narrow part of road at the lower end of Bankside Lane. I have personally had a car accident at this point, where a car scraped along my car and then drove off, causing damage. The road is not wide enough here for 2 cars to pass. - 2. Parking - The access route up to the back of Huttock farm is currently not a suitable access road, an additional 40 houses as proposed in this particular development, plus the additional areas on Bankside Lane could result in 200 additional cars on an already overpopulated route. - 3. The Green Belt land that is currently occupied by this and all the proposed areas of Bankside Lane, is critical to the area and needs to be maintained for character and wellbeing of the local area. These areas must be retained as Greenbelt as removing this would result in reduction in quality of life. -		Whilst I understand the need to balance new housing in the area, building on land which is currently used as both a farm and/or public access land is against all previous council policies and should not be entered into lightly. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
545	Lisa	Hartley	-		Object	Greenfield site and should remain as such - full of wildlife e.g. 2 deer herds, foxes, badgers and birds of prey. Landowners train and breed horses on this land. - Bankside already extremely congested with traffic- not enough parking facilities now - council have had to put notices up asking people to park more consideratly as emergency services (fire engines) and council services (gritters) have been unable to pass through. - Bankside has 3 very narrow points where only one vehicle can pass at once and these areas are extremely close together in proximity incorporating blind bends as well - more houses would cause more cars causing chaos and accidents. Any through road to stacksteads that might be made would lead to bankside being used as a racing track for cars to pass through from stacksteads trying to avoid the busy main road! This in itself would be extremely dangerous as more houses Lead to more people living on bankside -probably children - resulting in more road traffic accidents and fatalities! We have enough at the moment we don't need anymore. - It would be a nightmare waiting to happen. - Building houses would cause further chaos with wagons attempting to make their way through when there is so little room - home shopping vehicles struggle at moment and are sometimes unable to gain access all the way across bankside! -		Please re think your plans as they will have very serious consequences for both the public and wildlife of bankside!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
555	Alison	Driver	-		Object	<p>There has been no assessment of flood risk at this site from surface water. The risk is significant. In 2012 surface water flooding flooded the house that I live in. I have just accessed flood resilience money and contributed significant personal financial resources to installing all manner of drainage to most effectively deal with the dramatic water ingress onto my property. The surface water assessment is reference SFRA10 this confirms that this area is low risk. I assume this has been a perfunctory desk based assessment carried out without the benefit of a site survey? - Issues that you must consider - 1. there is only one land drain off the hill into the surface water drain on Bankside Lane. That drain runs under my property. - 2. there is a culvert further up the hill above my house. The water from this culvert goes into the land drain which runs under my property. This drain cannot cope with the volume of surface water run off that the geography creates. This causes annual flooding at the front of my property caused by water backing up from the surface drain. United Utilities have confirmed that the cause of this issue is that it is a 6" drain connection into the surface water drain into the road. The maximum diameter of the drain leaving the water chamber at the top of my front steps can only be 6". The force of the water is too great, it fills the chamber and cascades down my steps. I can provide video evidence if required. - In my examination of the evidence presented in the local plan it has been confirmed to me by an officer of the Council that no assessment of sewerage capacity and management has yet been undertaken. Simple physics suggests that sewerage from 40+ homes cannot flow uphill. How will this issue be dealt with when the area lower down the slope than the new houses is existing privately owned property that would prevent access to the main sewers on Bankside Lane. - I conclude, therefore, that identification of site HS213 is based on inaccurate, incomplete data and that identification of this site for housing has not been thoroughly evaluated.</p> <p>Reviewing the evidence for this area I saw no assessment of impact on the local bat population. I believe that there are at least two species of bat in the vicinity, although I am not able to be more certain. I believe that they roost locally in the trees</p>		
557	michael	hudson	-		Object	<p>first the bankside lane cannot support any more traffic its a 20 mph zone but traffic goes a lot faster,the road floods a lot. most of that from old newtownroad waters running all the time.the inferstructure cannot cope with any more houses or veicles your concerned resident [...].</p>		i think there is plenty of brown sites around this area that could be used.and empty proerties around not being used.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
558	Terry	Nightingale	-		Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposals as follows - - 1. lack of suitable access to to the proposed sites .There is no suitable access to any of these sites with all traffic having to access and exit onto Bankside Lane (see also point 4) - - 2. risk of flooding to properties on Bankside Lane if housing built on green field site to rear. During periods of wet weather rainwater cannot now drain away and as such runs down through these properties gardens onto Bankside lane . increased building will further increase the risk of flooding for these properties - - 3. in addition to the flood risk there will be the increased sewerage demands onto the existing sewerage system on Bankside Lane /Close - - 4. A huge increase in vehicular traffic on an already overcrowded one way in and out Lane . - during winter months lack of available parking / inconsiderate parking on lower Bankside Lane regularly prevents LCC Gritters from being able to access this area . An increase in housing will inevitably bring increased fire risk . - - 5. There will be an environmental impact on wioldlife in the area . Land in the area is frequented by deer and many other types of wildlife . -</p>		
581	B	Woodrup			Object	<p>We are writing to object to the proposed plans to change areas of previous green belt sites to building sites of potentially 100 new houses. These are our concerns.</p> <p>The bottom of Bankside Lane has three bottle necks very steep and narrow and a bad bend only room for one car, a very narrow pavement on one side. Children will be walking down and up to get to school. The school run will be dangerous the road is already overloaded. In winter people try to park at the bottom of the lane in the morning, ready to go to work, because the road is always gritted. The road is sometimes so icy. It's frightening to drive down, as you could easily crash intot the wall or another vehicle parked or moving. I dread to think what could happen with more pedestrians (children).</p> <p>I am also concerned about the fire engines and ambulances and gritter trying to drive up and over bankside lane, especially after 7PM when most residents are home and there vehicles are all parked on the roadside's and pavements. This is a concern now. It's going to be really bad if another 100 houses are to be built. Most households have two cars.</p> <p>What about our wildlife. Bats, hedgehogs, deer, rabbits, badgers, toads and frogs.</p> <p>What about our beautiful countryside and outdoor spaces that we and our children and grandchildren really enjoy.</p> <p>We hope you seriously consider our concersn and objections.</p> <p>It has been mentioned to me that previously planning to build houses was turned down by the ministry of transport. Because of the bottlenecks at the bottom of bankside lane.</p> <p>There's also the question of policing all there extra residents and homes.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
582	G	Pearson			Object	<p>Dear Sirs I will to raise my objections to this Development due to the following reasons..</p> <p>The lane is already over loaded with vehicles from the existing houses, the Council has placed notices on the lampposts about the problem of gritting the lane due to traffic.</p> <p>My wife had a vehicle accident Two years ago as a vehicle reversed into her vehicle due to cars parked on Bankside lane.</p> <p>The road itself in a bad state of repair due to traffic movement.</p> <p>When your refuse teams come to collect they complain of the problems of traffic on the Lane.</p> <p>When the Animal farm is allowed to have functions on such as Halloween there are even worse traffic problems.</p> <p>The Green areas currently enjoyed by the locals and there children will be affected and even lost .</p>		
584	Craig	Ovenden	Next Century Property Services Ltd		Object	<p>I'm am led to believe that a new draft local development plan includes a proposal to allocate land for housing at 4 locations off Bankside lane?</p> <p>As a long term resident of Bankside lane I would object to the proposal on several counts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The lane is already extremely busy and access is always restricted down to a single track lane, if the proposal involves further vehicle access the road would need to be made wider. 2) The lane is in a poor state of repair, adding more traffic would create further ongoing maintenance. 3) We live right at the top of the lane, on refuse collection days, dependent on what time the collection takes place it can take me an extra 10-15 minutes to travel down the lane, the collection drivers are always really obliging and pull over when possible, however due to the amount of parked cars and traffic travelling in the opposite direction I often have to follow behind the vehicle right to the bottom, further housing would only compound the problem. 4) The bend in the road towards the bottom and the further narrowing of the road is a bottle neck often leading to vehicles waiting at the bottom to let oncoming traffic up and down the lane, this sometimes backs up as far as the main road, further housing/vehicular access would cause a danger at the junction with Newchurch road as vehicles que to access the lane. <p>Please can you consider these points before any decision is made to allocate the land for housing.</p>		
586	Sandra	Robinson			Object	<p>This email is in regards to the proposal for housing at 4 locations off Bankside Lane, I am a resident of Bankside Lane,I feel that there is too much traffic at the moment on this narrow road,I am lucky to have off road parking,however most do not which then causes problems for pedestrians.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
592	Jean	Peter Hannan			Object	I am submitting our opposition to the proposed building plans within the Bankside Lane area. Bankside Lane is already overloaded and congested with motor vehicles and we feel that added traffic will cause untold problems. Inadequate parking facilities already add to this problem and we feel very strongly that the above proposals will potentially cause accidents and traffic delays.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
608	A J	Doherty			Object	<p>Email received 29/09/2017: Dear Sirs I attended the road show at Futures Park on 21st September and saw the four sites you proposed for building upon. I object most strongly to all of them. Bankside Lane has a very narrow access from A 681 with room for one car only at the turning. A very steep incline for some yards and then at Dale Street the road narrows even more, again with room for one car only. The incline is even steeper. Near the end, there is a treacherous incline and turn. Parked cars line the whole of Bankside Lane already. In winter, in spite of efficient gritting by the Council, snow and ice can stop traffic. If the proposed building takes place, In the short term, many heavy vehicles would create chaos to our local traffic. Long term, the traffic would double making access a nightmare. I commend the services of Rossendale Council for their efficient rubbish collection and gritting in winter. I am sure they will tell you how difficult it is already to access Bankside Lane. In the case of an emergency - ambulance or fire - we would be put at great risk of delays. Perhaps we could call a helicopter...</p> <p>Email received 30/09/2017: Bankside Lane Bacup proposed building sites I attended the road show on 21st September 2017 at Futures Park, Bacup I object to any of the proposed building sites because Access is extremely restricted. The entrance to Bankside Lane from A 681 is very narrow and cannot be widened. The road is very steep. It continues between a house to the left and high bank to right leaving room for just one vehicle round a blind bend. The road here is also very steep and cannot be widened. Near the end of Bankside Lane there is another very steep incline, round two corners. The whole of Bankside Lane is congested with parked vehicles. If the proposed building takes place, access will be a nightmare. Already it is amazing that local authority vehicles - refuse collection and gritting in winter - manage so efficiently, but it would be almost impossible to continue were traffic to double.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
						<p>Winter snow and ice make the road dangerous and sometimes impassable. In the short term: probably over several years, heavy vehicles would block access.</p> <p>In the long term: four building sites would probably increase traffic to double what it is now.</p> <p>Ambulance , Fire Services and Police must have easy access and these would be put at risk.</p> <p>What do you suggest? Hire a helicopter?</p> <p>Lastly, you are intending to build on virgin moorland, destroying forever the natural beauty and wildlife it supports.</p>		
611	Christine	Hudson			Object	<p>I am writing in regard to the building of 183 houses in all off Bankside Lane. I drive up and down Bankside Lane most days (week and weekend) and it does get very congested at times with lorries and cars, the lane is not very wide and people who live here have to park both sides of the lane which only leaves enough space to get through.</p> <p>The very narrow park of Bankside Lane, as you go up the hill leaves only enough space for single traffic. A lot of people get very frustrated and angry putting it mildly. People forget it is a 20 mile limit so there is often a near miss.</p> <p>If the houses are going to be built 183 in all they will all have to use Bankside, so that means there will be an extra 30 cars. There would be heavy lorries and vans whilst they are being built. Most households are 2 car families hence 380 cars extra.</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>When we have heavy rainfalls which is often. We get a lot of water coming down from old newchurch road and onto the lane. In the last 5 years we have had flash flooding.</p> <p>One day we were sitting in our front lounge and our wheelie bins were floating about in the front garden. We opened our garage doors front and back and it was like a river running down the garden. All our plants were lost as they were in a pile of mud at the bottom of the garden.</p> <p>If these houses are going to be built, there will have to be better drainage. Also we have some lovely open green spaces around Bacup, that we all enjoy and cherish.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
615	Elaine	Garrard			Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed housing development sites referenced HS1.11, HS2.12, HS2.13 and HS2.32 which are listed in the housing allocations section of the above plan.</p> <p>The reason for my objection is that vehicles travelling to Bacup Town Centre from each of these sites will need to use Bankside Lane. This will add to the existing traffic which already presents a significant safety hazard for me personally at the steep and narrow section between its junctions with Maden Road and Market Street.</p> <p>I am disabled and have to travel to Bacup from my house via Bankside Lane either by car or whenever possible by mobility scooter. However, because the width of the pavement is very narrow I have to drive my scooter on the roadway and this means choosing the times of my journeys carefully to avoid peak congestion when I would be dangerous for me to use the road. In particular there are two sections of Bankside Lane which narrow to a single lane and where I cannot take evasive action if a hazard incident occurs. I consider therefore that by allowing additional developments along Bankside Lane and hence additional traffic hazards, the council will discriminate unfairly against me and also other disabled road users.</p> <p>On this basis I ask you to remove the above housing sites from the Local Plan unless the pavement or road widths can be improved to an acceptable standard.</p> <p>I attach a photograph which illustrates the difficulties.</p>		
621	David	Carey	-		Object	<p>Bankside Lane is a cul de sac which already has a lot of traffic going up and down, and parking is on road for the most part, making it very difficult bearing in mind the amount of people who already live on bankside lane, to pass. To add an extra 100 houses and the additional traffic this would cause would make it intolerable for existing house owners. - The added pressure of extra traffic would also affect our children, as there is no place on Bankside Lane to play bar on small play area, and for the most part children ride their bikes and play in front of their houses, this would be an additional safety risk. - It would also ruin the countryside feel we have and make it impossible to walk our dogs as you are planning on taking all our recreational grounds from us. - In the winter we have a lot of bad weather and the gritter's find it hard to get up and grit the Lane, it will be worse with the amount of traffic added. - Again no thought has gone into the additional traffic and the impact on the people living on bankside Lane. - - I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! - -</p>		Not at this time

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
648	Robert	Ormerod	-		Object	<p>These four sites are all Greenfield sites. After the council has done a good job at improving this type of site in Bacup it would be absurd to destroy the fields which complement all the wooded areas of our town. The countryside of Rossendale looks bad enough with all the wind farms without destroying the remaining countryside of Rossendale. Our fields and woods are just returning to being used by the local wildlife and wildlife needs open spaces as well as enclosed spaces to live and prosper. - The traffic on Bankside is already becoming dangerous and unacceptable with the one narrow road and the increases of traffic. Nearly all residents now have more than one vehicle and delivery traffic, usually large vans or wagons, have increased tenfold whilst the road has been left to deteriorate. The slow signs, road centre signs and markings are now almost completely gone and the road, which we were all told was due for replacement surfacing was actually patched up, once again, and still has many holes, dips and bumps. This is especially on the blind steep bend from the town centre. Unless the access situation is addressed the many unreported non injury collisions will soon become serious injuries or fatalities. -</p>		Please take these plans away from from the overcrowded area

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
661	CA and VJ	Jennings	Home Owner	HS2.32	Object	<p>I am contesting these housing developments on several grounds. - - My issues and concerns will be submitted, in writing by the closing date of 9th October 2017.</p> <p>Letter received 06/10/2017:</p> <p>The statement "Improving the lives of people in the Borough" is central to the Borough's current "mantra" regarding their fundamental philosophy and how it is applied in all Departments, and in all the things that they do. However, I feel that some of the current proposals as outlined in the above DLP could fall far short of the Council's altruistic intentions.</p> <p>These are our concerns in respect of the Fernhill Crescent, Fernhill Drive and Bankside Lane development proposals:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation - there is an extensive line of "mixed" trees which decorate the hillside from the end of Bankside Lane above Fernhill Crescent and Osborne Terrace. As far as I understand it, we all have a shared commitment to protect and preserve trees and the landscapes on which they reside. From the above plans, it seems that there is the potential for the removal of some of this tree-line on site HS2.32. This would have a huge and negative impact on the aesthetic outlook onto that hillside, and the potential for land slip, soil erosion, water-runoff and flooding on lower levels • Protecting the Environment - there are many issues here that would negatively affect several aspects of the local environment. Some of which resulting from over-capacity and over-crowding caused by the over-expansion in this area by these proposed developments (particularly along Bankside Lane) • Preserving the local Character - the area around an incorporating site HS2.32 is particularly attractive (especially to the West of Bankside lane) and is an asset to the local area and its residents. It offers countryside walks along heritage sites and long established pathways (ideal for walkers, dog-owners, explorers in general and "kids" of all ages) • Infrastructure - this aspect has never been something to celebrate in the Rossendale Valley area: mostly due to the uncompromising geography of the area rather than the incompetence of the local authorities. However, focusing on one point only, transport through the Valley is often difficult, and sometimes almost impossible at certain times of the day. Therefore, the addition of around 200 units along Bankside Lane would severely impact on both movement and parking. AND, the thought of possibly an additional 350 vehicles exiting onto the Bacup/Rawtenstall road and heading through the valley, doesn't bare thinking about!! AND, what about the winter if it's like the Fernhill area, some of it, or all of it, will not be gritted!! • Impact - in my opinion, the impact from these proposals would be many and 		To be submitted before 9th October 2017.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
						<p>wide ranging, but some would militate against the "improvement of lives"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of Wild-life Habitats - the treed areas and adjacent open fields and moorland, are homes for thriving wild-life. In addition to the usual populations of wildlife, we have seen deer, foxes, squirrels, birds of prey and colonies of bats. The retention of range of wild-life would be threatened by the proposed invasion of their "space" • Ecological/Biological Considerations - these extensive developments could severely compromise the 'health', stability and integrity of the land, its trees; also its top-soil and sub-soil and the life forms that inhabit them • Local Heritage Preservation - there are some historical mule tracks, bridal paths & walkways and access routes into Yorkshire in this area, and we have a duty to protect and preserve them • Land Integrity - we have been aware for many years that the land above part of Fernhill Crescent has been subject to land-slip over the years. In fact, we were told by an authoritative figure that the extent of the problem had been measured over time. This weakness in the land caused our builder to reinforce the retaining walls in the back gardens of Nos 22, 24 and 26. Indeed, the retaining wall at No 26 actually collapsed. <p>Interestingly, the field behind these and other FC properties seems to show evidence of land-slip, whereas the adjacent wooded field seems not to suffer this problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic Balance - given the attractiveness (in all respects) of this residential area, we would suggest that the proposed plans could severely impact upon the "wholesomeness" of this area, and have a negative effect upon the valuation of properties. Which would be, at least, unfair!!! • Practicality and Compatibility - in conclusion, and looking at just one aspect, when we factor-in access roads, traffic congestion and general disruption over time, and deterioration in the quality of people's lives, is it appropriate or acceptable to further pursue the Fernhill proposals?!? <p>Finally, who is it in the best interests of</p>		
667	Helen	Phythian	N.A.	HS2.11,HS2.12,H Object S2.13 and HS2.32		<p>I wish to object on the grounds that the proposed 100 houses will have at least two cars for each dwelling, this will mean a daily increase of journeys by at least four hundred trips on what is, in two places on Bankside Lane a single track road. - If the developers were to continue the road through to Stacksteads prior to start of the proposed development which would give an option to all residents, then maybe the plans would be viable. At the moment if Bankside Lane is left as is, the resulting traffic jams would increase the risks of accidents and also increase pollution,(drivers trying to pass the two single lane place , one of which is a blind bend as well as single lane, would be revving their cars to restart on an exceptionally steep hill).</p>		<p>overall I understand that the Government is laying down numbers for each area, instead of cramming in houses in every available green space left in Rossendale would it not be better to take a flat area of land and build a new village with all required facilities</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
679	leslie	hargreaves	-	h52.11.12.13. andh52.32	Object	Bankside lane is already completely saturated with cars having to park on the pavements and at times heavy commercial cannot get through ie road gritters and refuse vehicles.This is worse when vehicle that normally park on maden road have to park on bankside lane due to winter conditions i.e. ice and snow. Approximately 50 years ago excavation was started for house building was started on the two fields between lodge land and so called bonks area which was stopped because the area in what they call shifting sand. Acces to bankisde lane is tottally in adequate and I totally object to this proposal as we already have our share of accidents on this road		-
714	Marie	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	1) Bankside Lane is already very busy. There's already too many cars going up, down and along Bankside. Adding another 100 or more houses and therefore cars will just add to the congestion. 2) Bankside Lane has tight and narrow bends. Add more traffic to the mix and there will easily be some serious accidents especially in the winter when it snows. 3) Vehicles are already parking on pavements to allow other cars to get past. In case of an emergency (fire or ambulance) the emergency vehicles would already have trouble getting to the destination. Adding those extra cars would make it impossible. The gritter has problems now! 4) The proposed land is home to lots of wildlife including deer, badgers and foxes. Why should we disrupt their habitat? Where would they go? It's not fair on them when they cannot speak up for themselves. 5) 50 years ago they evacuated Bankside because the field was on shifting sands. 6) the local schools are already full, getting a doctors appointment is already difficult without getting extra residents and the same with the dentists. The proposed building seems unrealistic, unreasonable and unsustainable. -		I thought the idea was to build houses on brown sites not green sites. There's plenty of unused, rundown, empty, derelict properties in and around bacup, why not use them? Why take our countryside when there's perfectly good other land to use. Don't ruin it for future generations.
715	Jennifer	Hargreaves	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	Conversion on Bankside at moment, in the snow when vehicles can't get up the Lane this is what happens. The residents who live on Maiden Road and Rode Street occupy both sides of Bankside. - Ordinarily care are parked on both sides of the Lane a lot on pavements so that ambulances, fire engines can get through! - The gritter has problems as well the Council even put a sign up!! - - Loved on Bankside 52 years, all my married life , and about 50 years ago they tried excavating and stopped because of shifting sand. - - There isn't the infrastructure to accommodate this development as the road down the valley to Rawtenstall , and the road to Rochdale are a nightmare at peak times! - - Schools are full. - - Doctor's appointments are very difficult as it is without extra residents. - - I am completely against this proposal.		Thought the idea Jake Berry agreed to was to build on Brown Sites not Green sites. - - - There are plenty of derelict, empty properties in this area without taking our countryside from us!!! - - I'm thinking of my children and grandchildren.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
718	Joanne	Leyland	-	HS2.11 HS2.13	HS2.12 HS2.32	Object	I've lived on bankside lane for 20 years and I'm strongly objecting for the planning proposals of houses being built it's already overflowing with cars as most my neighbours and myself have 2 or 3 cars each and every one falls out all the time over parking as it is now so for more familys to be moving will just cause more problems, the roads are to narrow in many places it really will not work. Over the years I've lived here my 2 daughter's along with there friends who also live on bankside lane have grown up playing on the lane and it's so dangerous with the amount of cars going up and down it's an accident waiting to happen	It's just not acepticable to be building more houses with only a narrow road leading up to bankside lane and an average of 200 extra cars it will be an awful place to live and I love living here
729	Stanley	Horsfall				Object	Email received 30/09/2017: I would like to protest again at some of the the plan for bankside lane Email received 02/10/2017: I want to oppose the plan as the traffic on bankside is already congested	
759	Martin	Stansfield	-			Object	The width of the roads and the bends on Bankside Lane are already an accident to happen and cant support any oncrease in traffic,	have the same objection to the other 3 sites on bankside lane
769	Trevor	Bartram				Object	Access to all of the above sites is via Bankside Lane which is struggling to cope with the amount of traffic now using it. Another 150 houses, as proposed, would mean potentially a further 300 vehicles, which would add to an already congested road, there being only one way in and out of the town. - - With regard to the whole of Bacup a house building project of this scale will bring problems with Primary Schools, which are already full, doctors and roads. -	-
770	Jacqueline	Stansfield	-			Object	The road is too narrow and bendy for extra traffic. Near misses everyday sooner or later there will be a serious accident.	I do not think any of the other sites should be built on bankside lane for the same reason.
774	Stanley	Horsfall	-			Object	Bankside lane is already congested with traffic and and cannot take the extra that the plan would cause	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
785	Robert	Astbury	-		Object	<p>Bankside Lane does not have a suitable road to support the additional through-traffic created by additional housing, there are several narrow parts of the road on steep inclines that do not allow two way traffic and these are heavily congested at peak times. Additional housing on Bankside lane (and the connecting side roads) will make access very difficult and impede the access for emergency vehicles. when large vehicles such as lorry's or bin men are on this road; you are unable to pass them and it is difficult to find a place to park for them to pass you, additional housing will only further amplify these access problems. problems will also occur during winter months when some roads are inaccessible due to snow and normally residents park on the lower roads for safety, this will be more dangerous due to increased vehicles needing to do the same with no additional flat parking spaces provided. The development will get rid of a thriving petting farm which brings in much needed tourism to Bacup. local town development is in dire need of renovation and adding more houses will not improve the local community and will only add more strain to local services.</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
848	LORRAINE	WINNARD	-		Object	<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>		<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
								Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.
853	Ian	Read	-	HS2.5 HS2.32 HS2.13 HS2.11 HS2.12	Object	Fernhill Drive is not capable of taking any more traffic, The main Bacup to Rawtenstall carriageway is at it's capacity for traffic. - The site HS2.5 is not a suitable site for hosing and will cause problems on Fernhill Drive. - The site HS2.5 will interfere with the views of the existing houses		Bacup is full and no other housing should be built until the infrastructure in Bacup is improved ie Road to Rawtenstall.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
906	Graham	Smyth	-		Object	<p>Grounds for objection as follows: - - 1. Access: Bankside Lane is narrow, winding & steep with two blind bends, and already heavily used by vehicles. The bends are dangerous, the more so in winter, and such dangers would grow with any increase in traffic. Additionally there are already access problems for larger vehicles (eg. gritter lorries, emergency services) on Bankside Lane because of its narrow width, compounded by on-street parking on both sides (many houses - notably terraces - have nowhere else to park); again the problem would be compounded by more vehicles using the Lane. Access for construction traffic would also be problematic. Opening access from the other end would not be a solution - creating another very steep way, and a potential 'rat run' for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the main road through the valley. - - 2. Infrastructure: there are issues more generally in significantly adding further to housing in Bacup, given the limited scope to improve the already clogged route down the valley to Rawtenstall / the A56/M66 etc. It is likely that many taking new housing in Bacup would be commuting in and out, reducing traffic flow further. - - 3. Capacity: Bacup is already at capacity in important areas such as schools, health services, dentists and extended services and lacks the capacity to absorb lots more households. - - 4. Flooding dangers – from HS 2.11 in particular, to houses immediately below it, at a much lower level, and to the terrace adjacent to it (60-68) which already often suffers from ground water rising into cellars. - - 5. Landscape – would be impacted. These sites, notably HS 2.11 are at a high level, visible from many points so building would visibly add to the erosion of the countryside amenity in Bacup. It would also impact on wildlife in the area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
907	Carol	Mitchell	-	HS2.11 in particular and also HS 2.12, 2.13 and 2.32	Object	<p>Grounds for objections as follows: - - 1. Access: Bankside Lane is narrow, winding and steep with two blind bends, and already carrying more traffic than is ideal. The dangerous inherent in the bends would increase with growth in traffic; they are also particularly prone to accidents in wintry conditions, which again would be exacerbated. The Lane is narrow throughout its length and now regularly parked up on both sides, creating access problems for larger vehicles (such as gritter lorries, fire engines etc); many householders have nowhere else to park other than the road. The addition of more vehicles (not to mention construction vehicles) having to use the Lane will significantly increase difficulties passing through. If it were intended to create access from the other end, this would create another steep and a potential 'rat run' for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the main road through the valley – hence adding further to problems. - - 2. Other access issues: adding to the housing stock in Bacup more generally is also problematic, given the limited scope to improve the already clogged route down the valley towards Rawtenstall and the motorway – particularly given the likelihood that the majority of any new housing would be taken by people relying on commuting for employment. - - 3. Capacity: Bacup is already at capacity in important areas such as schools, health services, dentists and extended services and lacks the capacity to absorb many more households. - - 4. Flooding dangers: the field at HS 2.11 is well above the level of houses below it, raising potential flooding hazards to them from building. Interference to thw water table could also pose risks to the adjacent terrace (60-68) which already frequently suffers from ground water rising into the cellars. - - 5. Landscape: the elevation of the area around Bankside Lane also means that there would be an adverse impact on landscape as viewed from various points around and above the town. - -</p>		No
1003	john	dempsey	-	HS2.1 HS2.12 HS2.13 HS2.32	Object	<p>There are 3 separate places at the bottom of Bankside Lane, where the lane narrows to a single track. This means that you always have to stop to allow someone through, no matter what of day. Another 200 or so cars having to use this lane daily, would put an enormous amount of strain on the already stretched and limited road space. - This is an area where there are a lot of families and the extra traffic would be an accident waiting to happen, as many of the children play on or near the road. - One of the areas at the back of the semi detached houses is also an area where various wildlife roam and live. There are foxes, badgers and deer that are regularly seen in this area, making their way in or out of the wood.</p>		Only that we as a resident of Bankside Lane are totally opposed to the redevelopment of this area. We feel that it would spoil a green belt area of Bacup that leads onto the local countryside.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1023	Dave	Harding	-		Object	<p>The suggestion that further housing development is suitable on Bankside Lane is bordering on ridiculous. By the council's own admission, this road is already a "Problem Street for access" with vehicles double parking and the road itself being only wide enough for 1 vehicle to use at one time - in particular near the church and indeed pretty much all the way up to the proposed site HS2.11 and HS2.12. - Further housing would not improve the access and traffic density on this tiny lane - it would make it considerably worse. - - In addition to this, the increased noise and air pollution the extra properties would bring would be considerable - both during and after the building process.</p> <p>Rossendale Council showcase on their website a "clean and green Rossendale". Hardly clean or green if we use all our green spaces for building sites. - - The amenities also need to be improved before building many, many more houses. - - e.g. the options available for children going to secondary school in Bacup are extremely poor. The majority of "good" schools are oversubscribed, so children in Bacup are now being given the choice of a school in "Special Measures" - Fearn. As a parent of a child not far off secondary school, I'm considering moving out of the area - I certainly wouldn't consider moving in. - - The congestion on the main roads is ridiculous at rush hour times & quite simply, there isn't the demand for this many houses in Bacup. The development on New Line / Rockcliffe Rd area has never been finished - purely down to lack of interest from buyers. - - There are many suitable brownfield properties in the area that would be ideal for the right redevelopment however developers like the easy option... - - I'm not against change, however one of the biggest "selling points" of Rossendale are its green and open spaces. Remove these & it's one less reason for living round here. There aren't many left... -</p>		<p>The council should be looking at attracting people to the area by improving amenities, transport, education, shopping etc. Bacup in particular is becoming a joke. No Police Station, public transport is poor, schools are oversubscribed and / or failing miserably, the town centre looks rundown and scruffy etc. Hardly an area that is desirable.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1033	Ewan	Rowland		HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32	Object	<p>The additional houses proposed for the above sites will: - * increase traffic to and from Bankside Lane. The road is narrow and steep at key places along the route which allows only one car at a time to pass at specific points on the route. Driver's visibility is restricted by bends and rises in the road causing blind spots for drivers. Because of the narrowness at specific points, cars, vans and lorries have to swing across the road to pass buildings. - *there will also be an increase in traffic such as delivery vans/lorries and their service vehicles. - * houses opposite The Laurels Care Home at the junction of Maden Road and Bankside Lane have no off road parking and therefore park half on the road and pavement further restrict visibility for up hill and down hill traffic. Vehicles moving off the junction from Maden Road have very limited sight of cars coming down Bankside Lane at this narrow point and are forced to creep out onto Bankside Lane in order to safely access Bankside Lane. This also affects up hill traffic at this point forcing them to stop or slow down. - *vehicles joining Bankside Lane from Dale Street also have limited sight of approaching traffic at its junction and have to creep into the road until drivers have clear sight of up hill or down hill traffic. The road is only one car wide at this junction. - *the problem is compounded by traffic parking close to this junction for those attending services at St Mary Church, Dale Street. - *during the football season especially at weekends there is a high volume of traffic going to Maden Recreation Ground which causes congestion before and after football matches. The park is also popular with families and dogwalkers, most of whom arrive in cars, throughout the year. - *farm vehicles frequently use Maden Road via Bankside Lane on a regular basis which adds to congestion creating further potential hazards for other vehicles and pedestrians using Bankside Lane. - * Pedestrians have to cross the road at pinch points along Bankside because pavements stop due to the narrowness of the road. - * most households have two cars and the proposal to build an additional 140 houses on Bankside Lane will increase traffic by a potential 280 cars. The current access to these developments is inadequate for this amount of daily traffic. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1201	Stephen	Anderson	N/A		Not Applicable	The suggested allocation is impractical, but there are approaches that would allow for the residential development of part of the site. - - The site suffers from significant challenges, particularly access and drainage. - - Water runoff from the site currently regularly causes issues to properties on Bankside Lane. Developing the site is likely to exacerbate these issues, or make it unviable in order to resolve the issues. - - In respect of access, Bankside Lane already suffers from capacity issues, primarily due to a lack of off street parking and Newchurch Old Road is a single track historic cart route which has been locally widened with passing places to support the intensification of use at 'Quackers Farm' as a petting farm. - - Developing the site for residential use would be a significant intensification of use, based on the initial density suggestion used for Local Plan purposes. Newchurch Old Road does not have sufficient capacity to cope in its current form and widening at the key point, the junction with Bankside Lane, is not possible without the ownership of residential property being altered. - - An alternative approach would be to redevelop the farm itself for a small number of dwellings, which could be a mix of sizes, tenure types and affordability, re-using the existing buildings and adding in new dwellings. - - This approach would also protect and potentially improve the amenity of local residents given the challenges they have faced with the petting farm use. - - It should be noted that some of the farm buildings appear to be historic in nature, potentially as early as 17th Century and are likely to be recognised on Rossendale's emerging Local List, making them desirable to preserve and enhance.		On balance, the Draft Local Plan is the best and most well balanced option.
1242	David	Greenhalgh	-	HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	My objection is that Bankside lane is not capable of taking any more traffic and that extra housing with access onto this road will not only increase congestion even further on this already busy road, but will also be a potential safety hazard as there are already several narrow single car sections on this road, which have blind spots, due to housing and steepness of the road.		-
1267	Steven	Fielding	-		Object	The access road of Bankside Lane is already congested and way too narrow for cars to pass one another. I think it would be ridiculous to build more houses leading to potentially another 200 cars having to use Bankside Lane. - -		
1270	Beverley	Walsh	-		Object	It is overpopulated now and the road was never meant to take heavy use of traffic. Tight narrow bends and doubled park cars. Pavements are narrow and not fit for families with buggies and the disabled using their disabled scooters. There already have been numerous accidents on this road. Access for emergency vehicles is already very difficult. - Wildlife will be destroyed foxes, deers and badger sets etc will disappear. More houses are unsustainable as we have very limited facilities in Bacup. E.g. Primary schools are oversubscribed. The road from Bacup to Rawtenstall will be permanently gridlocked.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1271	Demi	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	I object to the plans to build houses on bankside lane for many reasons: - 1) Bankside lane is already congested - everyone already parks on the pavements and it's already quite difficult for gritters, fire engines and larger vehicles to get through. We do not need any more traffic added to this! As this will cause a huge amount of problems, not just for the residents but for the local council and the firebrigade. - 2) There are many narrow bends up Bankside lane therefore adding more cars would definitely be a health and safety issue with the only places left to park being near these bad bends causing collisions especially during the winter. - 3) The sites you are proposing to build on are habitats of many different animals ranging from deer to foxes and badgers! These animals would lose their homes which would lead to them dying out in this area as they struggle to survive. We don't want to lose any more of our precious wild life which has lived there undisturbed for many years! - 4) Building on some of these sites would also mean cutting down trees and getting rid of the wonderful country side the valley prides itself in so dearly! We need to look after areas like these and not build houses on them. There are many sites way more suitable for new housing that will not cause damage to the environment in the same way - what about old buildings that are no longer used? Why do we not use these first, this would cause so much less damage to the country side! - Building more houses on bankside would not only mean finding more space for houses but also finding a second route up Bankside to allow for more traffic. Bankside lane does not have the space to do this! It would be almost impossible to do this without causing a huge amount of damage and a huge amount of time, effort and money that could be better spent! Overall I think that building up Bankside would be a very big mistake, one which can be avoided!	-	
1279	Stephen	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	1) Bankside lane is already congested . It has many narrow parts that will become dangerous if more cars use the lane. - 2). Emergency services would have trouble getting past extra parked cars. - 3) It would have an affect on the wildlife eg deer foxes badgers if the fields disappear .	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1291	Alan	Mickleburgh	-		Object	The local and area infrastructure in Rossendale, and Bacup in particular, is insufficient to support the proposed housing developments. Roads, Public Transport, Schools, Police, NHS Services (GP' s and Dentists) will all suffer a major impact from the proposed developments. I am particularly concerned about the proposals for the Bankside Lane area. - - - Bankside Lane has only one access and departure route, via Market Street. Access is particularly difficult at peak times. - - - There are four single lane sections on Bankside Lane which creates congestion problems at any time. - - - Many households have more than one vehicle, and with restricted availability off road parking, vehicles are often double parked on both sides of the road with two wheels on the footpath. - - - Even at non-peak times, larger vehicles have considerable difficulty negotiating Bankside (eg. Trade deliveries, Council and Emergency Services). - - - Pavements are narrow, particularly where vehicles are double parked, creating major problems for pedestrians and the disabled. - - - Drainage is already a concern, with the amount of water draining from the higher ground. If these developments are approved, the excess water will be unable to be absorbed by the surrounding land and will potentially lead to flooding.		
1296	Sharon	Mickleburgh	-		Object	The reasons for my objection are:- - 1. There is no reasonable access as there is only one road (Bankside Lane) for both in and out. - 2. There are 4 extremely narrow sections on Bankside Lane. In some cases it is only wide enough for one car. - 3. The footpath is extremely narrow for pedestrians to use without increasing the amount of both people and Cars. - 4. It is virtually impossible to get out of Bankside Lane onto Market Street at peak times due to the amount of traffic on the main road. - 5. Turning left from Market Street onto Bankside Lane is very difficult if there is already a car waiting to get out Of Bankside Lane into Market Street as the road entrance is very narrow there. - 6. Some of the houses on Bankside Lane already suffer from water draining down from the fields due to lack of sufficient drains without more houses being built. - 7. I am concerned about the proposed expansion of housing in Bacup as the increased population will cause Problems for NHS facilities (doctors and dentists), schools, roads, public transport and policing. - 8. The Green Areas must remain to protect the environment and the wildlife around us. There are also quite a Number of bats around this area and other species that need protecting		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1343	Jane	Jones	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32	Object	Development at these sites would attract higher volumes of traffic travelling along Bankside Lane over a more concentrated period of time during the busy morning and early evening periods. This road has limited capacity and the increased levels of traffic could lead to traffic congestion and highway safety issues in this area having a detrimental effect on road safety on Bankside Lane and the busy A681 Market Street junction. - - There are already problems with access for council refuse vehicles due to the parking of residents vehicles along both sides of a narrow road, this has led to the placing of warning notices by the council informing residents that access for emergency vehicles including snow ploughs and gritting trucks is impeded by the number of inconsiderately parked vehicles. - - The vehicular access and car parking arrangements for any new developments would have an unacceptable impact on existing residents in terms of noise and safety, creating a traffic hazard and generating an undue environmental impact, exacerbating existing parking problems and resulting in excessive levels of on-street parking which would adversely affect local residents and the efficiency and safety of the highway network. - The introduction of in excess of 140 new homes; each with an average of 2 – 3 cars per household would produce approximately 300 – 350 additional vehicles per day using Bankside Lane, a road which has single lane pinch point access due to the existing narrowing of the road at its steepest point; which has a gradient of approximately 17%. During the winter months; weather conditions of ice and/or snow constantly prevent 2 wheel drive vehicles from driving up this hill, and lead to accidents when drivers are unable to control vehicles whilst attempting to descend when snow and ice have made this route impassable. -		I am fully aware that there is a need for more housing across Bacup and the whole of Rossendale, but meeting these requirements and government targets for the building of new homes should not be the sole focus of the council. - Understanding the current issues within local residential areas such as limited access due to road lay out, road safety concerns especially when there is an marked increase in the number of vehicles joining the main road from a street with an obstructed view due to the existing buildings (Bank on A681, parking on double yellow lines) should be given the highest priority.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1349	Nigel	Fagg	Alf's Blackbelt Academy	Proposed Plan to build 47 units above Fernhill Crescent and introduce a link road between the end of Bankhouse Lane to Hill Crest	Object	There are already issues with the traffic and the condition of the road surface on Fernhill Drive due to the majority of houses having no parking facilities, the proposed introduction of an additional 47 units would only make things a whole lot worse. For years the residents on Osbourne Terrace, Fernhill Drive, Fernhill Crescent, Fernhill Close, Fernhill Place and Fernhill Park have endured issues traversing up and down Fernhill Drive with issues relating to the number of parked cars and the really poor road surface. A further 47 units would create another 70 plus vehicles travelling up and down an already in sufficient road system which has already experienced quite a number of minor accidents. - - As a resident of Fernhill Crescent I do not particularly look forward to having houses above me as this is likely to lower the value of my own house which I feel is an unacceptable situation for a resident who has lived in the location for 35 plus years. The reduction of the existing green belt is only going to make the area even less of a desirable place to live. - - Instead of building on green land, planners should be using their talents in developing existing housing that has fallen into a state of disrepair which would only enhance the area and not make it look the way it currently does which is pretty depressing. There are many houses in Rossendale that are unoccupied and in a sorry state of repair. Just imagine what could be done with a degree of creativity at a fraction of the cost. As i drive home I travel past many locations that need some TLC to make them a decent property.		The objection is not only on my behalf but also my wife, we are both totally against any development in the surrounding area. I also cannot believe that the first we heard of this was on Friday 6th October with a note dropped through the letter box, giving me little time to respond not sure what would have happened had we been away for the weekend. - - Does not seem a very just and fair system to us.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1352	Alicia	Campbell Astbury	-	HS2.13, HS2.32, HS2.11, HS2.12	Object	<p>I have many concerns about the area being developed further for houses. The access road via Bankside Lane is both steep and heavily congested with parked vehicles, with additional traffic there will be issues with passing places being available, as this is already an issue at peak times. - During winter months people at the top of the road leave their cars further down the street, if more cars were to do this the road would be inaccessible. - Bats are known to the area proposed, so how will the new development impact our local wildlife? - Will additional housing cause any issues with rain run off from paving over a large mass of land on top of a hill? Will it cause water-logging of neighbouring properties or any drainage issues? - Land proposed is alongside public right of ways, will new pathways be made available to the local people; children use these paths to get to the recreational ground, which is a safer route as the roads are hazardous with tight bends and lack of pavements on some sections or cars mounting the kerb on others making them inaccessible. - My main concern is the additional traffic on the road and possibly parked cars to emergency services being able to gain access through the street? Many homes on this stretch do not have a drive and the number of cars on the street is excessive and difficult to navigate. Also there are two sections where the road narrows significantly and one of these is steep with a blind corner, additional traffic will add to the danger. - Will extra traffic entering the street cause delays to the main highway as the road isn't wide enough to allow traffic to pass when turning right into Bankside close? - How easy is it for heavy goods vehicles to access the street, especially significant numbers for a development, will this cause delays to residents?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1375	Margaret	Priestley	-		Object	<p>I have examined the plans and I know the sites well. I wish to object strongly to all the development of houses on or adjacent to Bankside Lane. - - The proposed siting of the developments is particularly ill-considered due to access, - Bankside Lane already has a high volume of traffic to the residential properties in the area. - - There is little pavement for pedestrians, the addition of extra traffic would create a safety hazard for them also. The pavements these days are a safety issue due to the amount of leaves from overhanging trees which the council no longer seem to cut back and maintain causing a buildup of slippery moss on the pavement surfaces. - Access is particularly hazardous in the winter months. The area is not always gritted, resulting in cars being abandoned along Bankside Lane as it becomes inaccessible. This leads to a knock-on effect resulting in access issues higher up Bankside Lane itself. - I therefore fail to see the advantage of building more houses in an already built up and inaccessible locations - In November 2013 due to the untreated surface I myself skidded into the wall just below the golf club during winter weather. - The other issue I would like to mention with Bacup itself< and forward thinking, is the lack of infrastructure with respect to banking. Two of the towns banks were closed last year with I think no objections from the council or at least no fight to keep them open that I am aware of. When the banks go people go out to other areas (e.g. Rawtenstall, Burnley, Rochdale, Bury) This will be the case with new residents, most of whom, if in employment, will be working out of the valley making Rossendale yet more of a commuter belt than it already is. Anyone travelling from Bacup via Rawtenstall or From Bacup to Rochdale can testify to this and know that anymore commuter traffic will be disadvantageous and effects all roads in the valley. People work outside the valley will conduct personal outside of Bacup.. - Therefore, I ask that Rossendale Borough Council refuse planning relating to the building of houses on Bankside Lane..</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1429	Nina	Byers	-		Object	<p>1) There would be a minimum of 200 extra cars using Bankside Lane if these houses were to be built! This would cause major problems with traffic building up at peak times (morning, evening, beginning and end of school times) in both Bankside Lane and Market Street. That corner is particularly tight, especially if there is a car waiting to come out of Bankside Lane. Then imagine a queue of traffic in the narrow, single track areas of Bankside Lane (of which there are 4) and you can see that traffic could easily come to a standstill on Market Street! Sometimes it is very difficult to turn right onto Market Street if there is a lot of traffic. - - 2) There is only one way to access these proposed development sites, via Bankside Lane. There are 4 stretches of the road which are only wide enough for one car. These stretches of road also happen to be on the steepest part of the road with blind bends. In bad weather conditions and at peak times this already causes problems without any extra traffic . There are also several further stretches of road which are only wide enough to get a car through due to people who already live on Bankside Lane needing to park their cars on the road due to them not having off road parking available! - - 3) The pathways for pedestrians are very narrow and non-existent in some places too! For example, by Cookoo Hall the path is very narrow! This is also made worse by cars being forced to park partially on the path and bins being stored on the path as there is no sensible alternative due to many houses being built much higher than the road! This makes it difficult for all pedestrians but especially the disabled elderly and parents with prams and young children! - - 4) Surface water run off will cause problems. I live on Bankside Lane, in front of and below Animal Quackers. There is already a lot of water running down from the fields behind us into our garden, which becomes very waterlogged and completely unusable! Our house is also down a flight of stairs which during heavy rainfall resemble a waterfall. I know that some of my neighbours have experienced some flooding into their house as a result of this. If that land was built on then this surface water would increase! This could result in possible flooding due to insufficient drainage. - - 5) There are already problems with the sewers, certainly with my neighbours, several houses either side have regular blockages which need unblocking using rods. Where would the sewerage drain to from the new housing? Would they also run through the same pipes? - - 6) These are all areas of natural beauty and support a lot of wildlife! There are also a lot of bats in the area which are protected.</p>		<p>The infrastructure of the area would be compromised. - - There is no police station - Not enough schools, no high school - Only one doctors surgery in Bacup - Only one Supermarket - Public transport. - No bus route on Bankside Lane as too narrow and steep. - All roads leading out of Bacup are narrow, some are steep and extremely busy at peak times</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1458	Jodie	Fairfax	-	Housing Site Allocations - specifically the sites behind Bankside Lane and at the back of Rooley View, but on housing development in general on any green land	Object	<p>I am a current resident of Bacup living on Edward Street with my husband. My parents (who live on Rooley View) and my sister and her family who live on Bankside Lane will also be objecting as will many of their neighbours. - - Empty houses already in Bacup abd Stacksteads - Firstly, I question the need for housing at all. If it is proven that housing is required, then there are hundreds of current buildings lying vacant in Bacup, as well as vacant industrial units where housing could easily be developed without touching the green land around Bacup and it's surrounding areas. In fact, from my house, within 20 yards of my front door, there are 4 houses boarded up that could easily be affordable housing. Not to mention no end of vacant properties on Newchurch Road through Bacup and Stacksteads. The Britannia Estate is still partially empty and those houses have been on the market for 2 -3 years already. - - Infrastructure - we have no police dedicated to the area; schools that are already oversubscribed, no high school or colleges; roads are already in a state of disrepair; public transport links are confined to the centre only; the healthcare in the area could not sustain the influx - doctors, dentists, not to mention no hospital. - - Width of roads (congestion) and width and lack of paths - specifically looking at Bankside Lane, the roads are already congested, double parking is rife. My husband drives a van and struggles to drive it up Bankside. The volume of vehicles required for a large housing development would not be feasible on the current road structures let alone the volume of extra residents using the road. Also, the paths are already too narrow for - the elderly, disabled and parents with prams and young children. - - Surface drainage problems and sewerage problems - possible flooding in some of the areas (e.g. Bankside Lane). Also, there is already existing issues with sewerage on Bankside Lane. The pipes frequently get blocked and overflow. My brother in law is a water specialist and had regularly unblocked it with rods so it stops running into his and other residents gardens. More sewage is not sustainable with the current system. - - Traffic in and out of Bacup at peak times - I commute to Salford daily. It often takes me 30 - 40 minutes to drive the 10 minutes to Rawtenstall at rush hour. This would increase. - - Wildlife and Areas of natural beauty - As already mentioned, I don't believe there is a need to build on green land, for example, behind Bankside near Animal Quackers. The impact on local residents, the environment and wildlife in the area will be catastrophic, and when there are many other options within current buildings and land, and so many empty houses, I don't believe this is needed. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1544	Enid & Kenneth	Burke		SHLAA16077	Object	<p>We strongly object to the proposed plans to change previous Green Belt sites to building sites mainly on the narrowness and steepness of the pavements and roads. Presently the volume of traffic is overloaded because most households have 2 or more cars. Visitors to the Golf Club, Football Pitches and Petting Farm add to the problem, especially at weekends when the volume of cars and work vehicles doubles. Last winter the council gritting vehicles could now operate in parts because of parked cars/vans. We have also witnessed a number of near "misses" on the bad bend near to the Laurels Nursing Home.</p> <p>The use of outdoor space is essential for our grandchildren and children, to lose this is not acceptable.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1576	David	Thompson			Object	<p>I object to the proposed housing development sites referenced HS2:11, HS2:12, HS2:13 and HS2:32 listed in Chapter 1 (HS2) of the above plan. My concern is that the connectivity of each of these sites to essential facilities in Bacup Town Centre is unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <p>There are only two routes from the sites to the Town centre, one of which is lodge lane and the other is Bankside lane.</p> <p>Lodge lane is to the South and East of the four sites, and is closed to motor vehicles as a through road. It has a very steep slope with an average gradient of 15% (1 in 7) and therefore does not comply with any national or regional planning guidance as being acceptable for use by pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists. It would therefore be improper to suggest lodge lane as a route from the sites to Bacup Town Centre.</p> <p>This means that Bankside lane is the only acceptable access to the Town Centre for all highway users. However Bankside lane has a particularly steep section for a length of 242 metres between its junctions with Market Street and Maden Road and I believe it to be unsatisfactory as a means of access to the proposed housing developments as evidenced in the following disclosures attached to this letter:</p> <p>Disclosure 1.</p> <p>a. Non Compliance with the Lancashire County Council Code of Practice on Mobility , Inclusive Mobility' Section 3 Footways</p> <p>b. Non Compliance with the Lancashire County Council Transport and Design Guidance 'Creating Civilised Streets' Section 5.5 Connected Streets</p> <p>c. Non Compliance with the Department for Transport 'Manual For Streets' Section</p> <p>7.6 Visibility Requirements. (Note this section includes calculations that have safety implications for highway users and I request that it is submitted to LCC Highways Engineers for verification).</p> <p>Disclosure 2.</p> <p>Breach of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan Policies:</p> <p>ENV1 - High Quality Development in the Borough</p> <p>ENV2 - Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Disclosure 3.</p> <p>Prior refusal of a planning application for development off Bankside Lane.</p> <p>On the basis of the above submissions I request that the proposed housing sites HS2:11, HS2:12, HS2:13 and HS2:32 be removed from the Rossendale Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1586	Adrian	Boyden			Object	Has a resident of Bankside Lane my concerns are of increase in traffic on this busy lane , more accident s and near misses especially on the blind bend . There are no other access routes for residents so to add more traffic is irresponsible.Also how do you propose to get wagons . Machinery .Etc to building sites ? Without causing chaos on a now fragile road .Shows the plans having been thought about properly .		
1588	Alison	Whittaker			Object	<p>I strongly object to these proposed plans to change areas,of previous Green Belt Sites,to building sites.The visual impact of the development will greatly effect my property,building work at the front of my property has already caused loss of existing views and is out of character in terms of its appearance. The proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood, the green spaces and rural views would be lost changing the landscape of a quiet rural area to an over populated housing estate. There would be significant loss of the open aspect of the current residential properties. The enjoyment of the current views, design and landscaping is an important residential amenity, and the loss of these features would have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of the existing properties.</p> <p>The new development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing properties adversely impacting on the character and appearance of the communityin particular the green spaces that is valued open space enjoyed by local residents. Furthermore there is a requirement to enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats and rural lands. Further housing development would result in overlooking, unacceptable high density, overshadowing and loss of natural light. Further over development would be overbearing and result in an adverse effect on the residential amenity of the current neighbourhood. Designs that are inappropriate in there context and fail to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions should not be approved.</p> <p>Unacceptable over development on Bankside lane would adversely affect highway safety and cause great problems for road users,the lane is just too narrow, steep with a blind bend that is already hazardous for road users. The current infrastructure is insufficient to support further increased vehicular access.Please can this concern be referred to qualified engineers for technical clarity.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1620	Jennifer	Cudworth			Object	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the plans mentioned above.</p> <p>My primary cause for objection is on the grounds of safety. Any proposal to build more houses using Bankside Lane as vehicular access is quite frankly dangerous. Bankside Lane already suffers badly with traffic issues - access to the proposed sites is via a steep, narrow road which is reduced to a single-track for the vast majority by parked vehicles. There have been numerous traffic collisions on Bankside Lane due to poor visibility caused by parked vehicles, and "near misses" are almost a daily occurrence. (The problem is exacerbated in bad weather as the gritter encounters difficulties passing the many parked vehicles, meaning there are often delays in treating the road at the top end of Bankside Lane. In addition there are the emergency services to consider - just a few weeks ago, a fire engine was forced to undertake a dangerous manoeuvre to negotiate a corner that was obstructed by parked vehicles, endangering the crew and causing damage to a resident's grass verge).</p> <p>The proposed building works would add to this situation not only short- to medium-term while large construction vehicles access the site, but also long-term due to the increased number of private vehicles requiring daily access to homes. The element of danger to pedestrians, animals and motorists would be greater still if an access route were to be constructed from the Stacksteads end, as this would inevitably be used as a "rat run" for people travelling between Bacup and Stacksteads and wanting to avoid congestion at Lee Mill. Secondly, the fields currently occupied by Huttock Top Farm, and the area of rough land known locally as "Old Joey's", between the top end of Bankside Lane/Rooley View to one side and Osborne Terrace/Hill Crest to the other, are both habitat to a multitude of wildlife including deer and bats. Both areas are affected by the proposed plans. The destruction of natural landscape and the pollution (noise and environmental) brought about by the construction would drive out the wildlife that residents enjoy sharing our green spaces with. Furthermore, Bacup been cited by English Heritage as the best preserved cotton town in England. The construction of new homes would affect the general appearance of the area to the detriment of Bacup's Heritage status. Also to build on the land locally known as "Old Joey's" (see above) would impact upon the skyline of the Rossendale Valley.</p> <p>In view of the above I would urge you to reject the proposals and keep Bankside Lane a safe place for its residents and wildlife.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1636	Kevin	Woods			Object	<p>I am responding to the proposed local plan to develop 4 building sites (100 new houses) off the Bankside Lane area of Bacup. I strongly oppose the plans as the topography of area is not suitable for further development which increases traffic flow, and should be changed back to green belt site.</p> <p>The reason I consider the area to be unsuitable for this development is that the access via Bankside Lane is too narrow and too steep to support development which increases traffic flow. Bankside Lane is single track in parts with both single and dual road junctions joining. The volume of traffic with existing demands is already a significant risk to safety.</p> <p>Each year for the past 20 years living on Maden Road we have been cut off from vehicular transport/ access at least once, when snow falls. Not all residents are able/ willing to buy a 4-wheel drive vehicle and so many become stranded each year. The consequences of this extend beyond personal inconvenience to being unable to get to work, to access emergency services or to discharge caring responsibilities for elderly relatives. Sometimes, due to the hazard of abandoned vehicles, the lane becomes impassable even with a 4 wheel drive vehicle.</p> <p>Since I have lived on Maden Road (above Bankside Lane) myself and family members have been involved in several traffic incidents on the lane in which the topography (and often weather) have been a significant contributory factor. In 2007, my car was collided into on Bankside Lane by a car travelling from Dale Street, in an incident in which the driver misjudged the traffic travelling from four directions between double and single track roads. My car was badly damaged requiring over £2000 of repair work (not my liability), though fortunately I was unhurt. In 2015 during a sudden heavy snowfall, my son's car slid out of control on a descent of Maden Road, whilst avoiding a driver attempting 'a run' up the hill and other abandoned vehicles. His car was written off, though fortunately he was not seriously hurt.</p> <p>I strongly urge the council to reconsider its proposals and find the necessary development sites or solutions which do not involve any further increase in traffic through Bankside Lane. The area does not have the topography to support any developments which would further increase traffic flow.</p>		
1642	Jane	Trivett			Object	<p>If any one lives on Bankside Lane/Bacup and works for RBC they must surely know that the proposed new build sites make no sense at all. Local people know how steep the lane is and unless major road widening took place it will not work. Bankside Lane is totally unsuitable for any more traffic. The recent road resurfacing proved how difficult it is and the Highways people struggled to hastily finish the job even with road closures. Another 200 plus cars up the lane is ridiculous.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1656	K	Jeppesen			Object	<p>Having bern notified via social media about your proposals regarding the Bankside area in Bacup, I must strongly object to it.</p> <p>I am baffled that such an idea can be a serious one! A number of issues springs to mind, and are so obvious, that its hard to take this proposal serious. Firstly the situation about the traffical access to the higher part of Bankside Lane. Blind bend, steep incline/desent. Abnormally narrow footpaths,- or entirely non-existing footpaths, makes it high risk to use this part of the road as a pedestrian. Not to mention , having to ask your children to use them to catch their school bus or go to activities elsewhere.</p> <p>To my knowledge , we have only by luck ,not had any serious accidents with personal injuries, but there has been plenty of bumps and minor crashes, costing residents here extra expense. I would assume that a further 200 dwellings wil take with it, close to 200 more cars,- probaly 300 in my opinion, which would of course also mean considerable higher risk, using our road. I have not mentioned the roadconditions during wintermonths, when ice and snow , makes using Bankside Lane an absolute gamble.</p> <p>In these condotions, many cars are unable to get up the incline, although many "have a go",and therefore get stranded halfway up, abadoning their car, and soon the road looks like an unorganized car-park. And traffic coming downhill the opporsite way, often find it impossible to stop, or even stear due to the snow/ice.</p> <p>Further more, beeing able to stop at the junction with the busy Market Street at the bottom of the lane, is a hazardous gamble ,even more so. Personally, I have, on a couple of occasions "skated" right out onto Market Street, with only Lady Luck to look after me ! I have seen others do the same, and it can only be a question of time, before some major incident will occur.</p> <p>So it seems to me, that somebody in the council havent done their homework, and certainly not used Bankside Lane very often, because any increase in traffic here, is equivalent to asking for incidents/injuries to residents up here. I would think that the land in question, originally was graded "green field" for a reason !?</p> <p>Deer, fox and multiple othe wildlife, is seen here on a daily basis, the view over the valley too , improves our quality of life, and is a daily pleasure. We live in a nice and quiet part of Bacup, and have been looking forward to keep doing that, into our retirement ,- the older part of us anyway. Neighbouring estates of "affordable housing", as the PM is asking for, sounds to me, like housing for clientel, not nessecary with the same outlook on life values !</p> <p>All in all I'd wish you to reconsider these proposals, as they have clearly not been scrutified thoroughly, before they were published. Let the Rossendale council show , once and for all, that it takes its citizens safety and wellbeing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
						<p>into account , when making these kind of plans. We have for years , constabty been "awarded" with council tax rates , that hardly were second to none,- unfortunately in the expensive end of the scale, but at the same time only seen cuts and poorer services in return. (swimmingpools, bin collections and household waste centres ring a bell?) Do the right thing, and reinstate green field areas to be what they should rightly be : green fields.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1660	Rachel	Greenhalgh			Object	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed changes to previous green belt sites to building sites in Bacup. Under the Draft Local Development Plan, there are plans to allocate building land for housing in the Bankside Lane area (site references HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32). As a resident in the area (MadenRoad), I already know that Bankside Lane is not able to sustain the current levels of traffic and that to build the proposed potential 100 New homes would bring the road into crisis. As you are no doubt aware, Bankside Lane is very steep and narrow- at some points little more than single width. Add into this the fact that the narrowest points also have very poor visibility, meaning vehicles travelling in opposite directions frequently have to perform emergency stops to avoid a collision and often have to reverse to clear the way, creating a new hazard for other approaching drivers. I myself have been involved in such situations several times a week and have serious concerns about the increased risks presented by any proposed housing and the extra traffic they would create.</p> <p>As you are presumably aware, the pavements here are also very narrow and walking along them can be very hazardous as the passing cars often have to come very close to or even mount the pavement to avoid cars coming in the opposite direction. We have seen an increased volume of traffic already coming up the Lane to access the Maden playing fields and also more groups of families and children walking up to the football sessions there. I have huge concerns for their safety if the volume of traffic is significantly increased by new residential traffic too.</p> <p>My primary objection to the proposed plans are centred around the increased dangers of introducing more traffic to an already congested and very narrow access road, however I also believe that we should not be sacrificing our green belt land to provide housing. We are lucky to live in such a beautiful area and we should be doing all we can to protect and sustain the very features which attract people to our town. As we all know, Bacup has not seen the levels of regeneration and investment that some local towns have seen. Indeed the centre of town is currently underoccupied and full of empty buildings. Would our local plan not be better off considering how best to breathe life into these areas rather than eating into green belt land which should be left for all to enjoy and encourage a healthy lifestyle? there have been several studies published in recent years that highlight the importance of the natural world in combating the stresses of modern life and it's positive impact upon mental health. Surely this is a reason to protect our green belt land?</p> <p>Perhaps instead of building new housing around the edges of town, we could look at converting some of the empty commercial sites into apartments and low cost housing which would support those who really need to get onto the housing ladder. We have seen several large housing estates already built in Bacup, somebody which have struggled to sell all their housing stock. Do we</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
						<p>need to introduce more? There are a large number of existing houses already for sale in the town and some of these have been on the market for some time. Surely building more new homes will only exacerbate this problem? We should be encouraging new people to come and live in our town, but who will want to buy in an area where the resale prospects are not attractive?</p> <p>I apologise for the length of this email but this is an issue I feel vey strongly about. I hope that you will give due consideration to my concerns, and I would appreciate a response from you to confirm the receipt of my objection.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1756	R	Prime			Object	<p>The above sites appertain to the bankside area of Bacup.</p> <p>Over the 50 years that we have lived at 48 Bankside Lane we have seen a huge rise in the amount of traffic using this lane from a mere handful of vehicles in the 1960s to hundreds more at the present time.</p> <p>Bankside Lane is a cul-de-sac and obviously all vehicles going up the lane have to come back by the same route.</p> <p>As well as private houses, there is an old peoples home, a golf club, an animal farm and a recreation ground.</p> <p>So there is a lot of extra traffic because of these business facilities plus ambulances, brewery wagons, horse and animal boxes, fire engines, taxis, delivery and post vans etc etc etc.</p> <p>There are times during day when, if you took a ride up here, you might only see a handful of parked cars, evenings and weekends it is a different story. Yesterday for instance (Friday) from our house I could see only 10 parked cars but today (Saturday) I counted 36 ad that is by just looking out of our front door. Goodness knows how many more are parked further along the lane.</p> <p>I know that there has been talk of connecting bankside lane to newchurch road. But that would be madness and create a "rat run". Don't add anymore traffic please, accidents on the lane are frequent when the first fall of snow comes.</p> <p>Cars try to ascend the hill, can't do and slide back into one another. Likewise on icy days the cars slide down and after end up crashing into the wall or each other.</p> <p>Here are a number of blind junctions namely:- princess street lord street dale street police station row junctions with bankside when going up or down the lane. Maden road onto bankside when going down to bacup.</p> <p>Bottlenecks: - St mary's vicarage and the opposite houses. Joy cottage and the mount Cuckoo hall and 24/26 bankside</p> <p>These areas especially the one at joy cottage and the mount where the gradient is very steep and narrow is exceptionally bad to negotiate at the best of times.</p> <p>My husband had a car accident a few years ago coming out of dale street where it is very difficult to see cars coming down the lane, fortunately it was not too bad.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1779	Andrew	Heathcote			Object	I would like to oppose any planning application for any additional housing estates on Bankside lane in Bacup. The road can't handle any more traffic, and I believe that this would have a very negative impact on current house prices.		
1790	David	Trivett		SHLAA16077 Land south of Huttock Top Farm Bacup	Object	<p>SHLAA16077- Land south of Huttock Top Farm Bacup. HS2.13 Greenfield. Countryside adjoining the urban area. Currently Grassland and private garden, small area of storage for the farm. Yield calculated 40 units. Access off Bankside Lane via Newchurch (Old) Road which is a narrow lane. The proposed development access is identified incorrectly as Newchurch Road in Appendix E.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>The images provided to illustrate the pinch points and hazards already present with the existing volume of traffic on Bankside Lane. Winter conditions make these sections of Bankside Lane even more hazardous.</p> <p>More houses means more associated traffic for residents, visitors, large delivery vehicles, refuse vehicles, emergency services vehicles. More traffic joining Market Street at a difficult junction.</p> <p>All the development proposals with connections to Bankside Lane should be abandoned on the grounds of public highways safety.</p> <p>Access is also required by vehicles to and from Animal Quackers, Maden Recreation Ground and Bacup Golf Club.</p> <p>Why generate more traffic by the proposed developments with access via Bankside Lane?</p> <p>Please see appendix for photographs.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
1813		Brewster		Land south of Huttock Top Farm	Object	<p>We are objecting to the 4 proposed building sites on the Bankside lane area. We object to these plans on the grounds that the main Bankside lane road, which will have to be used to carry all the traffic for these proposed houses, is not adequate as the road is already struggling to accommodate the existing traffic.</p> <p>The stretch of road from Cuckoo Hall down past the church is very narrow, this will cause untold hazards with the volume of vehicles that are going to use the road when construction begins. Not to mention the extra permanent traffic that will be forced to use the road to access their homes. Any further volume of traffic is most certainly going to cause serious accidents and at the very worst, death.</p> <p>We have had an accident on this very stretch of road, so we talk from experience of how dangerous this stretch of road can be.</p> <p>When there is a funeral at the church the whole road is grid locked with cars being blocked in all directions, so with extra vehicles, this is going to make the grid lock even worse.</p> <p>We have a 20 miles per hour speed limit on Bankside lane, but no one seems to adhere to it and nobody seems to know who gives way to who! So, if locals don't know, do you think new residents will?</p> <p>What about when it snows? This stretch of road is absolutely treacherous. When a car is coming up the hill, and another is going down nobody dare stop, so it ends up with traffic both ways skidding all over the place and of course the whole road is blocked. Extra traffic is bound to cause more accidents and somewhere along the lines there WILL BE a death.</p> <p>The plans show that the majority of houses are four bedrooms, this means there will most likely be more than one car per household. So as the plans show, there are to be 200 homes meaning there will be a minimum of 400 hundred extra cars using Bankside Lane. Large parts of the road are only wide enough for one vehicle, and most existing residents can only park their cars on the road because they have no drive.</p> <p>Which brings us to the main point of discussion, Newchurch Road.</p> <p>We can be quite sure that should these houses be built the majority of buyers will be from outside the valley. This means they will be commuting to and from the valley to go to work, when we have ONE ROAD TO AND FROM RAWTENSTALL, to access the M66. This motorway is already chronically over congested as it is. WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM BURNLEY, WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM TODMORDEN, AND WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM ROCHDALE.</p> <p>When we have to have work done on the stretch of road FROM BACUP TO RAWTENSTALL, our main commuting road, to the M66, the backup of traffic is absolutely horrendous with waiting times up to one hour. I doubt we could cope with extra traffic on our ONE ROAD THROUGH TO RAWTENSTALL.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.013	Further comment
						<p>So, the extra strain on our one main road is going to have an impact on the whole of the valley.</p> <p>Then we come to our amenities. Can our Health Centre cope with the extra work load? Are there even enough places in our schools?</p> <p>Then what about our green belt, we live in a beautiful valley, which the council should be trying to promote to tourists, instead of being hell bent on destroying this unique part of Lancashire.</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BANKSIDE LANE, BACUP - HS2:11, 12, 13 and 32 proposes to allocate land which could result in 137 new dwellings off Bankside Lane which is an unclassified road approximately 1.1km in length varying in width and gradient with several pinch points and heavy on-street parking. To the west of its junction with Thistle Street, Bankside Lane provides the sole access to circa 150 dwellings. <p>The existing layout on Bankside Lane is broadly reflected on the 1845 historic map and would not be considered acceptable under the current standards. The land to the west of Bankside Lane is at a higher level than the road which results in high retaining structures and there are buildings on both sides of Bankside Lane at several points which abut the road with no footway provision. Where there is footway provision, the widths are sub-standard along most sections.</p> <p>There is little opportunity for improvement works to the current road layout within the extents of the adopted highway.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would seek a secondary / emergency access to be provided where more than 100 houses are proposed off a sole access such as Bankside Lane. Therefore any development land allocated off Bankside Lane should provide a secondary vehicle access point onto the highway network. The topography of the land presents difficulty in providing a suitable route and within the land that is proposed for allocation it appears unlikely.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has serious concerns about these sites and the ability to provide a safe and suitable access in accordance with the NPPF and adequate permeability for traffic distribution in accordance with Manual for Streets.</p>		
Number of comments						72	HS2.013	
Reference		HS2.014		Land off Burnley Road and Meadows Avenue, Bacup				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.014	Further comment
1756	R	Prime			Object	<p>The above sites appertain to the bankside area of Bacup.</p> <p>Over the 50 years that we have lived at 48 Bankside Lane we have seen a huge rise in the amount of traffic using this lane from a mere handful of vehicles in the 1960s to hundreds more at the present time.</p> <p>Bankside Lane is a cul-de-sac and obviously all vehicles going up the lane have to come back by the same route.</p> <p>As well as private houses, there is an old peoples home, a golf club, an animal farm and a recreation ground.</p> <p>So there is a lot of extra traffic because of these business facilities plus ambulances, brewery wagons, horse and animal boxes, fire engines, taxis, delivery and post vans etc etc etc.</p> <p>There are times during day when, if you took a ride up here, you might only see a handful of parked cars, evenings and weekends it is a different story. Yesterday for instance (Friday) from our house I could see only 10 parked cars but today (Saturday) I counted 36 ad that is by just looking out of our front door. Goodness knows how many more are parked further along the lane. I know that there has been talk of connecting bankside lane to newchurch road. But that would be madness and create a "rat run". Don't add anymore traffic please, accidents on the lane are frequent when the first fall of snow comes.</p> <p>Cars try to ascend the hill, can't do and slide back into one another. Likewise on icy days the cars slide down and after end up crashing into the wall or each other.</p> <p>Here are a number of blind junctions namely:- princess street lord street dale street police station row junctions with bankside when going up or down the lane. Maden road onto bankside when going down to bacup.</p> <p>Bottlenecks: - St mary's vicarage and the opposite houses. Joy cottage and the mount Cuckoo hall and 24/26 bankside</p> <p>These areas especially the one at joy cottage and the mount where the gradient is very steep and narrow is exceptionally bad to negotiate at the best of times.</p> <p>My husband had a car accident a few years ago coming out of dale street where it is very difficult to see cars coming down the lane, fortunately it was not too bad.</p>		

Number of comments HS2.014

1

Reference	HS2.016	Land behind Penine Road and to the north east of Pennine Road
-----------	---------	---

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.016	Further comment
55	Kirsty	Walker	-		Object	The drainage in my garden is already terrible, the garden in winter turns into what only can be described as a swamp, I am concerned that putting more houses behind my house would just exacerbate the issue. I also feel that putting houses on that site would decrease the value of my home greatly for when we come to sell, the views and greenery are a selling point, it was why my partner and I purchased the house originally. I also do not believe that the roads can actually handle more traffic, even now the roads down to the main road are congested and are dangerous, there have been a number of incidents of children being run over on pennine road, one quite recently, and more traffic just increases that risk. - I worry that adding more houses to that site will give criminals a better chance of sneaking into the gardens on goldcrest avenues as they will have more cover. - The field is also a haven to wildlife, Its great to have somewhere on your doorstep to show children where wildlife lives. I also see a lot of people use the area to walk their dogs, and the bike track is the only area close to pennine road for the children to go! It keeps them out of trouble, something which, some of the children of Bacup have a hard time steering clear of! -		There are other areas in Bacup to build on that wouldn't cause as much disruption to as many people. I do believe we need more houses but there needs to be more thought out into it. The roads are horrendous as it is, if 4000 houses are built which schools will the extra children attend? As ours are full enough! Same for the doctors surgeries, there's a week long wait for a doctor. Imagine at least another 16,000 people adding to it.
61	lucy	Greenwood	-		Object	I strongly object to houses being built on the grass area behind my house as this particular area is used by so many people including my self, my children. - Its the one place people love to go to let the kids run free. Familys go their on a sunny day , play ball etc, walk the dog and make use of the open space. Bike riders, den building thats what i would like to see when i look out the window not houses and certainly not next to my fence , might as well put them on the door step. - W e already have poor drainage when it rains heavily. - Also their would be more traffic passing by and already this year a child has been run over , right outside my door infact . The only way to build houses on this location is to build another road.		I would like you to take into consideration the peoples views on this particular site . as it is well used by so many and we would like to continue to do so. - Kids use it , familys use it, denbuilding,dogwalking,exercise. its a very sociable place loved by all and not to mention the view its GREAT
62	Dominique	McCormack	-		Object	I object to houses being built behind Pennine Road as I live on Pennine Road and it is nice to see the fields and view. - - Lots of wildlife life on the fields behind us and need that habitat. - - It's already crowded enough. To have a house behind mine it would invade our privacy. - - The roads are already full of pot holes more houses and cars would make this even worse.		-
63	Annemarie	Carey	-		Object	I object to houses behind pennine road. I like to look out of my kitchen window and see the beautiful view fields and animals. - - And to have houses at the back of pennine road would spoil it. - - as we have a own privacy. - - I Like feeding wildlife. and see the amazing view. -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.016	Further comment
64	Paul	Barnes-towers	-		Object	The space is used by many people, dog walkers, children playing in the fields it's a safe place for them away from the road. Only a couple of months ago a young child was in a road traffic accident with life threatening injuries this space was used for air ambulance to land adding vital time to saving the child's life. Bacup is losing a lot of its beautiful scenery to development it would cause a lot of congestion and more traffic which there is already a high volume of. It's getting quite crowded up this area being able to see into neighbours gardens and windows		Bacup is a small village and quite busy with traffic. When there are road works it brings the place to a standstill, creating more housing would cause more congestion with commuters passing through to work out of town as there is not much employment in the valley. If you are to build then do so to bring trade e.g. employment, amenities, cinema, leisure centre, things to attract public to valley and make it a thriving place like Todmorden or Rawtenstall, Ramsbottom not just somewhere to get a hair cut and a takeaway to eat.
879	Nick	Earnshaw	-		Object	A travellers site bordering 2 townships is asking for trouble. The site is completely unsuitable for one entrance to our 'prospering valley'. People comment about Nimby's - damn right, Bacup doesn't need this sort of community on its doorstep. The adjacent moorlands will become a dump from the travelling tree gangs and scrap dealers.		I understand the need for some more housing, but please - drive around the valley, look at all the derelict and run down sites that exist already and build on them. Our valley infrastructure is overwhelmed already.. Roads are shocking, services stretched and minimum investment at the top of the valley (RBC inheriting the Lee quarry - it's a disgrace for the money spent on it, it should be a landmark). Grow a pair as a council and tell the policy makers Rossendale is full and stop ruining the only tourist attraction we have - our countryside location.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.016	Further comment
1080	Bryan William	Hanson	-	HS2.16-Both sites.hs2.22- hs2.23	Object	The sites i have mentioned above are places that people use for there children to play in safety as there is no traffic in these areas that puts children in danger.Another thing i would be concerned about is the increase in the volume of traffic, the roads will just not be able to cope .Another thing that concernes me is ,How will our doctors health center cope with all the extra people they will have to see,as it is now people can not get appointments when needed .Another thing i am worried about is all the wildlife that is going to be affected ,What is going to happen to them in hs2.16 shlaa16402 hs2.16shlaa16043 and hs2.23shlaa16066.As i see it these houses are not going to benifit any of our local people ,they are only going to to bring people in from out of town.As there is no employment prospsects in the area ,all these extra people that come here will be using the already poor roads to cause further congestion on the already backed up roads at certain times of the day to get to there work.These are only part things i can think of for these houses not to go ahead.Therefor i very strongley object to these houses being built in these areas i have mentioned.		Yes i am very concerned about the amount of greenfield sites that are going to be lost in our beautiful valley as are lots morepeople i speak to ,I find it hard to speak to anybody that is in favour of the planned houses just dismay.
1430	Billy	Hanson	-	hs1.6 hs2.23 hs2.22	Object	These 3 sites are greenfield sites that people use and children are safe to play away from main roads.I would be very concernd about the increase in traffic houses being built on these sites would create especially on the pennine road and thorn bank.It also concerns me how all these houses will affect already streached doctors schools and all the extra traffic these houses will create on roads that are not fit to cater for traffic that use them now.These houses will not in any way be of any benifit to people that already live here ,they will only bring in people from other places.I am also worried about all the wildlife that is going to be affected by these proposels.Im sure i could go on ,But these are my main concerns .So i strongly object to houses being built on these sites.		I hope the objections people send in will ALL be taken into consideration.
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	HS 2:16 – Pennine Road - There is insufficient width between 112 – 114 Pennine Road to provide a vehicular access that is safe and suitable to the site. The land would be sufficient to provide a pedestrian/cycleway only. Alternative means of vehicle access to the highway network will be required.		
Number of comments		HS2.016				9		
Reference		HS2.017		Tong Farm, Bacup				
1818	Anonymous				Object	vvvvv		
Number of comments		HS2.017				1		
Reference		HS2.022		Thorn Bank, Bacup				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.022	Further comment
1080	Bryan William	Hanson	-	HS2.16-Both sites.hs2.22- hs2.23	Object	The sites i have mentioned above are places that people use for there children to play in safety as there is no traffic in these areas that puts children in danger.Another thing i would be concerned about is the increase in the volume of traffic, the roads will just not be able to cope .Another thing that concernes me is ,How will our doctors health center cope with all the extra people they will have to see,as it is now people can not get appointments when needed .Another thing i am worried about is all the wildlife that is going to be affected ,What is going to happen to them in hs2.16 shlaa16402 hs2.16shlaa16043 and hs2.23shlaa16066.As i see it these houses are not going to benifit any of our local people ,they are only going to to bring people in from out of town.As there is no employment prospsects in the area ,all these extra people that come here will be using the already poor roads to cause further congestion on the already backed up roads at certain times of the day to get to there work.These are only part things i can think of for these houses not to go ahead.Therefor i very strongley object to these houses being built in these areas i have mentioned.		Yes i am very concerned about the amount of greenfield sites that are going to be lost in our beautiful valley as are lots morepeople i speak to ,I find it hard to speak to anybody that is in favour of the planned houses just dismay.
1430	Billy	Hanson	-	hs1.6 hs2.23 hs2.22	Object	These 3 sites are greenfield sites that people use and children are safe to play away from main roads.I would be very concernd about the increase in traffic houses being built on these sites would create especially on the pennine road and thorn bank.It also concerns me how all these houses will affect already streached doctors schools and all the extra traffic these houses will create on roads that are not fit to cater for traffic that use them now.These houses will not in any way be of any benifit to people that already live here ,they will only bring in people from other places.I am also worried about all the wildlife that is going to be affected by these proposels.Im sure i could go on ,But these are my main concerns .So i strongly object to houses being built on these sites.		I hope the objections people send in will ALL be taken into consideration.
Number of comments						HS2.022	2	
Reference			HS2.023			Land east of Rochdale Road, Bacup		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.023	Further comment
1080	Bryan William	Hanson	-	HS2.16-Both sites.hs2.22- hs2.23	Object	The sites i have mentioned above are places that people use for there children to play in safety as there is no traffic in these areas that puts children in danger.Another thing i would be concerned about is the increase in the volume of traffic, the roads will just not be able to cope .Another thing that concernes me is ,How will our doctors health center cope with all the extra people they will have to see,as it is now people can not get appointments when needed .Another thing i am worried about is all the wildlife that is going to be affected ,What is going to happen to them in hs2.16 shlaa16402 hs2.16shlaa16043 and hs2.23shlaa16066.As i see it these houses are not going to benifit any of our local people ,they are only going to to bring people in from out of town.As there is no employment prospsects in the area ,all these extra people that come here will be using the already poor roads to cause further congestion on the already backed up roads at certain times of the day to get to there work.These are only part things i can think of for these houses not to go ahead.Therefor i very strongley object to these houses being built in these areas i have mentioned.		Yes i am very concerned about the amount of greenfield sites that are going to be lost in our beautiful valley as are lots morepeople i speak to ,I find it hard to speak to anybody that is in favour of the planned houses just dismay.
1430	Billy	Hanson	-	hs1.6 hs2.23 hs2.22	Object	These 3 sites are greenfield sites that people use and children are safe to play away from main roads.I would be very concernd about the increase in traffic houses being built on these sites would create especially on the pennine road and thorn bank.It also concerns me how all these houses will affect already streached doctors schools and all the extra traffic these houses will create on roads that are not fit to cater for traffic that use them now.These houses will not in any way be of any benifit to people that already live here ,they will only bring in people from other places.I am also worried about all the wildlife that is going to be affected by these proposels.Im sure i could go on ,But these are my main concerns .So i strongly object to houses being built on these sites.		I hope the objections people send in will ALL be taken into consideration.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.023	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	1 Comments Relating to Estates The county council has previously proposed the designation of its land holding off Industrial Street and Gladstone Street in Bacup for residential development purposes. This area of land was subsequently assessed as part of the SHLAA Stages 1 & 2 Assessment of 2017. The Borough Council now proposes to designate a smaller area of land for housing development; specifically excluding the site of the former Bacup Nursery and land immediately to the south of Gladstone Crescent. It is the view of the County Council that there is no overriding land use planning reason why this land should not be included in the proposed housing site HS2.23. The former pens and allotment uses of the land to the south of Gladstone Crescent have declined to a point where they are of negligible value for that purpose. The site of the former Bacup Nursery is demonstrably brownfield and, whilst it sits at a slightly lower level from the adjoining proposed housing site HS2.23, the difference is not considered to be so adverse as to preclude an appropriate engineered solution to connect with the proposed housing land immediately to the east. This would facilitate its co-joining with the proposed housing site, (similarly accessed from the higher point on the Gladstone Street frontage). The County Council therefore requests that these two areas of land be included within the housing site allocation HS2.23.		

Number of comments HS2.023

3

Reference	HS2.024	Land at Blackwood Road and north of Blackwood Road, Stacksteads
------------------	----------------	--

93	Norman	Crook	-	Land north of Blackwood Road, Stacksteads	Support	The site is suitable for housing for the following reasons: - - 1. The site is previously developed (brownfield) and has no special landscape, ecological or scenic value. - - 2. The land has no value as strategic open land (e.g. as green belt, farmland, etc.) and would not compromise policies to protect the wider countryside. - - 3. It will benefit the local area by improving housing choice, contributing to accessible open space, environmental and local highway and footpath improvements. - - 4. The site has potential for a high quality, sustainable mixed housing development. - - 5. The site is close to facilities and services and is sustainable in terms of accessibility. - - 6. The site is deliverable and developable within the Plan period.		No. - - If further information, clarification or explanation is required, please do not hesitate to contact the Agent.
----	--------	-------	---	--	---------	--	--	--

Number of comments HS2.024

1

Reference	HS2.025	Glen Mill, 640 Newchurch Road, Stacksteads
------------------	----------------	---

1522	Natalie	Blackhurst	Kenyon Planning		Support	We would support the allocation on the basis that the site is allocated for housing and remains within the defined urban boundary.		-
------	---------	------------	--------------------	--	---------	--	--	---

Number of comments HS2.025

1

Reference	HS2.028	Booth Road / Woodland Mount
------------------	----------------	------------------------------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
747	John	Foster			Support	<p>I have recently being emailed concerning the Draft Local Plan, particularly the Policy HS18:Self build and custom houses, that identifies specific sites for self build projects.</p> <p>Many thanks for this information; I understand that this is a draft plan and it may be many months/years before this land is available, however, I would like to register my interest at this stage, particularly in HS2.28 - Booth road/woodland mount. This would be ideally positioned for my self.</p> <p>Having being looking for land in the Brittania/whitworth/newline/Bacup area for a number years and failing to find any within my budget (most single plots of land for sale are aimed at larger, 4 bed properties whereas I am aiming to build a more modest 3 bed detached bungalow) I am eager to receive any information on possible future plots available.</p> <p>Most of the land designated is in the Rossedale valley, and not on the Bacup to Whitworth side - which was disappointing.</p> <p>Thanks again</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Not Applicable	<p>WE SUPPORT THE ALLOCATION OF THE SITE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, HOWEVER THIS SHOULD BE EXTENDED BEYOND 'SELF BUILD' DWELLINGS - PLEASE SEE DETAILED REPRESENTATION FOR FULL DETAILS.</p> <p>Email received 11/10/2017:</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. Following the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in November 2011, RBC commenced work on its Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. However, this document was halted in favour of the preparation of a full new Local Plan which has now been issued for consultation from Monday 24 July to Monday 9 October 2017. This edition of the Local Plan comprises the Regulation 18 consultation document which sets out the Council's preferred approach to future housing, employment and leisure uses over the Plan period. Once adopted the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy (2011).</p> <p>1.2 Within the draft Local Plan, sites have been proposed for development (for housing or employment use), for environmental protection and for recreation uses, as identified on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation Areas, along with an extension to an existing Conservation Area, are being considered. 1.3 Documents included in the Draft Local Plan Consultation are the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement), the accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 1.4 The evidence base which supports the Local Plan comprises the following documents: • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017). • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017). • Employment Land Review (2017). • Green Belt Review (2016). • Environmental Network Study (2017). • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (2016). • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study (2017). • Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) (previously published). • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2016). • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing (2017). • Landscape Study (2015) (previously published). • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published). • Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites (2017). 1.5 In addition to the above documents, the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, although not strictly evidence, has informed the development of the draft policies.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the emerging Local Plan in relation to land at Booth Road/Woodland Mount, Stacksteads.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
						<p>The site has been allocated for housing; Reference HS2.28.</p> <p>1.7 The 0.3 ha site lies to the north of Booth Road in the northern part of the settlement of Stacksteads and comprises the garden land to the residential property known as Heath Hill House.</p> <p>SCOPE</p> <p>1.8 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>1.9 This document follows earlier Representations and discussions made by Mr Brian Boys as part of previous consultation stages in the Local Plan process, albeit that parts of the Local Plan were subsequently halted in favour of a complete new Local Plan.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.10 The starting point for consideration of the emerging Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Local Plan document.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The RBC Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
						<p>Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain’s demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development. These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”. <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
						<p>dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168). HOUSING</p> <p>2.21 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
						<p>Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.22 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.25 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.26 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
						<p>sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE – LAUNCHED 6 MARCH 2014</p> <p>2.28 On 28 August 2013 the government launched its draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The draft NPPG was subject to consultation for 6 weeks and was launched on 6 March in its final form. The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.29 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Report, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms): “Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.30 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306): “WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
						<p>can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply.”</p> <p>2.31 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 of the section titled ‘Local Plans’ (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that: “HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED? To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.”</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.32 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.33 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.34 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.35 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>2.36 Crucially the provision of the right type of housing in the right locations is considered to be relevant to this Representation.</p> <p>3. POLICY HS2: HOUSING SITE ALLOCATIONS</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
						<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3.1 Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations identifies all sites within the Borough which have been allocated for residential development. For each site allocated, site area, capacity, delivery timescales and the type of residential allocation is identified.</p> <p>3.2 Land at Booth Road/Woodland Mount is identified as Housing Allocation Ref. HS2.28 as shown below.</p> <p>Fig. 1 Extract from Site Allocations Table (Policy HS2)</p> <p>3.3 The proposed allocation is identified in Figure 2.</p> <p>3.4 We support the aims of the Local Plan to identify key development sites which are central to the delivery of the overall strategy for new housing.</p> <p>3.5 The site is in single land ownership, being solely within the ownership of Mr Brian Boys. The allocation site is made up of private garden land which is bordered on all sides by trees and is located in the north of Stacksteads. To the north of the site is open countryside with the predominant surrounding land use being residential in nature.</p> <p>3.6 The allocation site has not been the subject of any previous planning applications.</p> <p>3.7 There are no environmental or statutory designations or other technical considerations that would prejudice the residential development of the site. The site is sustainably located and is capable of delivering housing now.</p> <p>3.8 Land at Booth Road/Woodland Mount is available and deliverable and we therefore support the identified delivery timescale of 1-5 years.</p> <p>3.9 However, we consider that the proposed number of units referred to (10 units) could be increased in this location. It is stated in a footnote to the allocations table that 'when calculating the potential numbers of housing on each site a density of 30 dwellings per hectare has been used unless more detailed information is available'. Density could appropriately be increased in this location due to the site's location and its surroundings.</p> <p>3.10 In addition, we consider that the allocation for self-build only is too restrictive and may hinder the delivery of this sustainable residential development site within the timeframe specified.</p> <p>SUGGESTED MODIFICATION</p> <p>3.11 To ensure that this site delivers to its full potential, and the timescales for delivery are not hindered, it is suggested that the Council make a modification to the draft Local Plan document to simply allocate the site for housing, rather than self-build more specifically, for up to 25 dwellings. The Proposals Map should also be amended to show the site as orange (as with other allocated housing sites) rather than red to identify self-build housing sites only, thereby not restricting development on this site and indicating that the site can deliver housing within the early part of the Plan period.</p> <p>3.12 At a time when the Council is directed to significantly boost the supply of housing in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the Framework, it is suggested</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.028	Further comment
						<p>that the Local Plan should simply allocate sites for housing, rather restricting the nature of the potential developer/builder.</p> <p>4. POLICY HS18: SELF BUILD AND CUSTOM BUILT HOUSES</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>4.1 The site at Booth Road / Woodland Mount, Stacksteads has been identified as suitable for self build and custom built houses as detailed under Policy HS18. The policy states that this is to ensure a variety of housing provision and is in line with government aspirations to promote self/custom build dwellings as a mainstream housing option.</p> <p>4.2 Whilst we support the notion of providing variety in terms of housing options, we consider that limiting sites to self/custom build may hinder the delivery of much needed residential development on sustainable sites. It is particularly pertinent to note that within the explanation to Policy HS18 it is states that, in relation to self/custom build housing, 'evidence from the SHMA indicates that the level of demand for plots is currently low in Rossendale'. We consider that whilst some sites may lend themselves to this more readily, sites should not be identified under Policy HS18 specifically, with support for individuals who would like to build or commission their own home being supported on a case by case basis.</p> <p>SUGGESTED MODIFICATION</p> <p>4.3 Policy HS18 should be amended to remove specific site references in order to ensure that the policy and sites allocations are not unduly restrictive. The policy can still set out the Council's commitment to support individuals who would like to build or commission their own home where this is appropriate and there is some certainty in relation to delivery.</p> <p>5. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>5.1 The starting point for consideration of the Council's draft Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the Framework that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>5.2 Notwithstanding concerns expressed in this Representation about the Evidence Base which supports the preparation of this draft Local Plan Part document, the subject site should continue to form part of the Council's housing growth strategy and we support its proposed housing allocation, subject to the changes set out in this Representation.</p> <p>5.3 Our client's site is capable of being developed for residential purposes now. Please see appendix</p>		
Number of comments						HS2.028	2	
Reference		HS2.029		Land west of Sow Clough				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.029	Further comment
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Object	HS 2:29 – Tunstead - The privately maintained unnamed road (possibly known locally as Cop Lane) carries public footpath 56 and is insufficient in width to accommodate any development traffic. There is heavy on-street parking on the lane which further narrows the width and the residents have no alternative off-street parking. An alternative vehicular access would be required and the options appear very due to the proximity of existing properties.		

Number of comments HS2.029

1

Reference HS2.032 Land off Newchurch Old Road, Bacup

443	Jim	Leach			Object	This area has for more than forty years been a natural habitat for Wildlife, Squirrels, Badgers, Foxes, and Weasels, Plus many varieties of wild birds. This area is also used as an ideal off-road area for exercising Dogs and Horses - To lose this Oasis Bankside Lane is already a hazardous road, access is frequently restricted to existing houses by car. There is existing a sign " Gritting Route, Problem access road " Further Housing and therefore Traffic would only add to the existing problems A Domestic Fire would,at present,be difficult for a Fire Engine to attend during the daytime, at night ,when everyone is at home it would be impossible These areas should be returned to Green Belt status		Not at Present
-----	-----	-------	--	--	--------	--	--	----------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
486	Susan	Ormerod			Object	<p>All of the above sites are in the Bankside Lane area of Bacup. All are Greenfield Sites and should be changed back to this status without delay.</p> <p>All of these sites are currently used by the local people and their children, in one form or another, as well as the local deer herds (of which there are two), foxes, badgers and a host of other wildlife, including the birds of prey from the Stacksteads area.</p> <p>Some of these sites are owned by local farmers to breed and train horses. The vehicle activity on Bankside, where there are three serious hazards on the approach from the town centre due to narrow roads and a blind bend on a steep incline, is already a danger with the local traffic. These three narrow sections are all within a 20 metre stretch and will not allow even two small vehicles to pass. This hazard has been increased by the "home delivery" method of purchasing goods for the already existing occupants and further population increases would inevitably mean increases of delivery wagons and vans.</p> <p>Any changes of road from the Stacksteads area would provide a "rat run" between the town centre and Stacksteads and any road up from an improved "Lodge Lane" would be a worse hazard than Bankside is at the moment. Almost certainly impassible in winter.</p> <p>The current parking situation on Bankside Lane is already causing concern as shown by the council notices which appeared some time ago. Access for the emergency services has already caused hold ups on five occasions know to myself during the past twelve months.</p> <p>In conclusion, these plans, if passed, will implement a serious deterioration in living standards for all existing occupants of the Bankside Lane area and an increased health risk factor for all who use the lane either in a vehicle or as a pedestrian.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
488	Helen	Koczur			Object	<p>To even consider planning further homes on any part of Bankside Lane, Bacup is totally ludicrous.</p> <p>The lower part of Bankside Lane is exceptionally steep and narrow in 2 sections and cannot cope with any further traffic. On days that the Golf Club holds events, or football teams are playing on the recreation ground, access becomes impossible. In bad weather, the gradient together with the width restrictions leads to chaos and accidents, of which I have not only witnessed but suffered in the past. There is also limited pedestrian access at these dangerous sections. The route CANNOT cope with any further traffic. As these access problems are at the lower part of Bankside Lane ANY future housing expansion at any point further up the lane would affect this section.</p> <p>We recently had road improvement work which proved access problems. I dread to think what would happen to emergency services under these conditions as access will not be easy.</p> <p>The difficult access means that houses do not sell here, so why on earth build more? I do not see an increase in employment opportunities in the area so the occupants of any new build would travel out of the area for work. This would mean that the volume of vehicles would increase to a dangerous level. If some of the build is required to be for social housing, access for young families with prams and elderly would be impossible without transport.</p> <p>There has been a development of houses over in Weir. All have normal road access, not single track as on Bankside Lane, yet in bad weather the access problems cause the main Bacup to Burnley Road to be severely restricted with abandoned vehicles. Putting further houses off Bankside Lane would also cause a similar problem to the centre of Bacup.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
489	Denise	Duffy			Object	<p>I have lived in the Bankside Lane area some 47 years, in effect all of my adult life. The journeys up and down the Lane have become increasingly hazardous and dangerous and I am appalled that RBC is considering allocating 4 locations for new housing.</p> <p>> For a start the blind narrow bend around Ivy Cottage has always been hazardous and the increase in car numbers has made it doubly so over the years. Further traffic will only serve to exacerbate the conditions we experience daily.</p> <p>> Parking and especially double parking along the Lane and even on pavements has increased significantly. You only have to ask your own drivers (bins, gritting) of the difficulties they regularly face. Emergency services , especially Fire Engines, would also confirm their difficulties along the Lane.</p> <p>> As most home owners frequently have more than one car in their families, sometimes up to four cars once adult children start driving, the addition of garages does little to ease the situation. Apart from the fact that garages are often storage places rather than car shelters.</p> <p>> Although I have personally not been involved in an accident, accidents have happened on numerous occasions. The steepness of the lower Lane, especially in winter conditions, calls for careful negotiation. Again, additional traffic will exacerbate the residents safety concerns.</p> <p>Thank you in anticipation for forwarding this to whom ever it concerns</p>		
503		McKeown			Object	<p>I am against the proposed new housing off Bankside Lane as I am worried about road safety with poor visibility of oncoming traffic in areas and speeding vehicles. Also there would be gridlock at the bottom of Bankside Lane if there is to be additional housing because there are not two lanes of traffic which relies on drivers good faith on many occasions as you travel up the hill (there are many difficulties with this now).</p> <p>I am a resident Meadow Way. At present I have increasing issues with run off of rain water which already requires bailing out of water in winter. The new housing area, no longer being fields to absorb the rain water, will impact further on the massive drainage problem I am having to cope with.</p> <p>I would be very keen to know more about sewage system and how and which route the new system will follow as I have sewage pipe work under my side garden which serves about 24 houses.</p> <p>I am concerned about trucks during the building works and the additional dirt on the roads creating slippery areas for vehicles, damage to the road, and being additionally busy leading to increased chance of accidents.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
534	Romanii	Fitton	-		Object	I most certainly want to object to anymore houses being built on or around bankside lane in bacup. The street is congested with cars and wouldn't be able to cope with more vehicles coming up and down it every day. We also love the little bit of green land we have left and don't want it spoiled by any more houses being built.		-
539	Simon	Midgley	-	HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32	Object	This site would be accessed from Bankside Lane which is already difficult to navigate at peak traffic periods: it is narrow and is accessed from Market Street via a very steep and narrow hill section. In normal conditions this needs extreme care when navigating, in winter snow and ice this access is dangerous and often impassable. Additional traffic generated by housing on these sites (HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32) would make a dangerous situation even worse. Cars are parked on both side of Bankside Lane narrowing it to one car's width in many sections: there is nowhere else for the cars to park. - - Development on sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.14, HS2.32 would also be "skyline" development which residents were told would not be permitted. This would destroy the green character and visual amenity of this part of Bacup - forever. - - Currently farmland, these sites soak up precipitation helping to reduce flood risk which development would increase.		Bankside Lane is an inappropriate area for housing development for the reasons already outlined above. It is important that we do not lose this green space on the Valley side.
540	BRETT	HARRIS	-		Object	BANKSIDE LANE CAN NOT SUPPORT MORE TRAFFIC IT IS ALREADY STRUGGLING WITH THE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC.		-
543	Thomas	Hammant	-		Object	As well as the other objections made in line with HS2.13 which are true for all developments on Bankside Lane, in particularly this area is used for health and wellbeing of many adults and animals, and is a public right of way and bridleway used for horse		Whilst I understand the need to balance new housing in the area, building on land which is currently used as both a farm and/or public access land is against all previous council policies and should not be entered into lightly. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
545	Lisa	Hartley	-		Object	Greenfield site and should remain as such - full of wildlife e.g. 2 deer herds, foxes, badgers and birds of prey. Landowners train and breed horses on this land. - Bankside already extremely congested with traffic- not enough parking facilities now - council have had to put notices up asking people to park more consideratly as emergency services (fire engines) and council services (gritters) have been unable to pass through. - Bankside has 3 very narrow points where only one vehicle can pass at once and these areas are extremely close together in proximity incorporating blind bends as well - more houses would cause more cars causing chaos and accidents. Any through road to stacksteads that might be made would lead to bankside being used as a racing track for cars to pass through from stacksteads trying to avoid the busy main road! This in itself would be extremely dangerous as more houses Lead to more people living on bankside -probably children - resulting in more road traffic accidents and fatalities! We have enough at the moment we don't need anymore. - It would be a nightmare waiting to happen. - Building houses would cause further chaos with wagons attempting to make their way through when there is so little room - home shopping vehicles struggle at moment and are sometimes unable to gain access all the way across bankside! -		Please re think your plans as they will have very serious consequences for both the public and wildlife of bankside!
553	ALLAN PETER AND YVONNE	WEBB	-		Object	1. The building of these proposed houses is on the top of a very steep hill. - 2. These buildings would be on the sky line and directly above some of the houses on Fernhill Crescent. There were problems caused by the building of houses at the end of Bankside Lane previously because they can be seen above the sky line. - 3. As the occupiers of 24, Fernhill Crescent we are very worried about possible land-slip, as there are numerous mature trees whose roots secure the land on the side of the hill. The hillside is very ridged already, which suggest there could be some land slip. - 4. Top of the hill is quite flat and holds much rain water, hence reducing possible flooding of our dwellings and the danger of causing excess water to flow into the River Irwell, which is prone to flood when in spate. - 5. Main excess would be along Bankside Lane which is quite narrow, especially where it leads into Bacup town centre. It would be extremely difficult to make access onto Osborne Terrace or Hill Crest because of the steepness of the hillsides. During snowy or wintry weather these roads can be treacherous causing people to leave their cars on the main roads. - 6. Beautiful wooded area would be destroyed. - 7. Bats reside in the trees near to our house and are frequently seen flying around in the evening. (See Bat Conservation Trust). Deer are occasionally seen as well as foxes and badgers. There is also plenty of bird activity. - 8. The area is used by walkers, pony trekkers who make their way down into Stacksteads and dog walkers. - - By all means use brown site areas, but for goodness sake, leave the few green spaces left to us for our enjoyment and recreation. My grandson cried when he heard us discussing the possible building of houses on an area we have walked on and played on for years.		We've tried to be as concise and honest as possible. - - Peter and Yvonne Webb

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
557	michael	hudson	-		Object	first the bankside lane cannot support any more traffic its a 20 mph zone but traffic goes a lot faster,the road floods a lot. most of that from old newtownroad waters running all the time.the inferstructure cannot cope with any more houses or veicles your concerned resident [...].		i think there is plenty of brown sites around this area that could be used.and empty proerties around not being used.
558	Terry	Nightingale	-		Object	I wish to object to the proposals as follows - - 1. lack of suitable acess to to the proposed sites .There is no suitable access to any of these sites with all traffic having to access and exit onto Bankside Lane (see also point 4) - - 2. risk of flooding to properties on Bankside Lane if housing built on green field site to rear. During periods of wet weather rainwater cannot now drain away and as such runs down through these properties gardens onto Bankside lane . increased building will further increase the risk of flooding for these properties - - 3. in addition to the flood risk there will be the increased sewerage demands onto the existing sewerage system on Bankside Lane /Close - - 4. A huge increase in vehicular traffic on an already overcrowded one way in and out Lane . - during winter months lack of available parking / inconsiderate parking on lower Bankside Lane regularly prevents LCC Gritters from being able to access this area . An increase in housing will inevitably bring increased fire risk . - - 5. There will be an environmental impact on wioldlife in the area . Land in the area is frequented by deer and many other types of wildlife . -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
581	B	Woodrup			Object	<p>We are writing to object to the proposed plans to change areas of previous green belt sites to building sites of potentially 100 new houses. These are our concerns.</p> <p>The bottom of Bankside Lane has three bottle necks very steep and narrow and a bad bend only room for one car, a very narrow pavement on one side. Children will be walking down and up to get to school.</p> <p>The school run will be dangerous the road is already overloaded.</p> <p>In winter people try to park at the bottom of the lane in the morning, ready to go to work, because the road is always gritted. The road is sometimes so icy. It's frightening to drive down, as you could easily crash into the wall or another vehicle parked or moving. I dread to think what could happen with more pedestrians (children).</p> <p>I am also concerned about the fire engines and ambulances and gritter trying to drive up and over bankside lane, especially after 7PM when most residents are home and their vehicles are all parked on the roadside's and pavements. This is a concern now. It's going to be really bad if another 100 houses are to be built. Most households have two cars.</p> <p>What about our wildlife. Bats, hedgehogs, deer, rabbits, badgers, toads and frogs.</p> <p>What about our beautiful countryside and outdoor spaces that we and our children and grandchildren really enjoy.</p> <p>We hope you seriously consider our concerns and objections.</p> <p>It has been mentioned to me that previously planning to build houses was turned down by the ministry of transport. Because of the bottlenecks at the bottom of bankside lane.</p> <p>There's also the question of policing all these extra residents and homes.</p>		
582	G	Pearson			Object	<p>Dear Sirs I will raise my objections to this Development due to the following reasons..</p> <p>The lane is already over loaded with vehicles from the existing houses, the Council has placed notices on the lampposts about the problem of gritting the lane due to traffic.</p> <p>My wife had a vehicle accident Two years ago as a vehicle reversed into her vehicle due to cars parked on Bankside lane.</p> <p>The road itself in a bad state of repair due to traffic movement.</p> <p>When your refuse teams come to collect they complain of the problems of traffic on the Lane.</p> <p>When the Animal farm is allowed to have functions on such as Halloween there are even worse traffic problems.</p> <p>The Green areas currently enjoyed by the locals and their children will be affected and even lost .</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
584	Craig	Ovenden	Next Century Property Services Ltd		Object	<p>I'm am led to believe that a new draft local development plan includes a proposal to allocate land for housing at 4 locations off Bankside lane? As a long term resident of Bankside lane I would object to the proposal on several counts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The lane is already extremely busy and access is always restricted down to a single track lane, if the proposal involves further vehicle access the road would need to be made wider. 2) The lane is in a poor state of repair, adding more traffic would create further ongoing maintenance. 3) We live right at the top of the lane, on refuse collection days, dependent on what time the collection takes place it can take me an extra 10-15 minutes to travel down the lane, the collection drivers are always really obliging and pull over when possible, however due to the amount of parked cars and traffic travelling in the opposite direction I often have to follow behind the vehicle right to the bottom, further housing would only compound the problem. 4) The bend in the road towards the bottom and the further narrowing of the road is a bottle neck often leading to vehicles waiting at the bottom to let oncoming traffic up and down the lane, this sometimes backs up as far as the main road, further housing/vehicular access would cause a danger at the junction with Newchurch road as vehicles que to access the lane. <p>Please can you consider these points before any decision is made to allocate the land for housing.</p>		
586	Sandra	Robinson			Object	<p>This email is in regards to the proposal for housing at 4 locations off Bankside Lane, I am a resident of Bankside Lane,I feel that there is too much traffic at the moment on this narrow road,I am lucky to have off road parking,however most do not which then causes problems for pedestrians.</p>		
592	Jean & Peter	Hannan			Object	<p>I am submitting our opposition to the proposed building plans within the Bankside Lane area. Bankside Lane is already overloaded and congested with motor vehicles and we feel that added traffic will cause untold problems. Inadequate parking facilities already add to this problem and we feel very strongly that the above proposals will potentially cause accidents and traffic delays.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
608	A J	Doherty			Object	<p>Email received 29/09/2017: Dear Sirs I attended the road show at Futures Park on 21st September and saw the four sites you proposed for building upon. I object most strongly to all of them. Bankside Lane has a very narrow access from A 681 with room for one car only at the turning. A very steep incline for some yards and then at Dale Street the road narrows even more, again with room for one car only. The incline is even steeper. Near the end, there is a treacherous incline and turn. Parked cars line the whole of Bankside Lane already. In winter, in spite of efficient gritting by the Council, snow and ice can stop traffic. If the proposed building takes place, In the short term, many heavy vehicles would create chaos to our local traffic. Long term, the traffic would double making access a nightmare. I commend the services of Rossendale Council for their efficient rubbish collection and gritting in winter. I am sure they will tell you how difficult it is already to access Bankside Lane. In the case of an emergency - ambulance or fire - we would be put at great risk of delays. Perhaps we could call a helicopter...</p> <p>Email received 30/09/2017: Bankside Lane Bacup proposed building sites I attended the road show on 21st September 2017 at Futures Park, Bacup I object to any of the proposed building sites because Access is extremely restricted. The entrance to Bankside Lane from A 681 is very narrow and cannot be widened. The road is very steep. It continues between a house to the left and high bank to right leaving room for just one vehicle round a blind bend. The road here is also very steep and cannot be widened. Near the end of Bankside Lane there is another very steep incline, round two corners. The whole of Bankside Lane is congested with parked vehicles. If the proposed building takes place, access will be a nightmare. Already it is amazing that local authority vehicles - refuse collection and gritting in winter - manage so efficiently, but it would be almost impossible to continue were traffic to double.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
						<p>Winter snow and ice make the road dangerous and sometimes impassable. In the short term: probably over several years, heavy vehicles would block access.</p> <p>In the long term: four building sites would probably increase traffic to double what it is now.</p> <p>Ambulance , Fire Services and Police must have easy access and these would be put at risk.</p> <p>What do you suggest? Hire a helicopter?</p> <p>Lastly, you are intending to build on virgin moorland, destroying forever the natural beauty and wildlife it supports.</p>		
611	Christine	Hudson			Object	<p>I am writing in regard to the building of 183 houses in all off Bankside Lane. I drive up and down Bankside Lane most days (week and weekend) and it does get very congested at times with lorries and cars, the lane is not very wide and people who live here have to park both sides of the lane which only leaves enough space to get through.</p> <p>The very narrow park of Bankside Lane, as you go up the hill leaves only enough space for single traffic. A lot of people get very frustrated and angry putting it mildly. People forget it is a 20 mile limit so there is often a near miss.</p> <p>If the houses are going to be built 183 in all they will all have to use Bankside, so that means there will be an extra 30 cars. There would be heavy lorries and vans whilst they are being built. Most households are 2 car families hence 380 cars extra.</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>When we have heavy rainfalls which is often. We get a lot of water coming down from old newchurch road and onto the lane. In the last 5 years we have had flash flooding.</p> <p>One day we were sitting in our front lounge and our wheelie bins were floating about in the front garden. We opened our garage doors front and back and it was like a river running down the garden. All our plants were lost as they were in a pile of mud at the bottom of the garden.</p> <p>If these houses are going to be built, there will have to be better drainage. Also we have some lovely open green spaces around Bacup, that we all enjoy and cherish.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
615	Elaine	Garrard			Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed housing development sites referenced HS1.11, HS2.12, HS2.13 and HS2.32 which are listed in the housing allocations section of the above plan.</p> <p>The reason for my objection is that vehicles travelling to Bacup Town Centre from each of these sites will need to use Bankside Lane. This will add to the existing traffic which already presents a significant safety hazard for me personally at the steep and narrow section between its junctions with Maden Road and Market Street.</p> <p>I am disabled and have to travel to Bacup from my house via Bankside Lane either by car or whenever possible by mobility scooter. However, because the width of the pavement is very narrow I have to drive my scooter on the roadway and this means choosing the times of my journeys carefully to avoid peak congestion when I would be dangerous for me to use the road. In particular there are two sections of Bankside Lane which narrow to a single lane and where I cannot take evasive action if a hazard incident occurs. I consider therefore that by allowing additional developments along Bankside Lane and hence additional traffic hazards, the council will discriminate unfairly against me and also other disabled road users.</p> <p>On this basis I ask you to remove the above housing sites from the Local Plan unless the pavement or road widths can be improved to an acceptable standard.</p> <p>I attach a photograph which illustrates the difficulties.</p>		
621	David	Carey	-		Object	<p>Bankside Lane is a cul de sac which already has a lot of traffic going up and down, and parking is on road for the most part, making it very difficult bearing in mind the amount of people who already live on bankside lane, to pass. To add an extra 100 houses and the additional traffic this would cause would make it intolerable for existing house owners. - The added pressure of extra traffic would also affect our children, as there is no place on Bankside Lane to play bar on small play area, and for the most part children ride their bikes and play in front of their houses, this would be an additional safety risk. - It would also ruin the countryside feel we have and make it impossible to walk our dogs as you are planning on taking all our recreational grounds from us. - In the winter we have a lot of bad weather and the gritter's find it hard to get up and grit the Lane, it will be worse with the amount of traffic added. - Again no thought has gone into the additional traffic and the impact on the people living on bankside Lane. - - I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! - -</p>		Not at this time

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
648	Robert	Ormerod	-		Object	<p>These four sites are all Greenfield sites. After the council has done a good job at improving this type of site in Bacup it would be absurd to destroy the fields which complement all the wooded areas of our town. The countryside of Rossendale looks bad enough with all the wind farms without destroying the remaining countryside of Rossendale. Our fields and woods are just returning to being used by the local wildlife and wildlife needs open spaces as well as enclosed spaces to live and prosper. - The traffic on Bankside is already becoming dangerous and unacceptable with the one narrow road and the increases of traffic. Nearly all residents now have more than one vehicle and delivery traffic, usually large vans or wagons, have increased tenfold whilst the road has been left to deteriorate. The slow signs, road centre signs and markings are now almost completely gone and the road, which we were all told was due for replacement surfacing was actually patched up, once again, and still has many holes, dips and bumps. This is especially on the blind steep bend from the town centre. Unless the access situation is addressed the many unreported non injury collisions will soon become serious injuries or fatalities. -</p>		Please take these plans away from from the overcrowded area

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
661	CA and VJ	Jennings	Home Owner	HS2.32	Object	<p>I am contesting these housing developments on several grounds. - - My issues and concerns will be submitted, in writing by the closing date of 9th October 2017.</p> <p>Letter received 06/10/2017:</p> <p>The statement "Improving the lives of people in the Borough" is central to the Borough's current "mantra" regarding their fundamental philosophy and how it is applied in all Departments, and in all the things that they do. However, I feel that some of the current proposals as outlined in the above DLP could fall far short of the Council's altruistic intentions.</p> <p>These are our concerns in respect of the Fernhill Crescent, Fernhill Drive and Bankside Lane development proposals:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation - there is an extensive line of "mixed" trees which decorate the hillside from the end of Bankside Lane above Fernhill Crescent and Osborne Terrace. As far as I understand it, we all have a shared commitment to protect and preserve trees and the landscapes on which they reside. From the above plans, it seems that there is the potential for the removal of some of this tree-line on site HS2.32. This would have a huge and negative impact on the aesthetic outlook onto that hillside, and the potential for land slip, soil erosion, water-runoff and flooding on lower levels • Protecting the Environment - there are many issues here that would negatively affect several aspects of the local environment. Some of which resulting from over-capacity and over-crowding caused by the over-expansion in this area by these proposed developments (particularly along Bankside Lane) • Preserving the local Character - the area around an incorporating site HS2.32 is particularly attractive (especially to the West of Bankside lane) and is an asset to the local area and its residents. It offers countryside walks along heritage sites and long established pathways (ideal for walkers, dog-owners, explorers in general and "kids" of all ages) • Infrastructure - this aspect has never been something to celebrate in the Rossendale Valley area: mostly due to the uncompromising geography of the area rather than the incompetence of the local authorities. However, focusing on one point only, transport through the Valley is often difficult, and sometimes almost impossible at certain times of the day. Therefore, the addition of around 200 units along Bankside Lane would severely impact on both movement and parking. AND, the thought of possibly an additional 350 vehicles exiting onto the Bacup/Rawtenstall road and heading through the valley, doesn't bare thinking about!! AND, what about the winter if it's like the Fernhill area, some of it, or all of it, will not be gritted!! • Impact - in my opinion, the impact from these proposals would be many and 		To be submitted before 9th October 2017.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
						<p>wide ranging, but some would militate against the "improvement of lives"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of Wild-life Habitats - the treed areas and adjacent open fields and moorland, are homes for thriving wild-life. In addition to the usual populations of wildlife, we have seen deer, foxes, squirrels, birds of prey and colonies of bats. The retention of range of wild-life would be threatened by the proposed invasion of their "space" • Ecological/Biological Considerations - these extensive developments could severely compromise the 'health', stability and integrity of the land, its trees; also its top-soil and sub-soil and the life forms that inhabit them • Local Heritage Preservation - there are some historical mule tracks, bridal paths & walkways and access routes into Yorkshire in this area, and we have a duty to protect and preserve them • Land Integrity - we have been aware for many years that the land above part of Fernhill Crescent has been subject to land-slip over the years. In fact, we were told by an authoritative figure that the extent of the problem had been measured over time. This weakness in the land caused our builder to reinforce the retaining walls in the back gardens of Nos 22, 24 and 26. Indeed, the retaining wall at No 26 actually collapsed. <p>Interestingly, the field behind these and other FC properties seems to show evidence of land-slip, whereas the adjacent wooded field seems not to suffer this problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic Balance - given the attractiveness (in all respects) of this residential area, we would suggest that the proposed plans could severely impact upon the "wholesomeness" of this area, and have a negative effect upon the valuation of properties. Which would be, at least, unfair!!! • Practicality and Compatibility - in conclusion, and looking at just one aspect, when we factor-in access roads, traffic congestion and general disruption over time, and deterioration in the quality of people's lives, is it appropriate or acceptable to further pursue the Fernhill proposals?!? <p>Finally, who is it in the best interests of</p>		
667	Helen	Phythian	N.A.	HS2.11,HS2.12,H Object S2.13 and HS2.32		<p>I wish to object on the grounds that the proposed 100 houses will have at least two cars for each dwelling, this will mean a daily increase of journeys by at least four hundred trips on what is, in two places on Bankside Lane a single track road. - If the developers were to continue the road through to Stacksteads prior to start of the proposed development which would give an option to all residents, then maybe the plans would be viable. At the moment if Bankside Lane is left as is, the resulting traffic jams would increase the risks of accidents and also increase pollution,(drivers trying to pass the two single lane place , one of which is a blind bend as well as single lane, would be revving their cars to restart on an exceptionally steep hill).</p>		<p>overall I understand that the Government is laying down numbers for each area, instead of cramming in houses in every available green space left in Rossendale would it not be better to take a flat area of land and build a new village with all required facilities</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
679	leslie	hargreaves	-	h52.11.12.13. andh52.32	Object	Bankside lane is already completely saturated with cars having to park on the pavements and at times heavy commercial cannot get through ie road gritters and refuse vehicles.This is worse when vehicle that normally park on maden road have to park on bankside lane due to winter conditions i.e. ice and snow. Approximately 50 years ago excavation was started for house building was started on the two fields between lodge land and so called bonks area which was stopped because the area in what they call shifting sand. Acces to bankisde lane is tottally in adequate and I totally object to this proposal as we already have our share of accidents on this road	-	
714	Marie	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	1) Bankside Lane is already very busy. There's already too many cars going up, down and along Bankside. Adding another 100 or more houses and therefore cars will just add to the congestion. 2) Bankside Lane has tight and narrow bends. Add more traffic to the mix and there will easily be some serious accidents especially in the winter when it snows. 3) Vehicles are already parking on pavements to allow other cars to get past. In case of an emergency (fire or ambulance) the emergency vehicles would already have trouble getting to the destination. Adding those extra cars would make it impossible. The gritter has problems now! 4) The proposed land is home to lots of wildlife including deer, badgers and foxes. Why should we disrupt their habitat? Where would they go? It's not fair on them when they cannot speak up for themselves. 5) 50 years ago they evacuated Bankside because the field was on shifting sands. 6) the local schools are already full, getting a doctors appointment is already difficult without getting extra residents and the same with the dentists. The proposed building seems unrealistic, unreasonable and unsustainable. -	I thought the idea was to build houses on brown sites not green sites. There's plenty of unused, rundown, empty, derelict properties in and around bacup, why not use them? Why take our countryside when there's perfectly good other land to use. Don't ruin it for future generations.	
715	Jennifer	Hargreaves	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	Conversion on Bankside at moment, in the snow when vehicles can't get up the Lane this is what happens. The residents who live on Maiden Road and Rode Street occupy both sides of Bankside. - Ordinarily care are parked on both sides of the Lane a lot on pavements so that ambulances, fire engines can get through! - The gritter has problems as well the Council even put a sign up!! - - Loved on Bankside 52 years, all my married life , and about 50 years ago they tried excavating and stopped because of shifting sand. - - There isn't the infrastructure to accommodate this development as the road down the valley to Rawtenstall , and the road to Rochdale are a nightmare at peak times! - - Schools are full. - - Doctor's appointments are very difficult as it is without extra residents. - - I am completely against this proposal.	Thought the idea Jake Berry agreed to was to build on Brown Sites not Green sites. - - - There are plenty of derelict, empty properties in this area without taking our countryside from us!!! - - I'm thinking of my children and grandchildren.	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
718	Joanne	Leyland	-		Object	I've lived on bankside lane for 20 years and I'm strongly objecting for the planning proposals of houses being built it's already overflowing with cars as, most my neighbours and myself have 2 or 3 cars each and every one falls out all the time over parking as it is now so for more familys to be moving will just cause more problems, the roads are to narrow in many places it really will not work. Over the years I've lived here my 2 daughter's along with there friends who also live on bankside lane have grown up playing on the lane and it's so dangerous with the amount of cars going up and down it's an accident waiting to happen		It's just not acepticable to be building more houses with only a narrow road leading up to bankside lane and an average of 200 extra cars it will be an awful place to live and I love living here
729	Stanley	Horsfall			Object	Email received 30/09/2017: I would like to protest again at some of the the plan for bankside lane Email received 02/10/2017: I want to oppose the plan as the traffic on bankside is already congested		
759	Martin	Stansfield	-		Object	The width of the roads and the bends on Bankside Lane are already an accident to happen and cant support any oncrease in traffic,		have the same objection to the other 3 sites on bankside lane
769	Trevor	Bartram			Object	Access to all of the above sites is via Bankside Lane which is struggling to cope with the amount of traffic now using it. Another 150 houses, as proposed, would mean potentially a further 300 vehicles, which would add to an already congested road, there being only one way in and out of the town. - - With regard to the whole of Bacup a house building project of this scale will bring problems with Primary Schools, which are already full, doctors and roads. -		-
770	Jacqueline	Stansfield	-		Object	The road is too narrow and bendy for extra traffic. Near misses everyday sooner or later there will be a serious accident.		I do not think any of the other sites should be built on bankside lane for the same reason.
774	Stanley	Horsfall	-		Object	Bankside lane is already congested with traffic and and cannot take the extra that the plan would cause		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
785	Robert	Astbury	-		Object	Bankside Lane does not have a suitable road to support the additional through-traffic created by additional housing, there are several narrow parts of the road on steep inclines that do not allow two way traffic and these are heavily congested at peak times. Additional housing on Bankside lane (and the connecting side roads) will make access very difficult and impede the access for emergency vehicles. when large vehicles such as lorry's or bin men are on this road; you are unable to pass them and it is difficult to find a place to park for them to pass you, additional housing will only further amplify these access problems. problems will also occur during winter months when some roads are inaccessible due to snow and normally residents park on the lower roads for safety, this will be more dangerous due to increased vehicles needing to do the same with no additional flat parking spaces provided. The development will get rid of a thriving petting farm which brings in much needed tourism to Bacup. local town development is in dire need of renovation and adding more houses will not improve the local community and will only add more strain to local services.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
848	LORRAINE	WINNARD	-		Object	<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.</p>		<p>Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup. - - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane) and HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that all but one of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - - On</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
								Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there.
853	Ian	Read	-	HS2.5 HS2.32 HS2.13 HS2.11 HS2.12	Object	Fernhill Drive is not capable of taking any more traffic, The main Bacup to Rawtenstall carriageway is at it's capacity for traffic. - The site HS2.5 is not a suitable site for hosing and will cause problems on Fernhill Drive. - The site HS2.5 will interfere with the views of the existing houses		Bacup is full and no other housing should be built until the infrastructure in Bacup is improved ie Road to Rawtenstall.
857	Lucy	Beaumont	-	Hs2.32 + Hs2.5	Object	We use the hillside behind fernhill crescent extending down to bankside on a weekly basis with our young children, explaoring the area, looking a local wild life & animals. These green areas are used regularly by members of the public on a daily basis. What a shame to ruin it for the whole community when so many empty unoccupied houses are scattered around rossendale. It is lovely to have access to such a beautiful green area just a minute from our home..our children have spend many hours exploring and playing here.. - - The second proposal site Hs2.5 is just off fernhill drive.. A road already backed up with parked cars the majority of the time. The road surface needs adressing at present with pot holes all over, more houses and cars conjesting this area would be awful for residents who already live in the area!		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
879	Nick	Earnshaw	-		Object	Having lived very near the proposed area for over 20 years, and deciding to extend my property and stay in this area, rather than move, I am appalled at the proposal of ruining one of the nicest and accessible areas on this side of Stacksteads. Any more development will be skylined on this side of the valley. A valuable local focal point for walking and exercise will be lost. The area is well used by adults and children alike. I have personally carried out maintenance and litter picking on this area and am proud to have a little bit of countryside on my doorstep to look after for everyone's benefit.		I understand the need for some more housing, but please - drive around the valley, look at all the derelict and run down sites that exist already and build on them. Our valley infrastructure is overwhelmed already.. Roads are shocking, services stretched and minimum investment at the top of the valley (RBC inheriting the Lee quarry - it's a disgrace for the money spent on it, it should be a landmark). Grow a pair as a council and tell the policy makers Rossendale is full and stop ruining the only tourist attraction we have - our countryside location.
906	Graham	Smyth	-		Object	Grounds for objection as follows: - - 1. Access: Bankside Lane is narrow, winding & steep with two blind bends, and already heavily used by vehicles. The bends are dangerous, the more so in winter, and such dangers would grow with any increase in traffic. Additionally there are already access problems for larger vehicles (eg. gritter lorries, emergency services) on Bankside Lane because of its narrow width, compounded by on-street parking on both sides (many houses - notably terraces - have nowhere else to park); again the problem would be compounded by more vehicles using the Lane. Access for construction traffic would also be problematic. Opening access from the other end would not be a solution - creating another very steep way, and a potential 'rat run' for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the main road through the valley. - - 2. Infrastructure: there are issues more generally in significantly adding further to housing in Bacup, given the limited scope to improve the already clogged route down the valley to Rawtenstall / the A56/M66 etc. It is likely that many taking new housing in Bacup would be commuting in and out, reducing traffic flow further. - - 3. Capacity: Bacup is already at capacity in important areas such as schools, health services, dentists and extended services and lacks the capacity to absorb lots more households. - - 4. Flooding dangers – from HS 2.11 in particular, to houses immediately below it, at a much lower level, and to the terrace adjacent to it (60-68) which already often suffers from ground water rising into cellars. - - 5. Landscape – would be impacted. These sites, notably HS 2.11 are at a high level, visible from many points so building would visibly add to the erosion of the countryside amenity in Bacup. It would also impact on wildlife in the area.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
907	Carol	Mitchell	-	HS2.11 in particular and also HS 2.12, 2.13 and 2.32	Object	<p>Grounds for objections as follows: - 1. Access: Bankside Lane is narrow, winding and steep with two blind bends, and already carrying more traffic than is ideal. The dangerous inherent in the bends would increase with growth in traffic; they are also particularly prone to accidents in wintry conditions, which again would be exacerbated. The Lane is narrow throughout its length and now regularly parked up on both sides, creating access problems for larger vehicles (such as gritter lorries, fire engines etc); many householders have nowhere else to park other than the road. The addition of more vehicles (not to mention construction vehicles) having to use the Lane will significantly increase difficulties passing through. If it were intended to create access from the other end, this would create another steep and a potential 'rat run' for traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the main road through the valley – hence adding further to problems. - 2. Other access issues: adding to the housing stock in Bacup more generally is also problematic, given the limited scope to improve the already clogged route down the valley towards Rawtenstall and the motorway – particularly given the likelihood that the majority of any new housing would be taken by people relying on commuting for employment. - 3. Capacity: Bacup is already at capacity in important areas such as schools, health services, dentists and extended services and lacks the capacity to absorb many more households. - 4. Flooding dangers: the field at HS 2.11 is well above the level of houses below it, raising potential flooding hazards to them from building. Interference to thw water table could also pose risks to the adjacent terrace (60-68) which already frequently suffers from ground water rising into the cellars. - 5. Landscape: the elevation of the area around Bankside Lane also means that there would be an adverse impact on landscape as viewed from various points around and above the town.</p>		No
1003	john	dempsey	-	HS2.1 HS2.12 HS2.13 HS2.32	Object	<p>There are 3 separate places at the bottom of Bankside Lane, where the lane narrows to a single track. This means that you always have to stop to allow someone through, no matter what of day. Another 200 or so cars having to use this lane daily, would put an enormous amount of strain on the already stretched and limited road space. - This is an area where there are a lot of families and the extra traffic would be an accident waiting to happen, as many of the children play on or near the road. - One of the areas at the back of the semi detached houses is also an area where various wildlife roam and live. There are foxes, badgers and deer that are regularly seen in this area, making their way in or out of the wood.</p>		Only that we as a resident of Bankside Lane are totally opposed to the redevelopment of this area. We feel that it would spoil a green belt area of Bacup that leads onto the local countryside.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1023	Dave	Harding	-		Object	<p>The suggestion that further housing development is suitable on Bankside Lane is bordering on ridiculous. By the council's own admission, this road is already a "Problem Street for access" with vehicles double parking and the road itself being only wide enough for 1 vehicle to use at one time - in particular near the church and indeed pretty much all the way up to the proposed site HS2.11 and HS2.12. - Further housing would not improve the access and traffic density on this tiny lane - it would make it considerably worse. - - In addition to this, the increased noise and air pollution the extra properties would bring would be considerable - both during and after the building process.</p> <p>Rossendale Council showcase on their website a "clean and green Rossendale". Hardly clean or green if we use all our green spaces for building sites. - - The amenities also need to be improved before building many, many more houses. - - e.g. the options available for children going to secondary school in Bacup are extremely poor. The majority of "good" schools are oversubscribed, so children in Bacup are now being given the choice of a school in "Special Measures" - Fearn. As a parent of a child not far off secondary school, I'm considering moving out of the area - I certainly wouldn't consider moving in. - - The congestion on the main roads is ridiculous at rush hour times & quite simply, there isn't the demand for this many houses in Bacup. The development on New Line / Rockcliffe Rd area has never been finished - purely down to lack of interest from buyers. - - There are many suitable brownfield properties in the area that would be ideal for the right redevelopment however developers like the easy option... - - I'm not against change, however one of the biggest "selling points" of Rossendale are its green and open spaces. Remove these & it's one less reason for living round here. There aren't many left... -</p>		<p>The council should be looking at attracting people to the area by improving amenities, transport, education, shopping etc. Bacup in particular is becoming a joke. No Police Station, public transport is poor, schools are oversubscribed and / or failing miserably, the town centre looks rundown and scruffy etc. Hardly an area that is desirable.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1033	Ewan	Rowland		HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32	Object	<p>The additional houses proposed for the above sites will: - * increase traffic to and from Bankside Lane. The road is narrow and steep at key places along the route which allows only one car at a time to pass at specific points on the route. Driver's visibility is restricted by bends and rises in the road causing blind spots for drivers. Because of the narrowness at specific points, cars, vans and lorries have to swing across the road to pass buildings. - *there will also be an increase in traffic such as delivery vans/lorries and their service vehicles. - * houses opposite The Laurels Care Home at the junction of Maden Road and Bankside Lane have no off road parking and therefore park half on the road and pavement further restrict visibility for up hill and down hill traffic. Vehicles moving off the junction from Maden Road have very limited sight of cars coming down Bankside Lane at this narrow point and are forced to creep out onto Bankside Lane in order to safely access Bankside Lane. This also affects up hill traffic at this point forcing them to stop or slow down. - *vehicles joining Bankside Lane from Dale Street also have limited sight of approaching traffic at its junction and have to creep into the road until drivers have clear sight of up hill or down hill traffic. The road is only one car wide at this junction. - *the problem is compounded by traffic parking close to this junction for those attending services at St Mary Church, Dale Street. - *during the football season especially at weekends there is a high volume of traffic going to Maden Recreation Ground which causes congestion before and after football matches. The park is also popular with families and dogwalkers, most of whom arrive in cars, throughout the year. - *farm vehicles frequently use Maden Road via Bankside Lane on a regular basis which adds to congestion creating further potential hazards for other vehicles and pedestrians using Bankside Lane. - * Pedestrians have to cross the road at pinch points along Bankside because pavements stop due to the narrowness of the road. - * most households have two cars and the proposal to build an additional 140 houses on Bankside Lane will increase traffic by a potential 280 cars. The current access to these developments is inadequate for this amount of daily traffic. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1142	CHRISTINE	JACKSON	-		Object	<p>ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN - BACUP AREA. - Whilst I am totally opposed to the constant development of the whole of Rossendale and the ever changing green belt boundary I feel I must object most strongly to the new proposals in Bacup, which is recognised as the best preserved milll town in the County. - As a resident of Bacup for over 30 years I have seen some of our most beautiful countryside turned into housing developments, many of the houses built over the last 10 years have still not been sold. The fact is that there are already hundreds of empty properties in Bacup, new and old, which could fill our quota. - Sites HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32 (Bankside Lane),HS2.6 AND HS2.7(Todmorden Old Road) and HS2.4 (land off Moorland Terrace) are the most important ones to me personally and I note that the majority of these sites are privately owned, will they be subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders? These privately owned sites sustain the livelihood of their owners who, in this pastoral farming community, raise their livestock. Will these livestock be forced indoors off a natural diet with sunshine and fresh air to be raised like battery hens? - The wildlife in these areas consist of foxes, badgers, small mammals, bats, deer and wild birds, these will all disappear/die without this natural habitat. - The local infrastructure, schools, nurserys, health centres, roads, drainage, police, ambulance, fire cews and public transport is already stretched to maximum capacity, will increasing these services be considered with all this additional pressure to meet demand? - On Bankside Lane in particular the access is already stretched beyond capacity, being only one car width at 3 points, with double-parked cars, steep hills and narrow pavements. Potentially another 200 cars up and down here on a daily basis would literally create havoc. Access off, single track, Todmorden Old Road is also practically impossible. - HS2.32 is an open area at the top of Bankside Lane which is enjoyed by residents of Bankside Lane and higher Stacksteads alike, and has been for many decades. There is also an abundance of wildlife there, it is also on the skyline, building on here would have a huge impact on the views for miles around.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1175	Lesley	Earnshaw	-		Object	As a resident we enjoy this area greatly for walking. We exercise ourselves and our dogs, see children playing and building dens, see a range of wildlife and just escape into our beautiful countryside. Horse riders take safe routes away from the valley traffic and noise. After 20 years of living here, I have seen our roads for the whole of Fernhill disintergrate and be unsuitable for the current level of traffic never mind adding to the situation. Roads are patched and pot holed and no money seems available to put this right. School's are full, local amenities are stretched already. We have limited banking facilities, shops and recreation areas. We cannot support the current level of people well with residents from this end of the valley needing to travel to swim, shop and bank. How then does adding more "improve the lives of people in the borough"? We have limited spaces for children to play away from traffic. The woods off Fernhill team with a variety of wildlife that we enjoy supporting. My husband and I take great pride in trying to keep the area clean by litter picking and helping with the footpaths. We are dismayed that this land would be potentially destroyed for yet more houses despite many houses standing empty in the valley. We have been told by elderly residents that the land you suggest is not suitable due to unstable land beneath. Our little patch of woodland that we so love and would so miss. An area of calm and peace. It would change our skyline dramatically from our beautiful trees to a block of ugly housing. - This seems to have all happened very quietly with consultations coming and going without any of us being informed. We found out with a few days to the deadline of 9th October from a note from a resident through our door, not from any department of Rossendale council, which all feels very underhand. - I'm not sure how this site is in any way in the best interests of local residents. The land off Fernhill Drive would again add more traffic to the already crumbling road. Poor choices! -		Bring the infrastructure to Bacup to support such schemes. Our town is dying in comparison to Rawtenstall. They have bars, banks, a range of wonderful shops, swimming pool and sports facilities, the train, the Newhallhey project, the Ski slope, park, museum What do we have?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1201	Stephen	Anderson	N/A		Support	<p>Whilst there are challenges to developing this site for residential use that would require the property market to be more robust before it would be viable (noting that it is programmed for later in the Local Plan period), it is the most practical and logical site for development along Bankside Lane. - - Bankside Lane suffers from capacity issues driven by a lack of off street parking along its length, topography and a single viable route in and out, which would need to be factored in to defining the nature of residential development on the site. Given the evidence base and the relatively affluent demographic profile of the Bankside Lane area, adding a smaller number of larger aspirational homes would seem to be an appropriate way forward for the development of the site, whilst preventing an undue increase in pressure on the capacity of Bankside Lane and its infrastructure. - - It would be impractical to look at Newchurch Old Road as an access route into this site, as this would require a widening of the access into land which is in private ownership, resolution of some challenging topographical issues and an impact on the amenity of a far larger number of local residents than is the case for using Bankside Lane as the primary access. - - It is also important to note that the site does have amenity value to local residents and that the site includes the historic cart track from Bacup to Newchurch, a 'hollow way' which continues on from Newchurch Old Road and provides a green pedestrian / bridle link from Bankside Lane into Stacksteads and retains historic fabric which is highly likely to be captured within the emerging Rossendale Local List. It would therefore be desirable to preserve and enhance these historic features and the path network they support as part of the development of the site. - - Therefore, developed intelligently and sensitively, the site should be acceptable and viable for residential development.</p>		On balance, the Draft Local Plan is the best and most well balanced option.
1242	David	Greenhalgh	-		Object	<p>My objection is that Bankside lane is not capable of taking any more traffic and that extra housing with access onto this road will not only increase congestion even further on this already busy road, but will also be a potential safety hazard as there are already several narrow single car sections on this road, which have blind spots, due to housing and steepness of the road.</p>		-
1267	Steven	Fielding	-		Object	<p>The access road of Bankside Lane is already congested and way to narrow for cars to pass one another. I think it would be ridiculous to build more houses leading to potentially another 200 cars having to use Bankside Lane. - -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1270	Beverley	Walsh	-		Object	It is overpopulated now and the road was never meant to take heavy use of traffic. Tight narrow bends and doubled park cars. Pavements are narrow and not fit for families with buggies and the disabled using their disabled scooters. There already have been numerous accidents on this road. Access for emergency vehicles is already very difficult. - Wildlife will be destroyed foxes, deers and badger sets etc will disappear. More houses are unsustainable as we have very limited facilities in Bacup. E.g. Primary schools are oversubscribed. The road from Bacup to Rawtenstall will be permanently gridlocked.		
1271	Demi	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	I object to the plans to build houses on bankside lane for many reasons: - 1) Bankside lane is already congested - everyone already parks on the pavements and it's already quite difficult for gritters, fire engines and larger vehicles to get through. We do not need any more traffic added to this! As this will cause a huge amount of problems, not just for the residents but for the local council and the firebrigade. - 2) There are many narrow bends up Bankside lane therefore adding more cars would definitely be a health and safety issue with the only places left to park being near these bad bends causing collisions especially during the winter. - 3) The sites you are proposing to build on are are habitats of many different animals ranging from deer to foxes and badgers! These animals would lose their homes which would lead to them dying out in this area as they struggle to survive. We don't want to lose any more of our precious wild life which has lived there undisturbed for many years! - 4) Building on some of these sites would also mean cutting down trees and getting rid of the wonderful country side the valley prides itself in so dearly! We need to look after areas like these and not build houses on them. There are many sites way more suitable for new housing that will not cause damage to the environment in the same way - what about old buildings that are no longer used? Why do we not use these first, this would cause so much less damage to the country side! - Building more houses on bankside would not only mean finding more space for houses but also finding a second route up Bankside to allow for more traffic. Bankside lane does not have the space to do this! It would be almost impossible to do this without causing a huge amount of damage and a huge amount of time, effort and money that could be better spent! Overall I think that building up Bankside would be a very big mistake, one which can be avoided!		
1279	Stephen	Hartley	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13, HS2.32	Object	1) Bankside lane is already congested . It has many narrow parts that will become dangerous if more cars use the lane. - 2). Emergency services would have trouble getting past extra parked cars. - 3) It would have an affect on the wildlife eg deer foxes badgers if the fields disappear .		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1291	Alan	Mickleburgh	-		Object	The local and area infrastructure in Rossendale, and Bacup in particular, is insufficient to support the proposed housing developments. Roads, Public Transport, Schools, Police, NHS Services (GP' s and Dentists) will all suffer a major impact from the proposed developments. I am particularly concerned about the proposals for the Bankside Lane area. - - - Bankside Lane has only one access and departure route, via Market Street. Access is particularly difficult at peak times. - - - There are four single lane sections on Bankside Lane which creates congestion problems at any time. - - - Many households have more than one vehicle, and with restricted availability off road parking, vehicles are often double parked on both sides of the road with two wheels on the footpath. - - - Even at non-peak times, larger vehicles have considerable difficulty negotiating Bankside (eg. Trade deliveries, Council and Emergency Services). - - - Pavements are narrow, particularly where vehicles are double parked, creating major problems for pedestrians and the disabled. - - - Drainage is already a concern, with the amount of water draining from the higher ground. If these developments are approved, the excess water will be unable to be absorbed by the surrounding land and will potentially lead to flooding.		
1296	Sharon	Mickleburgh	-		Object	The reasons for my objection are:- - 1. There is no reasonable access as there is only one road (Bankside Lane) for both in and out. - 2. There are 4 extremely narrow sections on Bankside Lane. In some cases it is only wide enough for one car. - 3. The footpath is extremely narrow for pedestrians to use without increasing the amount of both people and Cars. - 4. It is virtually impossible to get out of Bankside Lane onto Market Street at peak times due to the amount of traffic on the main road. - 5. Turning left from Market Street onto Bankside Lane is very difficult if there is already a car waiting to get out Of Bankside Lane into Market Street as the road entrance is very narrow there. - 6. Some of the houses on Bankside Lane already suffer from water draining down from the fields due to lack of sufficient drains without more houses being built. - 7. I am concerned about the proposed expansion of housing in Bacup as the increased population will cause Problems for NHS facilities (doctors and dentists), schools, roads, public transport and policing. - 8. The Green Areas must remain to protect the environment and the wildlife around us. There are also quite a Number of bats around this area and other species that need protecting		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1343	Jane	Jones	-	HS2.11, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32	Object	Development at these sites would attract higher volumes of traffic travelling along Bankside Lane over a more concentrated period of time during the busy morning and early evening periods. This road has limited capacity and the increased levels of traffic could lead to traffic congestion and highway safety issues in this area having a detrimental effect on road safety on Bankside Lane and the busy A681 Market Street junction. - - There are already problems with access for council refuse vehicles due to the parking of residents vehicles along both sides of a narrow road, this has led to the placing of warning notices by the council informing residents that access for emergency vehicles including snow ploughs and gritting trucks is impeded by the number of inconsiderately parked vehicles. - - The vehicular access and car parking arrangements for any new developments would have an unacceptable impact on existing residents in terms of noise and safety, creating a traffic hazard and generating an undue environmental impact, exacerbating existing parking problems and resulting in excessive levels of on-street parking which would adversely affect local residents and the efficiency and safety of the highway network. - The introduction of in excess of 140 new homes; each with an average of 2 – 3 cars per household would produce approximately 300 – 350 additional vehicles per day using Bankside Lane, a road which has single lane pinch point access due to the existing narrowing of the road at its steepest point; which has a gradient of approximately 17%. During the winter months; weather conditions of ice and/or snow constantly prevent 2 wheel drive vehicles from driving up this hill, and lead to accidents when drivers are unable to control vehicles whilst attempting to descend when snow and ice have made this route impassable. -		I am fully aware that there is a need for more housing across Bacup and the whole of Rossendale, but meeting these requirements and government targets for the building of new homes should not be the sole focus of the council. - Understanding the current issues within local residential areas such as limited access due to road lay out, road safety concerns especially when there is an marked increase in the number of vehicles joining the main road from a street with an obstructed view due to the existing buildings (Bank on A681, parking on double yellow lines) should be given the highest priority.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1352	Alicia	Campbell Astbury	-	HS2.13, HS2.32, HS2.11, HS2.12	Object	I have many concerns about the area being developed further for houses. The access road via Bankside Lane is both steep and heavily congested with parked vehicles, with additional traffic there will be issues with passing places being available, as this is already an issue at peak times. - During winter months people at the top of the road leave their cars further down the street, if more cars were to do this the road would be inaccessible. - Bats are known to the area proposed, so how will the new development impact our local wildlife? - Will additional housing cause any issues with rain run off from paving over a large mass of land on top of a hill? Will it cause water-logging of neighbouring properties or any drainage issues? - Land proposed is alongside public right of ways, will new pathways be made available to the local people; children use these paths to get to the recreational ground, which is a safer route as the roads are hazardous with tight bends and lack of pavements on some sections or cars mounting the kerb on others making them inaccessible. - My main concern is the additional traffic on the road and possibly parked cars to emergency services being able to gain access through the street? Many homes on this stretch do not have a drive and the number of cars on the street is excessive and difficult to navigate. Also there are two sections where the road narrows significantly and one of these is steep with a blind corner, additional traffic will add to the danger. - Will extra traffic entering the street cause delays to the main highway as the road isn't wide enough to allow traffic to pass when turning right into Bankside close? - How easy is it for heavy goods vehicles to access the street, especially significant numbers for a development, will this cause delays to residents?	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1375	Margaret	Priestley	-		Object	<p>I have examined the plans and I know the sites well. I wish to object strongly to all the development of houses on or adjacent to Bankside Lane. - - The proposed siting of the developments is particularly ill-considered due to access, - Bankside Lane already has a high volume of traffic to the residential properties in the area. - - There is little pavement for pedestrians, the addition of extra traffic would create a safety hazard for them also. The pavements these days are a safety issue due to the amount of leaves from overhanging trees which the council no longer seem to cut back and maintain causing a buildup of slippery moss on the pavement surfaces. - Access is particularly hazardous in the winter months. The area is not always gritted, resulting in cars being abandoned along Bankside Lane as it becomes inaccessible. This leads to a knock-on effect resulting in access issues higher up Bankside Lane itself. - I therefore fail to see the advantage of building more houses in an already built up and inaccessible locations - In November 2013 due to the untreated surface I myself skidded into the wall just below the golf club during winter weather. - The other issue I would like to mention with Bacup itself< and forward thinking, is the lack of infrastructure with respect to banking. Two of the towns banks were closed last year with I think no objections from the council or at least no fight to keep them open that I am aware of. When the banks go people go out to other areas (e.g. Rawtenstall, Burnley, Rochdale, Bury) This will be the case with new residents, most of whom, if in employment, will be working out of the valley making Rossendale yet more of a commuter belt than it already is. Anyone travelling from Bacup via Rawtenstall or From Bacup to Rochdale can testify to this and know that anymore commuter traffic will be disadvantageous and effects all roads in the valley. People work outside the valley will conduct personal outside of Bacup.. - Therefore, I ask that Rossendale Borough Council refuse planning relating to the building of houses on Bankside Lane..</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1429	Nina	Byers	-		Object	<p>1) There would be a minimum of 200 extra cars using Bankside Lane if these houses were to be built! This would cause major problems with traffic building up at peak times (morning, evening, beginning and end of school times) in both Bankside Lane and Market Street. That corner is particularly tight, especially if there is a car waiting to come out of Bankside Lane. Then imagine a queue of traffic in the narrow, single track areas of Bankside Lane (of which there are 4) and you can see that traffic could easily come to a standstill on Market Street! Sometimes it is very difficult to turn right onto Market Street if there is a lot of traffic. - - 2) There is only one way to access these proposed development sites, via Bankside Lane. There are 4 stretches of the road which are only wide enough for one car. These stretches of road also happen to be on the steepest part of the road with blind bends. In bad weather conditions and at peak times this already causes problems without any extra traffic . There are also several further stretches of road which are only wide enough to get a car through due to people who already live on Bankside Lane needing to park their cars on the road due to them not having off road parking available! - - 3) The pathways for pedestrians are very narrow and non-existent in some places too! For example, by Cookoo Hall the path is very narrow! This is also made worse by cars being forced to park partially on the path and bins being stored on the path as there is no sensible alternative due to many houses being built much higher than the road! This makes it difficult for all pedestrians but especially the disabled elderly and parents with prams and young children! - - 4) Surface water run off will cause problems. I live on Bankside Lane, in front of and below Animal Quackers. There is already a lot of water running down from the fields behind us into our garden, which becomes very waterlogged and completely unusable! Our house is also down a flight of stairs which during heavy rainfall resemble a waterfall. I know that some of my neighbours have experienced some flooding into their house as a result of this. If that land was built on then this surface water would increase! This could result in possible flooding due to insufficient drainage. - - 5) There are already problems with the sewers, certainly with my neighbours, several houses either side have regular blockages which need unblocking using rods. Where would the sewerage drain to from the new housing? Would they also run through the same pipes? - - 6) These are all areas of natural beauty and support a lot of wildlife! There are also a lot of bats in the area which are protected.</p>		<p>The infrastructure of the area would be compromised. - - There is no police station - Not enough schools, no high school - Only one doctors surgery in Bacup - Only one Supermarket - Public transport. - No bus route on Bankside Lane as too narrow and steep. - All roads leading out of Bacup are narrow, some are steep and extremely busy at peak times</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1458	Jodie	Fairfax	-	Housing Site Allocations - specifically the sites behind Bankside Lane and at the back of Rooley View, but on housing development in general on any green land	Object	<p>I am a current resident of Bacup living on Edward Street with my husband. My parents (who live on Rooley View) and my sister and her family who live on Bankside Lane will also be objecting as will many of their neighbours. - - Empty houses already in Bacup abd Stacksteads - Firstly, I question the need for housing at all. If it is proven that housing is required, then there are hundreds of current buildings lying vacant in Bacup, as well as vacant industrial units where housing could easily be developed without touching the green land around Bacup and it's surrounding areas. In fact, from my house, within 20 yards of my front door, there are 4 houses boarded up that could easily be affordable housing. Not to mention no end of vacant properties on Newchurch Road through Bacup and Stacksteads. The Britannia Estate is still partially empty and those houses have been on the market for 2 -3 years already. - - Infrastructure - we have no police dedicated to the area; schools that are already oversubscribed, no high school or colleges; roads are already in a state of disrepair; public transport links are confined to the centre only; the healthcare in the area could not sustain the influx - doctors, dentists, not to mention no hospital. - - Width of roads (congestion) and width and lack of paths - specifically looking at Bankside Lane, the roads are already congested, double parking is rife. My husband drives a van and struggles to drive it up Bankside. The volume of vehicles required for a large housing development would not be feasible on the current road structures let alone the volume of extra residents using the road. Also, the paths are already too narrow for - the elderly, disabled and parents with prams and young children. - - Surface drainage problems and sewerage problems - possible flooding in some of the areas (e.g. Bankside Lane). Also, there is already existing issues with sewerage on Bankside Lane. The pipes frequently get blocked and overflow. My brother in law is a water specialist and had regularly unblocked it with rods so it stops running into his and other residents gardens. More sewage is not sustainable with the current system. - - Traffic in and out of Bacup at peak times - I commute to Salford daily. It often takes me 30 - 40 minutes to drive the 10 minutes to Rawtenstall at rush hour. This would increase. - - Wildlife and Areas of natural beauty - As already mentioned, I don't believe there is a need to build on green land, for example, behind Bankside near Animal Quackers. The impact on local residents, the environment and wildlife in the area will be catastrophic, and when there are many other options within current buildings and land, and so many empty houses, I don't believe this is needed. -</p>		<p>I am a current resident of Bacup living on Edward Street with my husband. My parents (who live on Rooley View) and my sister and her family who live on Bankside Lane will also be objecting as will many of their neighbours. - - Empty houses already in Bacup abd Stacksteads - Firstly, I question the need for housing at all. If it is proven that housing is required, then there are hundreds of current buildings lying vacant in Bacup, as well as vacant industrial units where housing could easily be developed without touching the green land around Bacup and it's surrounding areas. In fact, from my house, within 20 yards of my front door, there are 4 houses boarded up that could easily be affordable housing. Not to mention no end of vacant properties on Newchurch Road through Bacup and Stacksteads. The Britannia Estate is still partially empty and those houses have been on the market for 2 -3 years already. - - Infrastructure - we have no police dedicated to the area; schools that are already oversubscribed, no high school or colleges; roads are already in a state of disrepair; public transport links are confined to the centre only; the healthcare in the area could not sustain the influx - doctors, dentists, not to mention no hospital. - - Width of roads (congestion) and width and lack of paths - specifically looking at Bankside Lane, the roads are already congested, double parking is rife. My husband drives a van and struggles to drive it up Bankside. The volume of</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
								<p>vehicles required for a large housing development would not be feasible on the current road structures let alone the volume of extra residents using the road. Also, the paths are already too narrow for - the elderly, disabled and parents with prams and young children. - - Surface drainage problems and sewerage problems - possible flooding in some of the areas (e.g. Bankside Lane). Also, there is already existing issues with sewerage on Bankside Lane. The pipes frequently get blocked and overflow. My brother in law is a water specialist and had regularly unblocked it with rods so it stops running into his and other residents gardens. More sewage is not sustainable with the current system. - - Traffic in and out of Bacup at peak times - I commute to Salford daily. It often takes me 30 - 40 minutes to drive the 10 minutes to Rawtenstall at rush hour. This would increase. - - Wildlife and Areas of natural beauty - As already mentioned, I don't believe there is a need to build on green land, for example, behind Bankside near Animal Quackers. The impact on local residents, the environment and wildlife in the area will be catastrophic, and when there are many other options within current buildings and land, and so many empty houses, I don't believe this is needed.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1544	Enid & Kenneth	Burke		SHLAA16079	Object	<p>We strongly object to the proposed plans to change previous Green Belt sites to building sites mainly on the narrowness and steepness of the pavements and roads. Presently the volume of traffic is overloaded because most households have 2 or more cars. Visitors to the Golf Club, Football Pitches and Petting Farm add to the problem, especially at weekends when the volume of cars and work vehicles doubles. Last winter the council gritting vehicles could now operate in parts because of parked cars/vans. We have also witnessed a number of near "misses" on the bad bend near to the Laurels Nursing Home.</p> <p>The use of outdoor space is essential for our grandchildren and children, to lose this is not acceptable.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1576	David	Thompson			Object	<p>I object to the proposed housing development sites referenced HS2:11, HS2:12, HS2:13 and HS2:32 listed in Chapter 1 (HS2) of the above plan. My concern is that the connectivity of each of these sites to essential facilities in Bacup Town Centre is unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <p>There are only two routes from the sites to the Town centre, one of which is lodge lane and the other is Bankside lane.</p> <p>Lodge lane is to the South and East of the four sites, and is closed to motor vehicles as a through road. It has a very steep slope with an average gradient of 15% (1 in 7) and therefore does not comply with any national or regional planning guidance as being acceptable for use by pedestrians, the mobility impaired and cyclists. It would therefore be improper to suggest lodge lane as a route from the sites to Bacup Town Centre.</p> <p>This means that Bankside lane is the only acceptable access to the Town Centre for all highway users. However Bankside lane has a particularly steep section for a length of 242 metres between its junctions with Market Street and Maden Road and I believe it to be unsatisfactory as a means of access to the proposed housing developments as evidenced in the following disclosures attached to this letter:</p> <p>Disclosure 1.</p> <p>a. Non Compliance with the Lancashire County Council Code of Practice on Mobility , Inclusive Mobility' Section 3 Footways</p> <p>b. Non Compliance with the Lancashire County Council Transport and Design Guidance 'Creating Civilised Streets' Section 5.5 Connected Streets</p> <p>c. Non Compliance with the Department for Transport 'Manual For Streets' Section</p> <p>7.6 Visibility Requirements. (Note this section includes calculations that have safety implications for highway users and I request that it is submitted to LCC Highways Engineers for verification).</p> <p>Disclosure 2.</p> <p>Breach of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan Policies:</p> <p>ENV1 - High Quality Development in the Borough</p> <p>ENV2 - Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Disclosure 3.</p> <p>Prior refusal of a planning application for development off Bankside Lane.</p> <p>On the basis of the above submissions I request that the proposed housing sites HS2:11, HS2:12, HS2:13 and HS2:32 be removed from the Rossendale Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1586	Adrian	Boyden			Object	Has a resident of Bankside Lane my concerns are of increase in traffic on this busy lane , more accident s and near misses especially on the blind bend . There are no other access routes for residents so to add more traffic is irresponsible.Also how do you propose to get wagons . Machinery .Etc to building sites ? Without causing chaos on a now fragile road .Shows the plans having been thought about properly .		
1588	Alison	Whittaker			Object	<p>I strongly object to these proposed plans to change areas,of previous Green Belt Sites,to building sites.The visual impact of the development will greatly effect my property,building work at the front of my property has already caused loss of existing views and is out of character in terms of its appearance. The proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood, the green spaces and rural views would be lost changing the landscape of a quiet rural area to an over populated housing estate. There would be significant loss of the open aspect of the current residential properties. The enjoyment of the current views, design and landscaping is an important residential amenity, and the loss of these features would have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of the existing properties.</p> <p>The new development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing properties adversely impacting on the character and appearance of the communityin particular the green spaces that is valued open space enjoyed by local residents. Furthermore there is a requirement to enhance the local environment including wildlife habitats and rural lands. Further housing development would result in overlooking, unacceptable high density, overshadowing and loss of natural light. Further over development would be overbearing and result in an adverse effect on the residential amenity of the current neighbourhood. Designs that are inappropriate in there context and fail to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions should not be approved.</p> <p>Unacceptable over development on Bankside lane would adversely affect highway safety and cause great problems for road users,the lane is just too narrow, steep with a blind bend that is already hazardous for road users. The current infrastructure is insufficient to support further increased vehicular access.Please can this concern be referred to qualified engineers for technical clarity.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1620	Jennifer	Cudworth			Object	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the plans mentioned above.</p> <p>My primary cause for objection is on the grounds of safety. Any proposal to build more houses using Bankside Lane as vehicular access is quite frankly dangerous. Bankside Lane already suffers badly with traffic issues - access to the proposed sites is via a steep, narrow road which is reduced to a single-track for the vast majority by parked vehicles. There have been numerous traffic collisions on Bankside Lane due to poor visibility caused by parked vehicles, and "near misses" are almost a daily occurrence. (The problem is exacerbated in bad weather as the gritter encounters difficulties passing the many parked vehicles, meaning there are often delays in treating the road at the top end of Bankside Lane. In addition there are the emergency services to consider - just a few weeks ago, a fire engine was forced to undertake a dangerous manoeuvre to negotiate a corner that was obstructed by parked vehicles, endangering the crew and causing damage to a resident's grass verge).</p> <p>The proposed building works would add to this situation not only short- to medium-term while large construction vehicles access the site, but also long-term due to the increased number of private vehicles requiring daily access to homes. The element of danger to pedestrians, animals and motorists would be greater still if an access route were to be constructed from the Stacksteads end, as this would inevitably be used as a "rat run" for people travelling between Bacup and Stacksteads and wanting to avoid congestion at Lee Mill. Secondly, the fields currently occupied by Huttock Top Farm, and the area of rough land known locally as "Old Joey's", between the top end of Bankside Lane/Rooley View to one side and Osborne Terrace/Hill Crest to the other, are both habitat to a multitude of wildlife including deer and bats. Both areas are affected by the proposed plans. The destruction of natural landscape and the pollution (noise and environmental) brought about by the construction would drive out the wildlife that residents enjoy sharing our green spaces with. Furthermore, Bacup been cited by English Heritage as the best preserved cotton town in England. The construction of new homes would affect the general appearance of the area to the detriment of Bacup's Heritage status. Also to build on the land locally known as "Old Joey's" (see above) would impact upon the skyline of the Rossendale Valley.</p> <p>In view of the above I would urge you to reject the proposals and keep Bankside Lane a safe place for its residents and wildlife.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1636	Kevin	Woods			Object	<p>I am responding to the proposed local plan to develop 4 building sites (100 new houses) off the Bankside Lane area of Bacup. I strongly oppose the plans as the topography of area is not suitable for further development which increases traffic flow, and should be changed back to green belt site.</p> <p>The reason I consider the area to be unsuitable for this development is that the access via Bankside Lane is too narrow and too steep to support development which increases traffic flow. Bankside Lane is single track in parts with both single and dual road junctions joining. The volume of traffic with existing demands is already a significant risk to safety.</p> <p>Each year for the past 20 years living on Maden Road we have been cut off from vehicular transport/ access at least once, when snow falls. Not all residents are able/ willing to buy a 4-wheel drive vehicle and so many become stranded each year. The consequences of this extend beyond personal inconvenience to being unable to get to work, to access emergency services or to discharge caring responsibilities for elderly relatives. Sometimes, due to the hazard of abandoned vehicles, the lane becomes impassable even with a 4 wheel drive vehicle.</p> <p>Since I have lived on Maden Road (above Bankside Lane) myself and family members have been involved in several traffic incidents on the lane in which the topography (and often weather) have been a significant contributory factor. In 2007, my car was collided into on Bankside Lane by a car travelling from Dale Street, in an incident in which the driver misjudged the traffic travelling from four directions between double and single track roads. My car was badly damaged requiring over £2000 of repair work (not my liability), though fortunately I was unhurt. In 2015 during a sudden heavy snowfall, my son's car slid out of control on a descent of Maden Road, whilst avoiding a driver attempting 'a run' up the hill and other abandoned vehicles. His car was written off, though fortunately he was not seriously hurt.</p> <p>I strongly urge the council to reconsider its proposals and find the necessary development sites or solutions which do not involve any further increase in traffic through Bankside Lane. The area does not have the topography to support any developments which would further increase traffic flow.</p>		
1642	Jane	Trivett			Object	<p>If any one lives on Bankside Lane/Bacup and works for RBC they must surely know that the proposed new build sites make no sense at all. Local people know how steep the lane is and unless major road widening took place it will not work. Bankside Lane is totally unsuitable for any more traffic. The recent road resurfacing proved how difficult it is and the Highways people struggled to hastily finish the job even with road closures. Another 200 plus cars up the lane is ridiculous.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1656	K	Jeppesen			Object	<p>Having bern notified via social media about your proposals regarding the Bankside area in Bacup, I must strongly object to it.</p> <p>I am baffled that such an idea can be a serious one! A number of issues springs to mind, and are so obvious, that its hard to take this proposal serious. Firstly the situation about the traffical access to the higher part of Bankside Lane. Blind bend, steep incline/desent. Abnormally narrow footpaths,- or entirely non-existing footpaths, makes it high risk to use this part of the road as a pedestrian. Not to mention , having to ask your children to use them to catch their school bus or go to activities elsewhere.</p> <p>To my knowledge , we have only by luck ,not had any serious accidents with personal injuries, but there has been plenty of bumps and minor crashes, costing residents here extra expense. I would assume that a further 200 dwellings wil take with it, close to 200 more cars,- probaly 300 in my opinion, which would of course also mean considerable higher risk, using our road. I have not mentioned the roadconditions during wintermonths, when ice and snow , makes using Bankside Lane an absolute gamble.</p> <p>In these condotions, many cars are unable to get up the incline, although many "have a go",and therefore get stranded halfway up, abadoning their car, and soon the road looks like an unorganized car-park. And traffic coming downhill the opporsite way, often find it impossible to stop, or even stear due to the snow/ice.</p> <p>Further more, beeing able to stop at the junction with the busy Market Street at the bottom of the lane, is a hazardous gamble ,even more so. Personally, I have, on a couple of occasions "skated" right out onto Market Street, with only Lady Luck to look after me ! I have seen others do the same, and it can only be a question of time, before some major incident will occur.</p> <p>So it seems to me, that somebody in the council havent done their homework, and certainly not used Bankside Lane very often, because any increase in traffic here, is equivalent to asking for incidents/injuries to residents up here. I would think that the land in question, originally was graded "green field" for a reason !?</p> <p>Deer, fox and multiple othe wildlife, is seen here on a daily basis, the view over the valley too , improves our quality of life, and is a daily pleasure. We live in a nice and quiet part of Bacup, and have been looking forward to keep doing that, into our retirement ,- the older part of us anyway. Neighbouring estates of "affordable housing", as the PM is asking for, sounds to me, like housing for clientel, not nessecary with the same outlook on life values !</p> <p>All in all I'd wish you to reconsider these proposals, as they have clearly not been scrutified thoroughly, before they were published. Let the Rossendale council show , once and for all, that it takes its citizens safety and wellbeing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
						<p>into account , when making these kind of plans. We have for years , constabty been "awarded" with council tax rates , that hardly were second to none,- unfortunately in the expensive end of the scale, but at the same time only seen cuts and poorer services in return. (swimmingpools, bin collections and household waste centres ring a bell?) Do the right thing, and reinstate green field areas to be what they should rightly be : green fields.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1660	Rachel	Greenhalgh			Object	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed changes to previous green belt sites to building sites in Bacup. Under the Draft Local Development Plan, there are plans to allocate building land for housing in the Bankside Lane area (site references HS2.1, HS2.12, HS2.13 & HS2.32). As a resident in the area (MadenRoad), I already know that Bankside Lane is not able to sustain the current levels of traffic and that to build the proposed potential 100 New homes would bring the road into crisis. As you are no doubt aware, Bankside Lane is very steep and narrow- at some points little more than single width. Add into this the fact that the narrowest points also have very poor visibility, meaning vehicles travelling in opposite directions frequently have to perform emergency stops to avoid a collision and often have to reverse to clear the way, creating a new hazard for other approaching drivers. I myself have been involved in such situations several times a week and have serious concerns about the increased risks presented by any proposed housing and the extra traffic they would create.</p> <p>As you are presumably aware, the pavements here are also very narrow and walking along them can be very hazardous as the passing cars often have to come very close to or even mount the pavement to avoid cars coming in the opposite direction. We have seen an increased volume of traffic already coming up the Lane to access the Maden playing fields and also more groups of families and children walking up to the football sessions there. I have huge concerns for their safety if the volume of traffic is significantly increased by new residential traffic too.</p> <p>My primary objection to the proposed plans are centred around the increased dangers of introducing more traffic to an already congested and very narrow access road, however I also believe that we should not be sacrificing our green belt land to provide housing. We are lucky to live in such a beautiful area and we should be doing all we can to protect and sustain the very features which attract people to our town. As we all know, Bacup has not seen the levels of regeneration and investment that some local towns have seen. Indeed the centre of town is currently underoccupied and full of empty buildings. Would our local plan not be better off considering how best to breathe life into these areas rather than eating into green belt land which should be left for all to enjoy and encourage a healthy lifestyle? there have been several studies published in recent years that highlight the importance of the natural world in combating the stresses of modern life and it's positive impact upon mental health. Surely this is a reason to protect our green belt land?</p> <p>Perhaps instead of building new housing around the edges of town, we could look at converting some of the empty commercial sites into apartments and low cost housing which would support those who really need to get onto the housing ladder. We have seen several large housing estates already built in Bacup, somebody which have struggled to sell all their housing stock. Do we</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
						<p>need to introduce more? There are a large number of existing houses already for sale in the town and some of these have been on the market for some time. Surely building more new homes will only exacerbate this problem? We should be encouraging new people to come and live in our town, but who will want to buy in an area where the resale prospects are not attractive?</p> <p>I apologise for the length of this email but this is an issue I feel vey strongly about. I hope that you will give due consideration to my concerns, and I would appreciate a response from you to confirm the receipt of my objection.</p>		
1683	E. Oliver and Beryl	Finnegan			Object	<p>Having studied this proposed development we are more confused than enlightened.</p> <p>Where is the line of development, if it is as we understand we wish to make a objection and our reasons why we object to the development in general.</p> <p>As we understand, the proposal is to build up to 200 houses, most on the existing Bankside Lane development and quite a number on a linear development extending beyond the top of Bankside Lane, parallel to Fernhill Crescent and Osborne Terrace.</p> <p>In our opinion this must be the most inappropriate area to build, the road network cannot cope with the existing traffic volume, local people and business are avoiding travelling on the Bacup to Rawtenstall road at several times of the day due to sheer volume of traffic causing a three mile queue.</p> <p>We are assuming if this folly goes ahead there will be no development on the skyline behind Fernhill Crescent, surely planning permission would not allow this.</p> <p>We are assuming the wooded area overlooking Fernhill Crescent and Osborne Terrace would not be effected as these are a haven for wildlife, and local families, there is a wide variety of birds in these woods, including a colony of bats, the animals' include rabbits, squirrels and even deer.</p> <p>This area is a haven for family groups who walk the ancient tracks and paths of this wonderful area in safety, well away from the danger and pollution of overcrowded roads.</p> <p>This wooded area was created for another important reason, and that was to stabilize the hillside, when we first moved into this house the hillside was so unstable the retaining wall in our back garden was undermined by land slip and had to be demolished and rebuilt, this also happened to several of our neighbours, after the wooded area was created none of us had any more problems with land heave.</p>		
1779	Andrew	Heathcote			Object	<p>I would like to oppose any planning application for any additional housing estates on Bankside lane in Bacup. The road can't handle any more traffic, and I believe that this would have a very negative impact on current house prices.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1790	David	Trivett		SHLAA16079	Object	SHLAA16079 - Land off Newchurch Old Road Bacup. HS2.32 Greenfield. Designated Greenlands. Countryside adjoining the urban area. Currently Grazing Land in part (horse related activities) woodland area and shrubland area. Yield calculated 93 units. Access via Sow Clough Road or Bankside Lane. The above proposed development access has conflicting information about the calculated yield, site area and access. The Policies Map shows the area marked HS2.32 with a yield calculated at 47 units. Appendix E notes "the steep slope to the south of the site has been excluded from the area available for development." This area is shown as green infrastructure on the Policies Map. This precludes access via Sow Clough Lane and restricts the site access to Bankside Lane. (...) The development reference SHLAA16709 HS2.32 is proposed for a Greenfield and Greenlands site where trees were planted as whips on rough moorland circa 25 years ago. The proposal for 47 units on this site will destroy the woodland area, removing the habitat for the groups of Roe deer we sometimes see from our living room window; a beautiful sight. The badgers, foxes and birdlife to be found in this open access green space will be lost to more housing. "Protecting our green spaces and promoting business are key priorities for our council." "Keep Rossendale Green" Greenfield, Greenlands woodland habitat proposed for development SHLAA16079 HS2.32. Land off Newchurch Old Road. Access via Bankside Lane. Green infrastructure. Mitigating CO2 and flood potential to the valley floor. Natural wildlife corridor, a stepping stone habitat for biodiversity. This site should be protected not developed for housing. (...) Policy ENV12: Trees and Hedgerows SHLAA16079 - Land off Newchurch Old Road Bacup. HS2.32 This development will have an impact on the Policies ENV11 and ENV12. Can we keep the established woodland and not develop this site please?		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
1813		Brewster		Land off Newchurch Old Road	Object	<p>We are objecting to the 4 proposed building sites on the Bankside lane area. We object to these plans on the grounds that the main Bankside lane road, which will have to be used to carry all the traffic for these proposed houses, is not adequate as the road is already struggling to accommodate the existing traffic.</p> <p>The stretch of road from Cuckoo Hall down past the church is very narrow, this will cause untold hazards with the volume of vehicles that are going to use the road when construction begins. Not to mention the extra permanent traffic that will be forced to use the road to access their homes. Any further volume of traffic is most certainly going to cause serious accidents and at the very worst, death.</p> <p>We have had an accident on this very stretch of road, so we talk from experience of how dangerous this stretch of road can be.</p> <p>When there is a funeral at the church the whole road is grid locked with cars being blocked in all directions, so with extra vehicles, this is going to make the grid lock even worse.</p> <p>We have a 20 miles per hour speed limit on Bankside lane, but no one seems to adhere to it and nobody seems to know who gives way to who! So, if locals don't know, do you think new residents will?</p> <p>What about when it snows? This stretch of road is absolutely treacherous. When a car is coming up the hill, and another is going down nobody dare stop, so it ends up with traffic both ways skidding all over the place and of course the whole road is blocked. Extra traffic is bound to cause more accidents and somewhere along the lines there WILL BE a death.</p> <p>The plans show that the majority of houses are four bedrooms, this means there will most likely be more than one car per household. So as the plans show, there are to be 200 homes meaning there will be a minimum of 400 hundred extra cars using Bankside Lane. Large parts of the road are only wide enough for one vehicle, and most existing residents can only park their cars on the road because they have no drive.</p> <p>Which brings us to the main point of discussion, Newchurch Road.</p> <p>We can be quite sure that should these houses be built the majority of buyers will be from outside the valley. This means they will be commuting to and from the valley to go to work, when we have ONE ROAD TO AND FROM RAWTENSTALL, to access the M66. This motorway is already chronically over congested as it is. WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM BURNLEY, WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM TODMORDEN, AND WE HAVE ONE ROAD TO AND FROM ROCHDALE.</p> <p>When we have to have work done on the stretch of road FROM BACUP TO RAWTENSTALL, our main commuting road, to the M66, the backup of traffic is absolutely horrendous with waiting times up to one hour. I doubt we could cope with extra traffic on our ONE ROAD THROUGH TO RAWTENSTALL.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.032	Further comment
						<p>So, the extra strain on our one main road is going to have an impact on the whole of the valley.</p> <p>Then we come to our amenities. Can our Health Centre cope with the extra work load? Are there even enough places in our schools?</p> <p>Then what about our green belt, we live in a beautiful valley, which the council should be trying to promote to tourists, instead of being hell bent on destroying this unique part of Lancashire.</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>BANKSIDE LANE, BACUP - HS2:11, 12, 13 and 32 proposes to allocate land which could result in 137 new dwellings off Bankside Lane which is an unclassified road approximately 1.1km in length varying in width and gradient with several pinch points and heavy on-street parking. To the west of its junction with Thistle Street, Bankside Lane provides the sole access to circa 150 dwellings.</p> <p>The existing layout on Bankside Lane is broadly reflected on the 1845 historic map and would not be considered acceptable under the current standards. The land to the west of Bankside Lane is at a higher level than the road which results in high retaining structures and there are buildings on both sides of Bankside Lane at several points which abut the road with no footway provision. Where there is footway provision, the widths are sub-standard along most sections.</p> <p>There is little opportunity for improvement works to the current road layout within the extents of the adopted highway.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would seek a secondary / emergency access to be provided where more than 100 houses are proposed off a sole access such as Bankside Lane. Therefore any development land allocated off Bankside Lane should provide a secondary vehicle access point onto the highway network. The topography of the land presents difficulty in providing a suitable route and within the land that is proposed for allocation it appears unlikely.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has serious concerns about these sites and the ability to provide a safe and suitable access in accordance with the NPPF and adequate permeability for traffic distribution in accordance with Manual for Streets.</p> <p>HS 2.32 – Subject to the provision of a secondary vehicle access to the site being provided (Lodge Lane has been reviewed and discounted due to its narrow width over a significant length and gradient), this site could be considered acceptable. A pedestrian and cycle link to Osbourne Terrace would be necessary to support the sustainability of the site and provide a suitable walking distance to the nearest bus stops on Newchurch Road , the local Primary School and food shop.</p>		
Number of comments						73	HS2.032	
Reference						HS2.033	Land at Kirkhill Avenue, Haslingden	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
3	Natalie	Hutton	-		Object	I currently live on Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden and we have a real problem with water coming from the land behind us. During the winter we have three rivers that are now a permanent feature. Several home on the Avenue has also flooded and the fire brigade have been called out to drain the water away. - - There are a large number of trees which are situated on the land, not only does this provide a home for the local wildlife but they also help to soak up some of the water that is coming down the hill. If you take those trees away you will just be causing more water to come down the hill into the houses. - - Is t not against planning regulations to allow building on land that has a flooding issue? - - the field that you are purposing to take away is the only green space around Hillside estate and Kirkhill Avenue so is used regularly by dog walkers and children who need a safe area to play.		I would like to questions how many times this consultation is going to take place.
707	Julie	Erwin	-		Object	The site (green space for community) is part of the original planning permission granted for existing housing and is maintained as such (grass cutting, path, bridge and land drain maintenance) - -Existing road and Moorland Rise unadopted and insufficient for extra traffic - -Kirkhill Ave and Moorland Rise are already dangerous in winter. This would only get worse with more houses - -Putting access onto Kirkhill Road would be dangerous (poor visibility, too steep) and create a 'rat run' from Bury Road, through Longshoot/Hillside estate - an area with many children and older people, putting them at risk - -The land is prone to flooding from water off the hillsides - -The land is now an established wild-life area - -The site is well used by local people from all around for dog walking, horse riding and children playing		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
1001	Martin	Yates	-		Object	<p>Whilst acknowledging the provision of new homes are required to meet the needs of the growing population my objection to this area having been designated for housing will definitely adversely impact on the views from adjacent properties by severely breaking the skyline, will have a detrimental effect upon the openness and informal recreational use of children playing and locals exercising their dogs, which may of course lead to further footpath fouling albeit none of this will not impact on the view from our property. - Development of 22 units here will definitely have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the area, will not enhance the street scene and will have a detrimental impact to the amenity of the occupiers of adjacent properties in terms of visual amenity, privacy, overlooking, massing and pollution. - Any development will result in the loss of a large and safe space in a quiet residential area that is in recreational use without the foreseeable replacement of the same type, of equal or greater quality in an appropriate location that is accessible from the same local community and as we all know recreation areas make a significant contribution to quality of life, they not only provide opportunities to participate in outdoor pursuits, they also have a positive impact on environmental quality and are important for health and well-being. It is also an area of wildlife from a variety of birds, deer and bats. - Development of 22 units here would take away a well used safe recreational space used all year round by families, walkers, equestrian's, dog walkers and children whatever the weather including rain and especially snow. - Vehicular access from Kirkhill Road would be very difficult in view of the prevailing speed of vehicles, the standard of access required from a classified road with the appropriate visibility splays and/or a roundabout and therefore unlikely to be given consent which means the only access will be from Kirkhill Avenue. The additional traffic generated by the development both in its construction and final usage would only exacerbate the existing poor road condition and as neither Moorland Rise nor Kirkhill Avenue are adopted, [I believe the council have refused to adopt these roads because they claim the drainage is inadequate, the road is insufficient for emergency and service vehicle to pass, albeit I don't understand why emergency vehicles should be travelling opposite directions at the same time and Kirkhill Avenue cannot be adopted as it is off an un-adopted road] therefore any repair cost would fall to the residents. - The increased traffic flow from both construction traffic and final users will impact severely on Kirkhill Avenue, Moorland Rise and also Sandown Road giving rise to further carriageway problems and frozen patches during winter conditions which will raise real safety concerns especially when children are going to school.</p>		An alternative that may be considered is only allowing building on the Northern section of HA2.33, as this is no longer maintained, water logged in places and the timber walkways and bridge are in need of serious repair and leaving the Southern grassed area as it is

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
1081	Christine	Goldthorp	-	SHLAA16319	Object	Development of residential units Kirkhill. - - I know this area well and wish to object strongly to the development of houses in this location. This area remains Greenbelt and development would result in urban sprawl and destruction of a recreational area. - - The site specific landscape study 2015 concluded that the majority of the site was not suitable for development due to the impact on landscape, high risk development area for the Coal Authority, potential land contamination and surface water flood risk. - - The loss of green space here has the potential to affect the flood zoning which is already in zone 2 and affected by medium surface water flooding. The footpaths are often small rivers in the rains and houses on Kirkhill have previously flooded. - - Footpaths run through this green site and the land itself promotes physical activity for the surrounding community, a play area for children and dog walking. Development would destroy this. - - There is likely to be an increase in noise disturbance during development and subsequently with increased residency and traffic. - - Access would need to be created. The LCC Highways understandably, have concerns with access from Kirkhill Road so Kirkhill Avenue is the only option and it is unadopted. The resulting increase in traffic would affect both the busy Hillside estate where there is a primary school and Moorland Rise which is also unadopted. - - Furthermore, there is the potential to reduce wildlife including European protected species that are found in this area such as bats. There are habitat corridors at the site which would be reduced, restricting the movement of wildlife using these habitats. -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
1100	William	Goldthorp	-	SHLAA 16319	Object	I know this area well and wish to strongly object to the development of houses in this location.This is a Greenberg area and development would result in urban sprawl and the loss of a recreational area. - The 2015 site specific landscape study concluded that the majority of the site was not suitable for development due to the impact on landscape,high risk development area for the Coal Authority,potential land contamination and surface water fold risk. - The loss of green space here has the potential to affect the flood zoning,alread in zone 2 which is affected by medium surface water flooding.The footpaths become streams in heavy rain and houses on Kirkhill have previously flooded. - Footpaths and the land itself in this green site promotes physical activity for the surrounding community,a play area for children and dog walkingDevelopment would destroy this. - There is likely to be an increase in noise during development with increased traffic and residency.Any increase in traffic would affect the busy Hillside estate,where there is a primary school, and Moorland Rise which is a narrow road and also unadopted. - Access would need to be created.The LCC Highways understandably have concerns with access from Kirkhill Rd so Kirkhill Avenue is the only option and is unadopted. - Finally there is the potential to reduce wildlife including European protected specie said that are found in this area such as bats.Also there are habitat corridors at this site which would be reduced which would restrict the movement of wildlife using these sites.The biodiversity of the site would also be compromised if not completely ruined. - -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
1371	Daniela	Ripa	-		Object	<p>I object to the allocation of HS2.33 for housing at Kirkhill Avenue, Haslingden. This allocation comprises Areas A and B of the Kirkhill and Moorland Haslingden sites of the Landscape Study Document (2015). This document identifies that these parcels are not suitable for development on landscape grounds, in particular Area B, which would result in moderate to substantial adverse harm to the landscape. The proposed allocation directly conflicts with the evidence base as the Landscape Study Document (2015, pages 152-157) identifies Areas C and E of the Kirkhill and Moorland parcel as potentially suitable for development with mitigation. Area E is to the north of Brynbella Drive within the under construction Taylor Wimpey development at the Former Rossendale Hospital Site (known as Dale Moor View) and this should be allocated for housing instead of HS2.33 and removed from the Green Belt on the grounds that: it is a logical phase 2 of this recent development; the infrastructure is already in place for this to be brought forward in the short to medium term, with a signalised junction at Union Road/Haslingden Road and potential for access from Brynbella Drive; and it would be in line with the Landscape Study (2015) which identifies only a moderate degree of harm would arise to the landscape, which is far less harm than would arise from the allocation of HS2.33 (moderate to substantial adverse harm). - - In addition, the requirement to bring the entirety of Hillside Road/Kirkhill Avenue to adoptable standards presents a challenge to the delivery of the housing allocation.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
1372	Gregory	Martin	-		Object	I object to the allocation of HS2.33 for housing at Kirkhill Avenue, Haslingden. This allocation comprises Areas A and B of the Kirkhill and Moorland Haslingden sites of the Landscape Study Document (2015). This document identifies that these parcels are not suitable for development on landscape grounds, in particular Area B, which would result in moderate to substantial adverse harm to the landscape. The proposed allocation directly conflicts with the evidence base as the Landscape Study Document (2015, pages 152-157) identifies Areas C and E of the Kirkhill and Moorland parcel as potentially suitable for development with mitigation. Area E is to the north of Brynbella Drive within the under construction Taylor Wimpey development at the Former Rossendale Hospital Site (known as Dale Moor View) and this should be allocated for housing instead of HS2.33 and removed from the Green Belt on the grounds that: it is a logical phase 2 of this recent development; the infrastructure is already in place for this to be brought forward in the short to medium term, with a signalised junction at Union Road/Haslingden Road and potential for access from Brynbella Drive; and it would be in line with the Landscape Study (2015) which identifies only a moderate degree of harm would arise to the landscape, which is far less harm than would arise from the allocation of HS2.33 (moderate to substantial adverse harm). - - In addition, the requirement to bring the entirety of Hillside Road/Kirkhill Avenue to adoptable standards presents a challenge to the delivery of the housing allocation.		The land to the south west of parcel HS2.62 marked 'IWS' on the Policies Map should be allocated as a Recreational Area within the Green Belt. It is a valuable area of informal recreational open space.
1374	Ross	Erwin	-		Object	The land in question forms the public open space serving the development at Kirkhill Avenue. This land is widely used for recreational purposes by the residents of Kirkhill Avenue, Moorland Rise, - Hillside Road and other streets in the area. The provision and maintenance of this public open space was a condition of the planning permission granted for the residential development of Kirkhill Avenue. This amenity space should therefore be retained in-pertetuity. -		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
1486	Hilary	Martin	-		Object	I object to the allocation of HS2.33 for housing at Kirkhill Avenue, Haslingden. This allocation comprises Areas A and B of the Kirkhill and Moorland Haslingden sites of the Landscape Study Document (2015). This document identifies that these parcels are not suitable for development on landscape grounds, in particular Area B, which would result in moderate to substantial adverse harm to the landscape. The proposed allocation directly conflicts with the evidence base. The Landscape Study Document (2015, pages 152-157) identifies Areas C and E of the Kirkhill and Moorland parcel as potentially suitable for development with mitigation. Area E is to the north of Brynbella Drive within the under construction Taylor Wimpey development at the Former Rossendale Hospital Site (known as Dale Moor View) and this should be allocated for housing instead of HS2.33 on the grounds that: it is a logical phase 2 of this recent development; the infrastructure is already in place for this to be brought forward in the short to medium term, with a signalised junction at Union Road/Haslingden Road and potential for access from Brynbella Drive; and it would be in line with the Landscape Study (2015) which identifies only a moderate degree of harm would arise, which is far less harm than would arise from the allocation of HS2.33 (moderate to substantial adverse harm). In addition, the requirement to bring the entirety of Hillside Road/Kirkhill Avenue to adoptable standards presents a challenge to the delivery of the housing allocation.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>1.1 This representation is prepared by Turley on behalf of our client Peel Holdings (Land & Property) Limited (hereafter “Peel” or “our client”). It provides comments to Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) in respect of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan1 (July 2017) (‘DLP’) which is currently the subject of public consultation.</p> <p>1.2 This document relates exclusively to the promotion of land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden, as a development opportunity. It should be considered in conjunction with the overarching representation submitted by Turley on behalf of Peel.</p> <p>Draft Rossendale Local Plan</p> <p>1.3 As set out in the overarching representation submitted, Peel has continuously and historically engaged with the plan-making process for Rossendale. This has included the submission of detailed representations to the previous Core Strategy and the draft Lives and Landscapes DPD (since withdrawn), including Development Frameworks that set out the development potential at four sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden (allocated in part) • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall (allocated in part) • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield (allocated) • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield (not allocated) <p>1.4 Peel welcomes the progress which has been made on the emerging Local Plan and supports, in principle, the proposals for development within it. In particular, Peel strongly supports the allocation of land at Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden, Haslam Farm in Rawtenstall, and Blackburn Road in Edenfield, which include some or all of three of the sites previously put forward (as above).</p> <p>1.5 It is noted, however, that additional work is required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is capable of meeting the full development needs of the Borough. Additional land will need to be allocated for residential development, above that which has been identified in the DLP.</p> <p>1.6 This opportunity is being taken to make representations in relation to the sites previously identified by Peel as capable of accommodating development in the Borough that have not been put forward in the DLP for allocation and/or Green Belt release. Peel is preparing updated Development Frameworks which will promote and justify its landholdings within Rossendale. Matters addressed below and in the overarching representation which directly affect its landholdings will be discussed in detail in each Development Framework.</p> <p>Additional Site Allocations</p> <p>1.7 In the context of the need for the Rossendale DLP to allocate additional land for development, Peel wish to reiterate the development opportunities at each of the four sites previously identified, as well as proposing a further</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
						<p>potential site at Rossendale Golf Club.</p> <p>1.8 These sites can each provide a deliverable housing development site in sustainable locations adjoining existing settlements. Initial reviews of site constraints and opportunities, landscape and highways have indicated that there are no significant barriers to development.</p> <p>Development Frameworks</p> <p>1.9 Further site appraisals are being undertaken to inform updated Development Frameworks which will be provided to the Council in due course.</p> <p>1.10 The updated Development Frameworks will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide analysis of the site constraints and opportunities. • Where relevant provide details of the findings of further technical assessment (such as highways, flood risk, ground conditions). • Consider the key principles for development of the site. • Present a proposed site layout plan illustrating development parcels, access, landscaping, etc. • Comment on the economic benefits of development. • Address comments / observations made within the recently published evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. <p>Proposed Development Opportunities</p> <p>1.11 In advance of the full Development Frameworks, the individual site representations are submitted providing initial reviews of the development opportunities.</p> <p>1.12 The Sites are represented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden (this document) • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield • Land at Rossendale Golf Course, Helmshore <p>1.13 This representation relates to land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2: A description of the site and its location • Section 3: Details of the consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA)2 and a review of the planning policy context including the Draft Local Plan • Section 4: A Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review • Section 5: Concluding comments <p>1.14 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted here for residential development.</p> <p>2. Opportunity Site Site Description</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
						<p>2.1 The land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise comprises two sites - land at Kirkhill Avenue (A) and land at Moorland Rise (B) on the eastern edge of Haslingden.</p> <p>2.2 Site A extends to c. 2.4 ha (5.9 acres) and is located to the north east of Kirkhill Avenue. It comprises open grassland, which rises towards the north and east and is used for informal recreation. Kirkhill Road forms much of the northern and eastern boundary of the site. Kirkhill Avenue forms the southern boundary of the site beyond which lies a large residential estate. Residential properties form the western boundary.</p> <p>2.3 Site B extends to c. 5.05 ha (12.47 acres) and is located to the east of Moorland Rise, Haslingden. Comprising open land, the site is bound to the north, south and west by residential properties. St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary School and playing fields lie south west of the site. Immediately north west of the site is a modern housing estate, comprising detached houses. Haslingden Old Road forms the north eastern part of the boundary; the remaining eastern boundary is defined a track. The south eastern boundary is defined by a footpath.</p> <p>Local Facilities</p> <p>2.4 The sites lie approximately 0.75 km to the east of Haslingden Town Centre, with Rawtenstall Town Centre approximately 3.5 km to the east. Haslingden Town Centre is home to a number of services and amenities including a dental surgeries; off-licence / grocery stores; national banks and building societies; and a pharmacy. The nearest large supermarket (Tesco superstore) is located c. 0.7 km south of the site.</p> <p>2.5 St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary School is the closest primary school to the site, located c. 0.3 km south of the site. All Saints Roman Catholic High School is c. 2.5 km south of the site, with Haslingden High School 2 km away. There are a total of 5 secondary schools and 18 primary schools within 5 km of the site.</p> <p>2.6 There are a number of bus stops located along Manchester Road in the centre of Haslingden c. 0.75 km south of the site. These stops are served up to every 10 minutes by the 464, 244 and 484 bus services, which connect Haslingden with Bury and Rochdale in the south, Rawtenstall in the West and Blackburn, Accrington and Burnley in the north. The nearest train station is located 8.5 km north of the site in Accrington. The site is also well connected to both the local and national highway, with the A56 c. 0.75 km from the site which connects to the M66 (c. 5.5 km) and in turn the M62 and M60 (c. 20 km).</p> <p>3. Planning Policy Context Consideration in SHLAA</p> <p>3.1 The Draft Local Plan evidence base includes the 2017 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which aims to identify the land supply</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
						<p>for housing within the administrative boundary of Rossendale within the next 15 years (2017 – 2032).</p> <p>3.2 Site A: Land at Kirkhill Avenue was promoted in the SHLAA (Site Ref 16319). The SHLAA Site Assessment confirmed that it is a viable and achievable site for up to 22 homes in the short term (1-5 years), subject to overcoming site constraints. Peel consider that the site could accommodate 50 units.</p> <p>3.3 The SHLAA notes that the site specific landscape study (2015) concluded that the majority of the site was not suitable for development on landscape grounds, but it is argued in the assessment that the site can become suitable in the medium to long term with appropriate landscape mitigation. The site is considered to be suitable for a housing development subject to the mitigation of the constraints identified.</p> <p>3.4 Site B: Land at Moorland Rise was assessed in the SHLAA (Site Ref 16395) but not promoted for development due primarily to landscape impact, and due to access constraints and electricity wayleaves. The SHLAA noted that the site is physically developable if these issues can be resolved. Moorland Rise was previously identified as an area for Green Belt Review and release from Green Belt in the 2011 Core Strategy.</p> <p>Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management DPD</p> <p>3.5 The Draft LP Part 2 was withdrawn. Within that plan, 'Site A' – Kirkhill Avenue was proposed for housing development (site ref. H36). Part of 'Site B' – Moorland Rise - comprising 1.2ha of land to the south west of the site, was proposed as safeguarded land by the LP Part 2 (site ref. H92), with a potential capacity of 30 dwellings. The wider site comprising c. 5.05 ha of land located to the east of residential dwellings on Moorland Rise, which would have remained within the Green Belt in the LP Part2.</p> <p>3.6 Representations made by Peel in response to that Plan supported the housing allocations and made further comment in relation to landscape and access to support the proposal. Both matters can be resolved through mitigation, which will be considered fully and illustrated in the updated Development Framework.</p> <p>Saved Policies</p> <p>3.7 As the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management DPD" (LP Part 2) was not taken forward by Rossendale BC, in relation to site allocations and designations, the Proposals Map and Saved Policies3 remain relevant as part of the development plan.</p> <p>3.8 The Proposals Map identifies the Site as outside the Urban Boundary (Policy DS1); Site A being in an open 'Countryside Area' (Policy C1) and Site B being within the Green Belt (Policy DS3).</p> <p>3.9 However, Policy 1 of the Core Strategy states that the Urban Boundary defined in Local Plan Saved Policy DS1 and the Green Belt boundary defined in Saved Policy DS3, will be reviewed and where necessary amended in the Site</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
						<p>Allocations DPD. The reviews would take into account criteria set out in Policy 1 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where small scale selective rounding off of Green Belt boundaries would promote sustainable development opportunities. • An extension/amendment to the urban boundary would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment. <p>3.10 Moorland Rise was identified as an area for Green Belt Review and release from Green Belt in the 2011 Core Strategy. Core Strategy Figure 15 identifies the east of Haslingden as an area for Green Belt review. Rossendale Draft Local Plan</p> <p>3.11 As discussed in the overarching representation, the Draft Local Plan (DLP) recognises that some release of Green Belt land will be required to meet the housing requirements and the NPPF requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites (DLP, page 12).</p> <p>3.12 The evidence presented in the DLP indicates that 4,425 dwellings will need to be delivered over the period to 2034. Considering the under provision of 425 dwellings since the adoption of the Core Strategy and the potential land supply from non- Green Belt sources of 2,907 dwellings, there is a significant gap of approximately 1,518 dwellings.</p> <p>3.13 The Draft Local Plan proposes areas for release from Green Belt, allowing for a delivery of a further 715 dwellings. It is therefore evident that the Green Belt releases proposed by the DLP need to be more than doubled - to accommodate 1,518 dwellings - if the emerging Local Plan is to be found sound.</p> <p>3.14 In relation to Site A specifically, the DLP proposes to extend the urban boundary to include this land and it is proposed to be allocated for housing development, Ref. HS2.33: – ‘Land at Kirkhill Aveune, Haslingden’ 0.74ha, for 22 dwellings, deliverable within 1-5 years.</p> <p>3.15 Peel supports this proposal and welcomes the allocation of the site.</p> <p>3.16 In respect of the land at Moorland Rise (Site B) however, the DLP does not propose to include this land within the Urban Boundary and the site would remain designated Green Belt. Policy SD2: Urban Boundaries directs all development within such boundaries ‘except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area.’</p> <p>3.17 As above, it is clear that there is a significant gap between the housing land supply identified in the DLP and the demand, which cannot be met by non-Green Belt sites alone.</p> <p>3.18 Peel contends that the inclusion of the Moorland Rise (Site B) land as a housing allocation and its release from Green Belt would be in keeping with the NPPF and would assist in achieving the shortfall of land within the Borough for the necessary housing development to meet demand.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
						<p>Continuation of the proposal to release this land from the Green Belt as in the Lives and Landscapes Plan, albeit it is now a housing site and not safeguarded land.</p> <p>3.19 The following section considers the role of the land in terms of its contribution to Green Belt purposes in greater detail.</p> <p>4. Green Belt Appraisal</p> <p>4.1 The land at Moorland Rise (Site B), is currently designated as Green Belt. A Green Belt review⁴ (GBR) forms part of the evidence base for the DLP which has informed the plan's proposed retention of the Site as Green Belt.</p> <p>4.2 The strategic purpose of the area of Green Belt which the Site forms part, is primarily to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall to the east. It also contributes to the separation of those two towns in the north from Edenfield to the south.</p> <p>4.3 The Site sits is on the eastern periphery of Haslingden. Site B at Moorland Rise corresponds with the western part of GBR Parcel P13, closest to the development at the edge of Haslingden, see below.</p> <p>Figure 4.1: P13 (Site location indicated)</p> <p>4.4 It is important to note at the outset that there are very clear and accepted exceptional circumstances which justify the release of significant amounts of land from the Green Belt to meet Rossendale's housing and employment needs. All land within the current Green Belt, fulfils at least some aspects of Green Belt purposes. As such, it will not be possible to meet the identified housing needs of Rossendale without some impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.5 It is also important to note when considering what land to release from the Green Belt to be clear that the "golden thread" which runs through plan making and decision taking is the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF confirms this at paragraph 84 when it states that "...when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development...". In considering the release of land from Green Belt it is therefore essential to consider what releases of land will achieve sustainable development while minimising the impacts on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p> <p>4.6 The GBR notes that Haslingden is not considered to be a large built up area, and therefore Green belt surrounding it cannot play a role in achieving this purpose.</p> <p>4.7 Peel agrees with this assessment.</p> <p>Purpose 2 - To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>4.8 The GBR considers that parcel P13 has a strong role in preventing towns merging, namely Haslingden and Rawtenstall. These settlements are within very close proximity (within 0.5km) and have good intervisibility in the lower lying areas to the south. The GBR considers that Pike Law - an area of elevated</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
						<p>land - forms a visual barrier between the two settlements that is of critical importance. It notes that the parcel plays an essential role in preventing the merging or erosion of the visual gap between Haslingden and Rawtenstall, any new development that took place within the parcel could lead a loss of openness and the perception of narrowing the gap between the two neighbouring towns.</p> <p>4.9 Peel disagrees with this assessment. It is considered that it is incorrect to treat Haslingden and Rawtenstall as separate settlements for the purpose of the Green Belt review. Whilst they may be distinct in terms of their urban character, they have already physically merged. The curtilages of properties at the east of Haslingden (to the rear of Yarmouth Avenue) and at the west of Rawtenstall (at the rear of the former NHS site off Haslingden Road) are back-to-back; the buildings in this location are very close.</p> <p>4.10 In any case, when considering only the western strip of the parcel P13 (the location of Site B land at Moorland Rise), in isolation from the eastern part of the parcel, the contribution to this purpose is even further limited. As set out in Peel's representation to the Local Plan Part 2, the release of the site would not significantly reduce the distance between Haslingden and Rawtenstall as the gap between the two settlements in this location would reduce by only 100m and would still be approximately 300m wide at the closest point.</p> <p>4.11 Therefore it is concluded that the land could be released from Green Belt without harm to this purpose.</p> <p>Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>4.12 The GBR found that the parcel's contribution in this respect was moderate. It found a sense of encroachment within the parcel as a result of the visual influence of the neighbouring settlement edge of Haslingden to the west and a small number of residential properties in the east. Despite this urbanising influence, the GBR found that the parcel displays characteristics of the open countryside, but lacks a strong and intact rural character. Due to the elevated topography of Pike Law, located within the parcel, the neighbouring settlements of Haslingden, Rawtenstall and Helmshore are highly visible from within it, although this does not substantially detract from its character.</p> <p>4.13 Peel considers that the land within their ownership does not accord with this assessment. The site adjoins the settlement of Haslingden and does not include the higher ground to the east (the remainder of the parcel P13), where Pike Law is located, which is of a more rural character. In following existing field boundaries lined on the eastern perimeter the development would be contained, maintaining the openness of the land to the east.</p> <p>4.14 Whilst it is accepted that it is important to protect the countryside from encroachment, it is considered that the release of Site B, together with the proposed DLP allocation to the north at Kirkhill Avenue, would be a logical extension to Haslingden, and that any limited harm in this respect would be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
						<p>outweighed by the benefit of meeting housing land supply requirements in a sustainable location.</p> <p>Purpose 4 - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p> <p>4.15 The GBR considered that P13 has intervisibility with Rawtenstall Town Centre. The openness of the parcel is not considered to form key part of the setting of these historic settlements but could form part of the wider setting; therefore effects of development within the parcel on the character of the historic settlements would be limited.</p> <p>4.16 Peel agrees with this assessment. Residential development to the edge of the existing developed area of Haslingden would not have a detrimental impact on the setting or character of Rawtenstall or Haslingden town centres.</p> <p>Purpose 5 - Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p> <p>4.17 The GBR notes that all parcels make an equally significant contribution to this purpose.</p> <p>4.18 The DLP proposes to optimise the re-use of brownfield sites to meet development needs and in doing so support ongoing urban regeneration.</p> <p>4.19 As noted above, and in the overarching representation, the supply of deliverable brownfield land is insufficient to deliver the number and type of new homes and employment land required to meet the needs of the borough. As such, the extent of urban regeneration/ brown field development which can be achieved is not sufficient to meet Rossendale's sustainable growth needs and must be accompanied by development on Green Belt land. Exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt release have been proven through the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. The release of land from the Green Belt will not therefore undermine this purpose.</p> <p>Green Belt Appraisal Conclusion</p> <p>4.20 The strategic purpose of the area of Green Belt which the Site forms part, is primarily to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall to the east. It also contributes to the separation of those two towns in the north from Edenfield to the south.</p> <p>4.21 Site B does not contribute to that strategic Green Belt function. It has been assessed in the GBR as part of a larger parcel, extending to the east including higher ground at Pike Law. The GBR accepts that this is not an area of Green Belt that restricts the sprawl of built up areas. Peel contests the view that Site B has any role to play on preventing Rawtenstall and Haslingden from merging, due to its isolated peripheral location within the context of the wider Green Belt parcel.</p> <p>4.22 Sensitive site masterplanning, together with the housing allocation to the north at Kirkhill Avenue (Site A), would deliver a sustainably located housing development. The proposed boundary will provide a long term defensible Green Belt boundary with the field boundaries to the east being strengthened with additional landscaping.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.033	Further comment
						<p>4.23 It is considered that this Site is suitable for development and is in a highly sustainable location. Its release from the Green Belt will therefore contribute to a sustainable pattern of development which makes the most of proximity to nearby highway infrastructure. There are therefore clear exceptional circumstances to justify its release from the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.24 Peel strongly supports the allocation of Site A and recommends the Council allocate Site B to ensure sufficient land is allocated to support the housing needs of the borough.</p> <p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>5.1 In relation to Peel's land interests in the Borough, this document concerns one of four sites which have been subject of previous Development Frameworks and representations in the context of the Local Plan development. Updates to these frameworks will be provided to RBC in due course, setting out a clear vision and proposals for the development of these sites.</p> <p>5.2 This representation provides an initial review of the development opportunity at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden, including details of the site and its location, consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA) and planning policy; and a Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review which forms part of the evidence base to the DLP</p> <p>5.3 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted for residential development.</p> <p>5.4 Site A has been allocated for housing development in the DLP. Peel strongly supports this allocation.</p> <p>5.5 The SHLAA identifies Site B as having potential for development, but with landscape impact as the major constraint; the DLP proposes it remain within Green Belt. Peel considers that the site can be developed with sensitivity to landscape features, and together with the allocated site, there is potential for a logical extension to the west side of Haslingden. The updated Development Framework to follow this representation will further illustrate the opportunity for the development of this site and give comfort that it should reasonably be released for development.</p> <p>5.6 Peel requests the designation of Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden in its entirety as a housing allocation.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		
Number of comments						HS2.033	10	
Reference		HS2.034		Land rear of Highfield Nursing Home				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.034	Further comment
660	Mandy	Sagar	-		Support	This site has been up for sale for at least 2 years and has planning for 2 dwellings, however it is highly priced and the developer will not negotiate has we are only interested in one plot of land - - Can you please contact the developer with a view for negotiating a less cost for one plot of land	-	
Number of comments		HS2.034				1		
Reference		HS2.037		Land adjacent Park Avenue / Criccieth Close, Haslingden				
529	Sherry	Long	-		Object	The plan on placing a housing development off Park Avenue/Criccieth Close needs further consultation. This is a community used area for walking dogs, and use by members of the Victoria Park Estate as it was known on the original plan. This parcel of land is subject to flooding in the autumn, winter and early spring every year. Talking to some of the residents who have been on Park Avenue since the 1940s, they tell me that there was a large lodge down at the bottom of the street. When this estate was built it was filled in with dirt, but never drained properly, hence it stays wet for a good part of the year. A developer will probably struggle to get it dry enough to build on; think muskeg!! It gets wet and stays wet and is not stable for large equipment which may sink in the boggy ground. Original property owners have restrictive covenants which prohibit alterations in use which would decrease property values of this estate. My husband is an original property owner. - However, you need to be aware there are other issues: in winter, when it snows, a large part of the residents cannot get their cars up the hill on Park Avenue due to snow and ice. We have identified the problems to both Lancashire County Council and Rossendale Borough Council voicing concerns about getting out of the estate but also how emergency vehicles might get in should the need arise in snowy conditions. Again the issue has not been addressed. The road is barely being maintained with the traffic from 100 households on this estate (many of the households having more than 1 car). There is not enough space for further access off Park Avenue which is already used as parking for events in and around Victoria Park. - We are concerned what another housing development will do to property values of this estate. - We will be keeping an eye on this open space and your future plans and will raise challenges with our neighbours if we need to protect our interests.	-	We believe it is a bad decision to open this space up for development.
703	Christopher	Fairclough	-		Object	I think that additional housing on Park Avenue will make an already busy and dangerous road when trying to enter and exit onto Manchester Road even more busy and dangerous. The road is already a single lane due to parking on both sides of the road towards the top of Park Avenue.	-	
704	Laura	Fairclough	-		Object	I think that additional housing on Park Avenue will make an already busy and dangerous road when trying to enter and exit onto Manchester Road even more busy and dangerous. The road is already a single lane due to parking on both sides of the road towards the top of Park Avenue.	-	
Number of comments		HS2.037				3		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.040	Further comment
Reference		HS2.040		Land adjacent 53 Grane Road, Haslingden				
712	Lynn	Brown	-		Object	The area is one of the few green areas remaining on Grane Road and will impact on the view and property value of my house. It will also affect the Blue lamp recreational area off Grane Road.		I have already been subjected to Rossendale Planning ignoring the views of local residents and can only hope that they take views on board this time!
Number of comments		HS2.040		1				
Reference		HS2.042		Hollin Way, Rawtenstall				
7	J	Wilson	-		Object	Too many 'new builds' do not maintain the existing character of the area. Many farm houses (including a grade 2 listed) in this area. County feel would be lost. - Schools, dentists and Doctors in this area are oversubscribed. - The road into Rawtenstall is constantly backed up with traffic despite recent traffic light adjustments. Linking Hollin way onto Lime Tree Grove would increase traffic on the estate ,particularly those trying to escape Burnley Road traffic, therefore posing a risk to children in the area. The field provides home to many different types of wildlife and is an area family's enjoy. Countryside views would be spoiled.		Rossendale has enough houses, people and traffic. Constant building is turning our lovely valley into a town. More people cause more litter and pollution. Schools are oversubscribed and children are losing fields in which they play. Those of us who were lucky enough to be born here worry about the future of what was/is an area of natural beauty which must be protected!
Number of comments		HS2.042		1				
Reference		HS2.044		Land at Hollin Lane and north of Hollin Lane, Rawtenstall				
563	Christopher	Easton	-		Object	I do not believe that the infrastructure and services can be developed to support this proposal.		No
564	Angela	Easton	-		Object	I do not believe that the infrastructure and services can be developed to support this proposal.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.044	Further comment
635	Ross	Hemsley	-		Object	The use of this land for housing was raised several years ago and was not taken forward then for several reasons, principally access and congestion issues. - - In the intervening years the amount of traffic using Hollin Lane has dramatically increased following the building of the Alder Grange 6th Form Centre and the growth of the Nursery attached to St Pauls school. Twice a day when schools are in the area becomes completely choked up with vehicles, parking restrictions are ignored and parents sit waiting for their kids quite often with their engines running. - - Once the parents have picked up or dropped off they then sit on the hill of Hollins Lane waiting to join the extremely busy Burnley Road which in any event gets backed up towards Crawshawbooth every morning. - - By building more houses at HS2.44 the developers would only add to the pressure on the already overloaded roads infrastructure, put even more pressure on local schools and other resources such as healthcare. - - The width of Hollin Lane itself once it splits from Calder Avenue is single track and as such would be unable to cope with the number of vehicles that the plan would generate. - - Ross Hemsley FCILT -		Rossendale is an amazing place to live and to work and is blessed with some unique and stunning landscape which should be protected. - - The fact that it is generally in a valley means that the amount of land available is finite and can only support so much development. - - If there is to be growth it must be made in a manner which can be supported by the surrounding infrastructure. Anybody trying to get to Haslingden or even worse Manchester in the morning is faced with long traffic queues and delays. Recently the traffic has backed up to Newhallhey roundabout several times as the M66 cannot cope with the volumes joining it from the A56 and A682 simultaneously. - - There has been talk of turning the railway into a commuter line, that is highly unlikely. - - I have always been a keen cyclist but despite talk of developing safe cycling routes the volumes of traffic just continue to rise, making cycling at any other time than early mornings at weekends extremely dangerous.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.044	Further comment
757	Anne	King	-		Object	<p>The following issues arise out of the Council's proposal to build 51 houses on the area HS2.44 of the Local Plan - - ACCESS - Access to the site is down a narrow single track lane. There is no space to allow two-way traffic. Even if one-way traffic was to be put in place, there is no space to allow for a pavement. The latter is necessary to allow safe access from the proposed houses to the local nursery, primary and secondary schools. - - The proposed access is on an almost blind bend which is already dangerous to negotiate at peak periods and school opening and closing times. - - Walkers from other areas in the north of the estate have to cross the lane on their way to school. Having increased traffic entering and exiting to and from the proposed housing would endanger walkers, children in particular, not all of whom have adult supervision. - - Already, parents park along the sides of all local roads at the start and close of the school day. It will be dangerous and difficult to exit the lane onto the blind bend as parked cars will make it difficult to see traffic coming down the hill from the top of the estate. - - Traffic coming up the hill from Burnley Road and turning right into Calder Road, towards the schools, already have to negotiate a blind bend. Adding another road to this junction will increase the difficulties at what is already a very dangerous turning, especially at peak periods. - - The junction of Hollin Lane and Burnley Road is already very heavy at peak hours of the day. Long tailbacks are common on week days as traffic from various roads on the estate only have access to Burnley Road from Hollin Lane. They also have to contend with the traffic coming up Hollin Lane and turning into Calder Road to access the two schools and nursery. Additional traffic coming from the new houses would increase the chaos, especially at this bend. - - ADDITIONAL AMENITIES REQUIRED - Current Rawtenstall nursery and primary schools are almost at capacity. What arrangements are being made to increase the capacity of these or build new school premises to accommodate the children from the houses proposed by the plan? - - What consideration is being given to the pressure additional housing will put on local GP and Dental surgeries? - Waiting lists for appointments are already very long. Additional families will need access to these already overburdened facilities. - - - - -</p>		<p>It is accepted that the council has a duty to build new housing to meet government requirements. This objection is not against additional housing. The objection is raised due to the dangers and pressures the proposed housing would put upon the local area and its residents.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.044	Further comment
761	David	King	n/a		Object	<p>The Council Proposal to designate the land for the construction of 51 houses has the following flaws to likely successful completion. - Access to HS 2.44 - The only present access is viable a single vehicle width, narrow lane with steep sloping shoulders supporting the gardens of a substantial number of properties. There would be inadequate access for emergency vehicles, delivery vehicles, domestic access via cars (100+ for 51 houses?) over the approximate 150 metre stretch of lane and no space for a pedestrian pavement. - - The lane meets the presently adopted highway at the junction of Calder Road and Hollin Lane on a sloping section of road at a blind bend. This is particularly busy with many parked cars at the start and end of the working day for the Secondary School, Primary School and Children's Nursery which have access and egress via the same junction. There is also the high volume of foot traffic of adults and children at the same time leading to a likelihood of road traffic accidents. - There would likely be an increase on the volume of traffic using the Hollin Lane junction to enter Burnley Road for access north and south to the principal road networks. - - Local Amenities - The Primary and Secondary schools are at virtual capacity. The addition of 51 larger houses would bring greater pressure on schools. There is no mention of extra provision in this area or for Shops, Pharmacies, Doctor's and Dental Surgeries to support the enlarged community.</p>		<p>The need for extra housing is appreciated but developments should be on a logical, sympathetic basis - where such developments can be accommodated into the community with safe road access meeting the required, stipulated standards and the provision of increased community facilities to supplement the existing infrastructure which is under substantial pressure and reaching/has reached capacity.</p>
766	Jennifer	Bailey	-		Object	<p>We have an important wildlife site on the land in question. - The land is already prone to flooding which will worsen with building. - The proposed access lane is a single track lane providing no opportunity for safe vehicle access, safe walking or cycling. - The local infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the volume of traffic in the locality. There is considerable traffic on the Constablee Estate due to the 4 school facilities on Calder Road and parent and staff parking is already blocking entrances into side streets and causing access problems in and out of the Estate. - There is a high volume of traffic using Burnley Road and any slight disruption causes long delays for several miles. Increasing housing on Constablee and up towards Crawshawbooth will create even more traffic delays. Air and noise pollution will increase which will damage the Valley's reputation as a rural area. - There are no plans to improve public transport in and out of the Valley and safe cycling is not a priority for the Council therefore we will have more cars, more pollution, more parking issues and more poor health issues. - Our facilities - GP and dental services, schools etc are over stretched . -</p>		<p>Parking around the Valley is becoming a problem for cyclists and pedestrians. Cars park on double yellow lines and on junctions on a daily basis particularly on Calder Road for school pick up causing great difficulties for pedestrians trying to cross the busy road. Cars are also parking regularly on double yellow lines on Bank Street and there appears to be little policing of illegal parking. - - There is a poor attitude towards cycling in the Valley and cars are regularly parked on the few cycleways that have been allocated. Perhaps more people would cycle to work or school if cyclists were given more consideration and priority by the Council. The condition of road surfaces around the Valley makes cycling extremely dangerous at present. - - -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.044	Further comment
781	Christine	Selim	-		Object	<p>Access to the site is down a narrow lane that will require to be widened even if this is so there will not be enough space for a footpath and would be hazardous to children parents and pushchairs. - The proposed access is on a blind bend which is made worse by traffic coming up Hollin lane and turning into Calder Rd towards the schools and nursery which are already overprescribed. - Crossing this area would be dangerous from residents from the other side of the estate. - Parents already park at ,schools leaving times all up Pendleton Ave and on the pavements and across drives,this of course would be increased. - The infrastructure must be carefully scrutinized as to Medicaland Dental services which are already overloaded and have to wait weeks for appointments. What arrangements are being made to increase this capacity and that of the schools.</p>		<p>It is appreciated that more affordable homes are required t,he objections are raised duetto the dangers and pressures that would be put on local services and safety as to the roads around the area.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.044	Further comment
1036	L	Bower	c/o agent		Support	<p>Policy HS2: Housing Allocations (Site HS2.44 – Land at Hollin Lane, Rawtenstall) - - Emery Planning is instructed by Mrs Lorraine Bower to submit representations to the above consultation document. Mrs Bower is the owner of part of Site HS2.44 – Land at Hollin Lane. Our client owns SHLAA16184. - - We have been instructed by the family for a number of years and took an active part in the Part 1 Examination and through the more recent consultations. Our client has also undertaken site specific work which has been submitted to the Council as part of the justification for the allocation of our client’s land. Therefore we welcome the allocation of the site in the plan. - - We strongly support the inclusion the allocation of the land at Hollin Lane (site ref: H2.44) and its inclusion within the urban boundary. - - The allocation of the site is in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy, and it is capable of making a full contribution to housing land supply in the borough in the short term. As will be noted we consider that the policy wording should be amended, hence the reason why the objection box on the form has been checked. - The site is greenfield land situated outside of the existing settlement boundary. However the site is located in an accessible location adjacent to the settlement boundary, and is surrounded by residential development to the west and partly to the north, a farm complex to the east, and a brook runs along the southern boundary with Alder Grange Community College to the south. The site represents a logical rounding off opportunity. A number of trees and planting is located along the brook, and would form the basis of a defensible urban boundary as part of a landscaping scheme. - - Our client controls the site and we can confirm that it is achievable and immediately available for development with the knowledge the plan is progressing and the site is allocated. The site is considered to be suitable for development, and there are no technical or environmental constraints. Further detailed site specific work would be considered further as part of any future application. - - The site is identified for development in years 6-15 of the plan. Our client is currently awaiting adoption of the plan prior to submitting a planning application, but would consider an early application if it were to be supported by the Council. The site should be identified in Years 1 to 5. - - Although the principle purpose of these representations is to support the proposed allocation of the site, we also have comments on a number of other policies as set out below.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.044	Further comment
1484	Eileen	Ainsworth	-		Object	<p>Access will be via Hollin Lane, a narrow single track bordered by gardens. It will not be wide enough. There will be bottlenecks and no room for pedestrians. Air quality will be detrimentally affected. Over 140 cars entering and egressing will pose a risk to health and safety. Vehicles will travel from Hollin Lane to Burnley Road, an area which is already busy due to school traffic. The development will exacerbate this hazard. The steep hill down to Burnley Road can be icy, occasionally dangerous to drive down. Residents park vehicles on Burnley Road to ensure getting to work. More residents mean more cars parked on Burnley Road. - In assessing the site, the council states "access is a major constraint and significant new infrastructure is required." In 2003, the council stated "Hollin Lane cannot be made to adoptable standard and cannot serve further residential development without causing material harm to highway safety." Therefore, is a new road proposed? Where and at what cost? Are there available school places? Will the GP cope? - The development will impact on natural land drains. The council considers 50% of the area is medium water flood risk and 10% is high. This is underestimated. Topography shows a gradient. The area is already very wet. There could inevitably be subsidence as there is on Hurst Crescent caused by a much smaller housing development. Another statistic is "10% of the site is within a woodland stepping stone." This is an Important Wildlife Site. The wildlife does not stay within that 10%. There are owls, foxes, herons, jackdaws and bats that live in this greenbelt area. They will perhaps be eradicated. Greenbelt land has been specified for the benefit of the environment, for us and for future generations. We should be protecting it and not moving boundaries to suit. The council is unnecessarily moving the urban boundary as there are brownfield sites that should be developed.</p>		<p>In 2015, following the previous consultation, the council's Forward Planning team after considering the responses received was to prepare a response to the issues raised and produce a report in which all the representations would be addressed. Has that report been completed and is it to be published.?</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.044	Further comment
1499	Roger	Ainsworth	-		Object	The increase in size of the nearby Alder Grange schools in 2012 has led to such high volumes of traffic that long lines of cars etc. are a twice daily occurrence during term time. This is happening "now" before any extra housing is put in place. Hollin Way is already congested. The extra traffic will exacerbate this. - Access via Hollin Lane or Downham Avenue will require reconstruction work which will cause major disruption both environmentally and logistically. It is likely that such a costly project could be proposed on paper but become unfeasible after commencement. A disaster in the making as the council will be left to resolve the difficulties and complete the project at the taxpayer's expense. To use Downham Avenue would change the nature of the Constable Lee estate making it incredibly busy and dangerous for existing residents and school children. Hollin Lane would become a rat run. - Moving the urban boundary to ensure the proposed site can be developed is short sighted, tragic for the environment, will be seriously detrimental to wildlife in the nearby IWS and also involve the demolition of existing houses and gardens. To cynically move the urban boundary to include this greenbelt land just because it is available is inexcusable. - These concerns have been given to the council in 2015 and before. They have been ignored in favour of using a totally inappropriate site. They have shamefully gone for the easy option without regard to the environment. There are so many other possible developmental sites in Rossendale having much less environmental and structural impact I question the Council planners' decision to include this site in the first place. -		
Number of comments					HS2.044	10		
Reference		HS2.045	Willow Avenue off Lime Tree Grove, Rawtenstall					

1257	Elizabeth	Ward	-		Object	We are concerned about this site allocation as it would impact on our immediate locality and access would be very difficult for construction traffic . Buildings would impact on light to the side of our home and would ruin our outlook considerably along with noise and traffic congestion on already busy roads.		
------	-----------	------	---	--	--------	---	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.045	Further comment
1258	Janice	Crawford	-		Object	<p>My objection is on the grounds that there is no suitable access to this site:- - - no</p> <p>On a 2D map there appears to be access from Willow Avenue, but there are 3 houses on this avenue, one mine and the other 2 my brothers. This is private land, not an adopted highway, therefore we would strongly object to being forced to provide right of access for construction traffic over our land. - -</p> <p>Access to Willow Avenue is either up LimeTree Grove from Burnley Road, which is a steep, twisting lane with walls on either side, barely wide enough for one vehicle and a pedestrian to pass safely. The walls are deteriorating and the lane was at one point given a weight limit by LCC of 3.5 tonnes. In a recent renovation scheme at The Elms the skip waggon refused to come up this lane, therefore I do not think it is suitable for construction traffic.</p> <p>Alternatively access could be down the hill from Slaidburn Avenue on the Constablelee estate, but again this is a one lane road currently blocked by LCC bollards because it was deemed unsafe for through traffic over 20 yrs ago. I seriously doubt that construction traffic would be able to negotiate the corner into Willow Avenue. - - Possible access from Whalley Drive has been blocked by private driveways and potential access from the main road via Cribden Street is unlikely because of the gradient on the hillside. - - Obviously you need to see the piece of land to understand the narrowness of the Lime Tree Grove access and gradient of the approach from Cribden Street. Therefore, I respectfully suggest that you visit the site before suggesting that it could possibly be built upon.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.045	Further comment
1765	Harry and Audrey	Foster			Object	<p>Having spoken to X last week regarding my concerns re the proposed planning for houses adjacent to Willow Avenue, Constablee (HS2.45) I hereby submit my concerns in writing as advised.</p> <p>The issues I am concerned about are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> : the access to the site whilst the houses are being constructed : the access when people are living in them <p>The reasons for the concerns are that Lime Tree Grove is a single track lane with bollards separating it into 2 parts. I am led to believe that large heavy traffic will be unable to access the site from the bottom of Lime Tree Grove to turn onto Willow Avenue.</p> <p>Access from the top of Lime Tree Grove will involve coming down Slaidburn Avenue which is already congested with parked vehicles . It would then need to travel down Lime Tree Grove - a single track lane and also involve the removal of the bollards. Even if the bollards were temporarily removed there is an raised island on which they are standing.</p> <p>This lane is used by many people on foot including lots of children and people with prams walking to the 2 nearby schools and is not suitable for heavy wagons . The removal of these bollards would also encourage other vehicles to travel along the lane with possible consequences . This road is highly unsuitable for the subsequent volume of traffic that would ensue. We have already witnessed one incident where a young girl had a very lucky escape from being pinned to the wall when the bollards were being repaired.</p> <p>Trusting you will give these points your serious consideration when deciding about this proposal and seek possible alternative routes of access.</p>		
1802		Rusden			Not Applicable	<p>it has come to our attention that MSM have been given permission to build 10 houses on Willows Avenue off Lime Tree Grove HS2.45 on the local plan written statement (Regulation18 Draft) page 9 as a resident of Lime Tree Grove and carers of an elderly mother-in-law we are concerned as to where access is going to be as Lime Tree Grove is a single track lane and would not be suitable for heavy traffic in fact it has a sign at the bottom saying unsuitable for motor vehicles to come either up or down if it was made into a road or you open it up it would become a rat run for school and very dangerous to residents, as a resident of Lime Tree Grove I would like to be kept informed on this matter as it will make our property deflate in price if we come to sell, we do actually pay very high council tax .</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.045	Further comment
1808	John and Helen	Pilling			Object	<p>I refer to our recent telephone conversation regarding the Draft Local Plan for Rossendale and the consultation which has taken place. I also refer to the recent SHLAA assessment of the land bordering numbers 31 to 37 Slaidburn Avenue, Constablee, Rawtenstall and the possible use of this land for constructing 10 housing units.</p> <p>In view of this I wish to make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The properties on the West side of Slaidburn Avenue would be overlooked by any development and would suffer a loss of amenity,ie. open aspect / outlook. 2. We feel that there must be some measure of doubt as to the suitability of the site in view of a severe land fall away along the edge of the proposed site. 3. The access to the site is solely from Lime Tree Grove via Willow Avenue. This would take on even greater significance given recent concerns regarding traffic volumes using Lime Tree Grove which has resulted in traffic bollards and reduction to a one way system below Willow Avenue. The concerns regarding safety which preceded the restriction on Lime Tree Grove would be all the more relevant with the traffic increase from any development on this site. 4. Emergency vehicles need adequate road width to access houses. Lime Tree Grove is 8feet wide at its narrowest point. Willow Avenue (a private road) is also narrow and vehicles parked there could create a problem. 5. The site / piece of waste land in question provides a valuable ' soak away' for rain water and, in the event of heavy rain, reduces the amount of water moving down the slope and affecting properties adjacent to Burnley Road. <p>This letter is supported by residents at X, X and X Slaidburn Avenue</p>		
1821	Pamela	Anthony			Object	<p>I believe that my neighbour has sent a statement regarding our concerns for building on the land identified above.</p> <p>I am in agreement with his comments and would be grateful if you would add me to the mailing list in order that I am informed if anything is proceeding with building on this land.</p>		
Number of comments					HS2.045	6		
Reference		HS2.047	Land adjacent Goodshaw Lane and Swinshaw Hall, Loveclough					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
614	Patricia	Bernard			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the land when going into Crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto Goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on goodshaw lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar of events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
711	Sally	Dewhurst	-		Object	<p>Local Plan should prioritise sites to avoid developers 'cherry picking' the easiest and most picturesque sites: Recognising that there is a 15 year plan, the development of the identified sites should follow a strict plan and be in 3 phases. The first phase should be to develop all brownfield sites regardless of any difficulty at which point the demand for further development should be assessed. Should demand persist then the second phase, should be to develop the remaining sites within the existing urban boundary after which further demand for housing should again be assessed. Only at this point should developing sites within the extended urban boundary be considered. The plan needs to ensure that the Rossendale countryside is preserved until it is absolutely necessary to develop these sites.</p> <p>• Goodshaw Lane is a single track lane, which is totally unsuitable for extra traffic: Site access is poor and unsafe contrary to the assessment in SHLA16203.</p> <p>• Loss of Open Space Amenity for existing residen</p> <p>• Rawshawbooth primary is already oversubscribed: 58 first choice applications were made in 2017 for 45 places resulting in 13 children not being given a place. The school has already had to impose a geographical priority area due to demand. Children within Loveclough will be forced to attend schools in either Burnley or Rawtenstall as their local village school is oversubscribed. There is no firm plan of how to resolve this issue.</p> <p>• Further development would exacerbate travel problems: As a resident who works in Manchester there are already considerable issues with commuting from Loveclough along Burnley road into Rawtenstall and then continuing along the M66. The Rossendale infrastructure delivery document is simply a list of issues with no practical or deliverable solutions and indeed forecasts 'transport issues to deteriorate over the plan period' with their being no realistic option to improve congestion into Rawtenstall due to the topography of the area.</p>		<p>If the consensus is a need for more housing on this site after addressing these legitimate concerns then development should not be for the commercial gain of the council and developers at the expense of existing residents.</p> <p>A suggested way forward is to leave a 100yd amenity space between the existing and new developments to include a suitable screening programme</p> <p>A master plan for the site should be in place and development should be in keeping with the surrounding buildings, many of which are bungalows.</p> <p>Restrictions should also be placed upon the hours of construction for the consideration of existing residents.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
719	Ken	Philipson			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
720	Mark	Norman			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>	HS2.047

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
721	David	Terry			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
722	Stella	Holmes			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
723	Denese	Price			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
724	E	Paul			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>	HS2.047

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
725	Denise	Smith			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
726	Mary	Gregson			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>	HS2.047

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
727	Barbara	Wroe			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
728	Joan	Furlong			Object	<p>I have objections regarding this proposal for housing allocated land which lies adjacent to Goodshaw Lane. My primary objection is the possible increase in traffic from these new developments.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is a very narrow lane which is used by parents and children to walk to and from school each day. It is also used by many dog-walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. The kennel's customers access along this lane also and there are two disability scooter drivers who use this part of the lane when going into crawshawbooth village.</p> <p>My worry is that if access from these proposed new developments is allowed onto goodshaw lane there would be an increase in traffic flow. There is only a tiny strip of pavement along the entirety of the lane, a mere handful of street lights and two 'blind bends'all of which is not conducive to increased usage.</p> <p>My other objection is regarding the proposed change to the settlement boundary on Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>St Mary's and All Saints church on goodshaw lane are two churches combined and have a busy weekly calendar or events plus funerals etc and unfortunately they have no parking facilities. If the new settlement boundary is put in place then it is possible the land it would then enclose will become developed. This would cause huge problems for the church and local residents along Goodshaw Avenue and possible parking problems for any future developments.</p> <p>There are also the other issues of extra traffic going into Rawtenstall, not enough school places, doctors or dentists to facilitate these proposed new housing developments.</p>	HS2.047

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
1061	Rachael	Rogers	-	HS2.50; HS2.52; HS2.49; HS2.47; HS2.51 and	Object	<p>The proposed extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will further exacerbate traffic issues within the valley. - - In the first instance Goodshaw Lane is a single track road in beautiful surroundings which is currently used extensively by cyclists and walkers thus promoting a healthier lifestyle. The extra traffic already on the lane caused by the extensions at Willows, Wags and Whiskers is problematic when walking children to the primary school which backs into the lane - children have to squash against the sides as the cars rush past (There is little paved area). This is a concern for the safety of both children and cyclists not to mention a potential reduction in the number of people selecting to walk - when as one of the most unhealthy areas of the country we are seeking to promote healthier lifestyles. - - Secondly Burnley Road will also struggle to accommodate the extra traffic. The traffic on a morning queuing to get through Rawtenstall enroute to Manchester currently can extend as far as Reeds Holme. This will only become worse with the extra houses and subsequent vehicles. - - The proposed extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will also need to be accommodated by the local Primary School. This year alone many local children were unable to access a place at Crawshawbooth School unless they had a sibling already attending. This results in children having to travel further to schools with the associated extra cars in the road. The only option would be to extend the school for which there is no facility. An extension would require a double form entry ensuring that the school lost its identity as a village school. In addition to this there have already been a number of 'near misses' involving children and cars around the school increasing numbers will only make the situation worse. - - Changing the urban boundary in the site near the Old Baptist Chapel and Hawthorn Farm will alter the whole setting for the Chapel (a protected English Heritage site). The Chapel is the oldest Baptist church in the country and enjoys visitors from across the world. This is a 'jewel' of Rossendale which should be preserved and protected in its natural setting.</p>		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
1065	Julian	Rogers	-	HS2.50, HS2.52, HS2.49, HS2.47 & HS2.51	Object	My key objections to the above site allocation numbers are around the impact on Goodshaw Lane, the local school, Crawshawbooth Primary and the main road (A682). - - Goodshaw Lane - This narrow single track lane is already very busy. It is widely used by walkers and cyclists who often have to get into the gutter and hedges to allow cars through. This is particularly the case during the school run. There have been many near misses with cars going too fast up and down the lane. The proposals will only add much more traffic to Goodshaw Lane - , exacerbating an already dangerous situation. - - Crawshawbooth Primary School - As a governor at this school, I am very aware of the problems many parents are experiencing trying to get their children into this school. The scope of the proposals means that the school would need to be greatly extended to accommodate the extra children who would be living in the new houses. This would certainly impact on the family feel of the school but more importantly, add to the traffic chaos which exists around the school at the beginning and end of the school day. It would create much more traffic travelling up and down Goodshaw Lane. - - Main road (A682) - This road is extremely busy at peak times. Traffic can be queued up as far as Reedsholme in the mornings getting down to Rawtenstall. The scale of these proposals will only add to these problems.		No.
1144	Victoria	Holt	-		Object	. Goodshaw lane is a single track lane which is unsuitable for even moderate traffic. The lane is extensively used by walkers, dog walkers, horse riders and children riding bikes. Extra traffic would pose a danger to existing residents and would discourage healthy outdoor activities. - - . Crawshawbooth Primary school is already oversubscribed with 58 first choice applications being made in 2017 for 45 places. Children living in loveclough will be forced to attend schools in either Burnley or Rawtenstall causing yet more traffic in Rossendale. There appears to be no firm plan to resolve this issue. - - . Development would further exacerbate travel problems. It already takes 30-45 minutes to travel from Loveclough to Rawtenstall between 8.30am and 9.30 am. Again there seems to be no firm plan to resolve this issue. In fact, the Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery Document forecasts, "transport issues to deteriorate over the plan period". - - . The Local Plan should be designed to ensure that developers do not "cherry pick" sites for ease and profit. Recognising that there is a 15 year plan the development of the identified sites should take place over three phases with an assessment of housing needs be carried out at the end of each phase - 1. The development of brownfield sites. - 2. Should demand persist: The development of remaining sites in the existing urban boundary. - 3. Should demand still persist: The development of sites in the extended urban boundary. - - . Loveclough is a rural hamlet. The people who live here made a choice to live in an area with no shops, little traffic and plenty of country side. By developing here you are taking this lifestyle away from the existing families of Loveclough.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
1236	JULIAN	ASHWORTH	-	HS2.47 (4 SITES)	Object	SHLAA 16203 ,16205 ,16206 , 16207 . - - 1. Concerns about the northward extension of the urban boundary from Badgercote Estate . - - 2.The impact of these 4 sites on the rural nature of this part Loveclough . - - 3 .The visual effects of this amount of properties on 3 sides of Swinshaw Hall . - - 4 .The access & egress for these sites ,whether on the A682 or Goodshaw Lane would seem to be potentially highly problematic . - - 5. Worries for the Terraced Houses being affected by land instability & drainage issues both in the long & short term .		1. It is difficult to make detailed comments without knowing the types of property proposed . - - 2. However , properties with a relatively low profile will have less visual impact & thus may be more acceptable particularly for the 2 Northern sites .
1575	David	Hempsall	Limey Valley Residents Association		Not Applicable	<p>Area A</p> <p>HS2.47 SHLAA16203 Land adjacent Goodshaw Bowling Green, Loveclough (13 houses): The LVRA sees no issues with this site other than access. Can Goodshaw Lane (which is effectively a single track lane) and the A682 support another 26 cars per day?</p> <p>HS2.47 SHLAA16205 Cornfield, off Goodshaw Lane adjacent to Swinshaw Hall, Loveclough (14 houses): The LVRA sees no issues with this site other than access. Can Goodshaw Lane (effectively a single track lane and the A682 support another 28 cars per day? A planning application was refused in 1976. Whilst the association has no details on this, the LVRA would draw to the planners' attention the fact that the Cotton Meadow is an extensive Quaker burial site. There is extant at the Friends Meeting House a map confirming this. It is also the association's understanding that a detailed survey of the site was undertaken in the recent past, though LVRA has no information on the outcome of this.</p> <p>HS2.47 SHLAA16206 Swinshaw Hall, Loveclough (31 houses): The LVRA sees no issues with this site other than access. Can the A682 support another 62 cars per day? There is also the issue of Quaker burials in this area.</p> <p>HS2.47 SHLAA16207 Land to the north of Swinshaw Hall, Loveclough (24 houses): The LVRA sees no issues with this site other than access. Can the A682 support another 48 cars per day? There is also the issue of Quaker burials in this area. The association's main concern is that the development of these four parcels of land in Area A will amount to an extension of the Badgercote estate to the north as far as the borough boundary. A total of 82 dwellings has the potential for an additional 150-plus cars accessing the already busy (and often congested) A682 Burnley Road for ingress and egress. An additional 200-300 residents will require the services of doctors and dentists and some will require school places. It is the association's view that these infrastructure issues need addressing before development, rather than RBC and LCC having to play catch-up. This principle needs to be applied across the piece. It is the LVRA's view that for the reasons outlined, this proposal should be much reduced in scale.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.047	Further comment
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	HS2.47 – Goodshaw Lane/Swinshaw – A new / widened access off Burnley Road appears achievable to include potentially the private access to Broad House and secondary/emergency, pedestrian/cycle access onto Goodshaw Lane should be provided.		
Number of comments		HS2.047				18		
Reference		HS2.048		Land south of 1293 Burnley Road, Loveclough				
1575	David	Hempsall	Limey Valley Residents Association	SHLAA16209	Not Applicable	On some of the other sites suggested which lie within the LVRA's "parish", the association's views are as follows: HS2.48 SHLAA16209 Land south of 1293 Burnley Road, Loveclough (5 houses): The association sees no issues with this site other than access. By the same token, any development will destroy completely the rural aspect of the immediate area and encourage further "creep" in an easterly direction.		
Number of comments		HS2.048				1		
Reference		HS2.049		Loveclough Working Mens Club				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.049	Further comment
1061	Rachael	Rogers	-	HS2.50; HS2.52; HS2.49; HS2.47; HS2.51 and	Object	<p>The proposed extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will further exacerbate traffic issues within the valley. - - In the first instance Goodshaw Lane is a single track road in beautiful surroundings which is currently used extensively by cyclists and walkers thus promoting a healthier lifestyle. The extra traffic already on the lane caused by the extensions at Willows, Wags and Whiskers is problematic when walking children to the primary school which backs into the lane - children have to squish against the sides as the cars rush past (There is little paved area). This is a concern for the safety of both children and cyclists not to mention a potential reduction in the number of people selecting to walk - when as one of the most unhealthy areas of the country we are seeking to promote healthier lifestyles. - - Secondly Burnley Road will also struggle to accommodate the extra traffic. The traffic on a morning queuing to get through Rawtenstall enroute to Manchester currently can extend as far as Reeds Holme. This will only become worse with the extra houses and subsequent vehicles. - - The proposed extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will also need to be accommodated by the local Primary School. This year alone many local children were unable to access a place at Crawshawbooth School unless they had a sibling already attending. This results in children having to travel further to schools with the associated extra cars in the road. The only option would be to extend the school for which there is no facility. An extension would require a double form entry ensuring that the school lost its identity as a village school. In addition to this there have already been a number of 'near misses' involving children and cars around the school increasing numbers will only make the situation worse. - - Changing the urban boundary in the site near the Old Baptist Chapel and Hawthorn Farm will alter the whole setting for the Chapel (a protected English Heritage site). The Chapel is the oldest Baptist church in the country and enjoys visitors from across the world. This is a 'jewel' of Rossendale which should be preserved and protected in its natural setting.</p>		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.049	Further comment
1065	Julian	Rogers	-	HS2.50, HS2.52, HS2.49, HS2.47 & HS2.51	Object	My key objections to the above site allocation numbers are around the impact on Goodshaw Lane, the local school, Crawshawbooth Primary and the main road (A682). - - Goodshaw Lane - This narrow single track lane is already very busy. It is widely used by walkers and cyclists who often have to get into the gutter and hedges to allow cars through. This is particularly the case during the school run. There have been many near misses with cars going too fast up and down the lane. The proposals will only add much more traffic to Goodshaw Lane - , exacerbating an already dangerous situation. - - Crawshawbooth Primary School - As a governor at this school, I am very aware of the problems many parents are experiencing trying to get their children into this school. The scope of the proposals means that the school would need to be greatly extended to accommodate the extra children who would be living in the new houses. This would certainly impact on the family feel of the school but more importantly, add to the traffic chaos which exists around the school at the beginning and end of the school day. It would create much more traffic travelling up and down Goodshaw Lane. - - Main road (A682) - This road is extremely busy at peak times. Traffic can be queued up as far as Reedsholme in the mornings getting down to Rawtenstall. The scale of these proposals will only add to these problems.		No.
1106	sheila	newton	-		Object	Although this is a mixed site it is on the West side of Burnley Road North of Crawshawbooth which the Council has made an undertaking to protect from development where possible. - Given that there are 3 more allocated sites for up to 70 houses on the directly opposite side of the road where building is feasible, to build up the area on both sides of the main road would be congested, adding to traffic access problems and detracting from the desirability of any houses built on the east side by reducing the views to open countryside on the West.		
1388	Stan	Ainsworth	-		Not Applicable	We wish you to consider extending this proposed housing site to include land adjoining it on the Northern side of Commercial Street - see attached - It is as sustainably located as that shown on the proposed plan under HS2.49. - It is a flat piece of land formerly used as a playing field but long since abandoned as such Please see appendix for plans.		Plans to be forwarded -
Number of comments		HS2.049				4		
Reference		HS2.050		Turton Hollow				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.050	Further comment
1061	Rachael	Rogers	-	HS2.50; HS2.52; HS2.49; HS2.47; HS2.51 and	Object	The propped extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will further exacerbate traffic issues within the valley. - - In the first instance Goodshaw Lane is a single track road in beautiful surroundings which is currently used extensively by cyclists and walkers thus promoting a healthier lifestyle. The extra traffic already on the lane caused by the extensions at Willows, Wags and Whiskers is problematic when walking children to the primary school which backs into the lane - children have to squash against the sides as the cars rush past (There is little paved area). This is a concern for the safety of both children and cyclists not to mention a potential reduction in the number of people selecting to walk - when as one of the most unhealthy areas of the country we are seeking to promote healthier lifestyles. - - Secondly Burnley Road will also struggle to accommodate the extra traffic. The traffic on a morning queuing to get through Rawtenstall enroute to Manchester currently can extend as far as Reeds Holme. This will only become worse with the extra houses and subsequent vehicles. - - The propped extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will also need to be accommodated by the local Primary School. This year alone many local children were unable to access a place at Crawshawbooth School unless they had a sibling already attending. This results in children having to travel further to schools with the associated extra cars in the road. The only option would be to extend the school for which there is no facility. An extension would require a double form entry ensuring that the school lost its identity as a village school. In addition to this there have already been a number of 'near misses' involving children and cars around the school increasing numbers will only make the situation worse. - - Changing the urban boundary in the site near the Old Baptist Chapel and Hawthorn Farm will alter the whole setting for the Chapel (a protected English Heritage site). The Chapel is the oldest Baptist church in the country and enjoys visitors from across the world. This is a 'jewel' of Rossendale which should be preserved and protected in its natural setting.		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.050	Further comment
1065	Julian	Rogers	-	HS2.50, HS2.52, HS2.49, HS2.47 & HS2.51	Object	My key objections to the above site allocation numbers are around the impact on Goodshaw Lane, the local school, Crawshawbooth Primary and the main road (A682). - - Goodshaw Lane - This narrow single track lane is already very busy. It is widely used by walkers and cyclists who often have to get into the gutter and hedges to allow cars through. This is particularly the case during the school run. There have been many near misses with cars going too fast up and down the lane. The proposals will only add much more traffic to Goodshaw Lane - , exacerbating an already dangerous situation. - - Crawshawbooth Primary School - As a governor at this school, I am very aware of the problems many parents are experiencing trying to get their children into this school. The scope of the proposals means that the school would need to be greatly extended to accommodate the extra children who would be living in the new houses. This would certainly impact on the family feel of the school but more importantly, add to the traffic chaos which exists around the school at the beginning and end of the school day. It would create much more traffic travelling up and down Goodshaw Lane. - - Main road (A682) - This road is extremely busy at peak times. Traffic can be queued up as far as Reedsholme in the mornings getting down to Rawtenstall. The scale of these proposals will only add to these problems.		No.
1575	David	Hempsall	Limey Valley Residents Association	SHLAA16220	Not Applicable	HS2.50 SHLAA16220 Turton Hollow, Goodshaw (30 houses): The association sees no issues with this site other than access. Can the A682 support another 60 cars per day?		
Number of comments						HS2.050	3	
Reference		HS2.051		Land adjacent Laburnum Cottages				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
562	Phillip	Byrne	-		Object	<p>The previous Local Plan (2011 – 2016) issued by the council recommended approximately 12 houses be developed on this site. This plan identified an area of land approximately 0.2 hectares and was realistic in its expectations. The new recommendation almost doubles the number of houses to be built and identifies additional land to allow this increase that is unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1. Residential amenity - The additional land released to double the number of houses being built is very steep in nature and will result in overshadowing, loss of outlook and loss of privacy to the detriment of residential amenity. The impact of these factors will be proportional to how close the new houses are to existing buildings. - The original proposal for 12 houses on the level land adjacent to Laburnum Cottages would not create such an impact. - 2. Grade II listed Church of St Mary and All Saints - The revised parcel of land proposed for this recommendation now adjoins the graveyard of the Church of St Mary and All Saints. Building houses too close to this graveyard will impact both the Grade II listed building and the houses themselves as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For a listed building, Part (1) of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 mandates, “preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.” - The setting of the church and, more importantly, the graveyard will be significantly affected if the additional houses are built close to its boundary. - The graveyard will be at a higher elevation than the new houses and the flow of groundwater will cause leached chemicals including ammonia, formaldehyde (from embalming) chloride and metals to wash into their grounds if they are too close. The Environment Agency has recognised the risk and has published guidance to ensure public safety. <p>- In summary, the proposal for building 12 homes on the level land adjacent to Laburnum Cottages, published in the Local Plan (2011 – 2016), was realistic in its expectations and would not have raised any objections. I urge the council to re-assess their revision and return to the original proposal.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
596	P	Byrne			Object	<p>Further to the publication of your draft local plan and presentation thereof, I would like to formally put on record my objection to the following proposal contained therein:</p> <p>HS2.51 - Land adjacent laburnum Cottages, 8126 155</p> <p>This change proposes building 23 houses on 0.77 hectares of greenfield land. The previous Local Plan (2011 - 2016) issued by the council recommended approximately 12 houses be developed on this site. This plan identified an area of land approximately 0.2 hectares and was realistic in its expectations. The new recommendation almost doubles the number of houses to be built and identifies additional land to allow this increase that is unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Residential amenity</p> <p>The additional land released to double the number of houses being built is very steep in nature and will result in overshadowing, loss of outlook and loss of privacy to the detriment of residential amenity. The impact of these factors will be proportional to how close the new houses are to existing buildings. The original proposal for 12 houses on the level land adjacent to Laburnum Cottages would not create such an impact.</p> <p>2. Grade II listed Church of St Mary and All Saints</p> <p>The revised parcel of land proposed for this recommendation now adjoins the graveyard of the Church of St Marys and All Saints. Building houses too close to this graveyard will impact both the Grade II listed building and the houses themselves as follows:</p> <p>For a listed building, Part (1) of section 66 of the Planning (listed buildings and conservation areas) act 1990 mandates, "preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.". The setting of the church and, more importantly, the graveyard will be significantly affected if the additional houses are built close to its boundary. The graveyard will be at a higher elevation than the new houses and the flow of groundwater will cause leached chemicals including ammonia, formaldehyde (from embalming) chloride and metals to wash into their grounds if they are too close. The environmental agency has recognised the risk and has published guidance to ensure public safety.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal for building 12 homes on the level land adjacent to Laburnum cottages published in the local plan (2011-2016), was realistic in its expectations and would not have raised any objections. I urge the council to re-assess their revision and return to the original proposal.</p>		
790	Paul	Meller	-		Object	<p>I've lived on church street for many years. I'd like to object as the area can not take any more traffic coming up the street as it is dangerous now for children to play out. The field is a play area for the children in this area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
812	Marie	Hargreaves	-	SHLAA 16197	Object	I strongly object to the proposed plan - the building of 23 houses on greenfield land. - COUNCIL SITE ASSESSMENTS- The site is accessible via Church St, the street is congested due to on-street parking. - I fully agree with this assessment, it is often impossible for residents to park outside of their own homes. - From Church St. the exit to Burnley Rd. is difficult. - Part of the site is at present used as a play area and has been for many years. - - Church of St. Mary's and All Saints - The setting of the church and most importantly the graveyard will be adversely affected if houses are built close to its boundary. The church is a Grade 11 listed building, surely as such every effort must be made to preserve it and the area it stands in, not just for now but for prosperity. - - I fully accept that some houses have to be built but it would be wonderful to keep some green spaces that I am sure would be appreciated not only by the local populace but also by our wildlife especially the badgers, foxes, birds and bats that frequent this area.		I am convinced you already know that we are all very concerned that the existing infrastructure is only coping with difficulty. I do not envy you your task of providing more schools, doctors, dentists, roads etc. to satisfy the needs of the increased population who will fill these houses.
825	Claire	Smith	-		Object	This recreational site is a safe play area between houses and away from main roads which is used by many children. This site was allocated as a recreational site when previous recreational land was given over to the Hawthorne Meadows development.	-	
828	Nicholas	Smith	-		Object	This recreational site is a safe play area between houses and away from main roads which is used by many children. This site was allocated as a recreational site when previous recreational land was given over to the Hawthorne Meadows development. - -	-	
1050	Derek	Keeble	-		Object	Although I think this is partly brown land site proposed to be extended to the east of Goodshaw Lane, it is old brown land. at present Goodshaw Lane can not cope with more traffic and it is an accident waiting to happen both on the lane and at its junction. Recent developments on Albert Rd, the residents have been informed by the police that they can no longer park on it and the only alternative is Goodshaw Lane. This means more cars parked on Goodshaw Lane, the reason for this is to give residents of 10 Goodshaw Lane and 669 Burnley Rd access to Goodshaw lane as they class the exit to Burnley Rd to dangerous so if the traffic is increased onto Goodshaw Lane this would be very dangerous as all the accesses onto Goodshaw Lane are blind exits and no future developements should be given access to Goodshaw Lane.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
1053	James	Pilling		SHLAA 16197	Object	Regarding the plot of land identified as Land Adjacent Laburnum Cottages – SHLAA 16197. - Although not overlooking the land and therefore not directly adversely affected by the proposal to bring it within the urban boundary we should like to register an objection on the grounds that it is probably the only piece of flat, level land available for children to play on. Certainly there are other playing areas but none of them are suitable for ball games. - - In these times when we all complain about the tendency of children to spend their free time engrossed in electronic devices it seems to us that we should be encouraging them to get out in the fresh air instead of reducing their opportunities for doing so. - - It's not well advertised but there are a number of badgers in the area with a set almost certainly located in or near the plot concerned. They frequently forage in our garden and, although they damage the lawn I feel that it's a price worth paying to know that we are home to a species which most people in this country have never seen in the wild. Badgers are not a source of bovine TB in this area and it would be a great shame if their habitat were to be destroyed just for the sake of a few houses. After all, they were there first!		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
1061	Rachael	Rogers	-	HS2.50; HS2.52; HS2.49; HS2.47; HS2.51 and	Object	<p>The propped extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will further exacerbate traffic issues within the valley. - - In the first instance Goodshaw Lane is a single track road in beautiful surroundings which is currently used extensively by cyclists and walkers thus promoting a healthier lifestyle. The extra traffic already on the lane caused by the extensions at Willows, Wags and Whiskers is problematic when walking children to the primary school which backs into the lane - children have to squash against the sides as the cars rush past (There is little paved area). This is a concern for the safety of both children and cyclists not to mention a potential reduction in the number of people selecting to walk - when as one of the most unhealthy areas of the country we are seeking to promote healthier lifestyles. - - Secondly Burnley Road will also struggle to accommodate the extra traffic. The traffic on a morning queuing to get through Rawtenstall enroute to Manchester currently can extend as far as Reeds Holme. This will only become worse with the extra houses and subsequent vehicles. - - The propped extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will also need to be accommodated by the local Primary School. This year alone many local children were unable to access a place at Crawshawbooth School unless they had a sibling already attending. This results in children having to travel further to schools with the associated extra cars in the road. The only option would be to extend the school for which there is no facility. An extension would require a double form entry ensuring that the school lost its identity as a village school. In addition to this there have already been a number of 'near misses' involving children and cars around the school increasing numbers will only make the situation worse. - - Changing the urban boundary in the site near the Old Baptist Chapel and Hawthorn Farm will alter the whole setting for the Chapel (a protected English Heritage site). The Chapel is the oldest Baptist church in the country and enjoys visitors from across the world. This is a 'jewel' of Rossendale which should be preserved and protected in its natural setting.</p>		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
1065	Julian	Rogers	-	HS2.50, HS2.52, HS2.49, HS2.47 & HS2.51	Object	My key objections to the above site allocation numbers are around the impact on Goodshaw Lane, the local school, Crawshawbooth Primary and the main road (A682). - - Goodshaw Lane - This narrow single track lane is already very busy. It is widely used by walkers and cyclists who often have to get into the gutter and hedges to allow cars through. This is particularly the case during the school run. There have been many near misses with cars going too fast up and down the lane. The proposals will only add much more traffic to Goodshaw Lane - , exacerbating an already dangerous situation. - - Crawshawbooth Primary School - As a governor at this school, I am very aware of the problems many parents are experiencing trying to get their children into this school. The scope of the proposals means that the school would need to be greatly extended to accommodate the extra children who would be living in the new houses. This would certainly impact on the family feel of the school but more importantly, add to the traffic chaos which exists around the school at the beginning and end of the school day. It would create much more traffic travelling up and down Goodshaw Lane. - - Main road (A682) - This road is extremely busy at peak times. Traffic can be queued up as far as Reedsholme in the mornings getting down to Rawtenstall. The scale of these proposals will only add to these problems.		No.
1149	EMMA	SMURTHWAIT	-		Object	Objection to the land adjacent to Laburnum Cottages - SHLAA16197.		E

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
1559	Ken	Iveson		SHLAA 16197	Object	<p>The proposal is the building of 23 houses on 0.77 hectares of greenfield land of which a percentage is a recreational field. This area has been maintained and mown as a playing field for the past thirty plus years. It was to replace the park (now Hawthorne Meadows) dismantled after a child was seriously injured on the slide. It is the only level playing field in the area on which football cricket can be played safely. Areas like this are being promoted by the government for a healthier community.</p> <p>Access to the proposed site is via Church St. which is already congested by cars parking on both sides of the road making passage difficult to existing properties at the top of the road (Hawthorne Meadows etc.), The exit to Burnley Rd-is dangerous as traffic approaches quickly from the bend in the road to the north. The prospect of at least another forty cars is daunting. The church of St. Mary's and All Saints is a listed building with its graveyard bordering the proposed site. During construction of 126, Goodshaw Lane, because of land movement, bones were uncovered which needed to be held in the church and re-buried. There is a potential that this may recur if foundations and site work are carried out in the vicinity of the graveyard. New houses would detract from its setting and historic value.</p> <p>I think we are all aware that because of the necessity of new houses being built to accommodate an ever increasing population much of the countryside is being encroached upon. Surely we need to keep small parcels of land to provide a wild life corridor and haven for small nesting birds, foxes, badgers, deer and owls. There is a badger sett on the land, please can you assure me that this will be dealt with in the correct manner. For the past eight years we have been fortunate enough to feed and enjoy watching a wide variety of creatures in the greenfield land in question.(A fact we have never generally advertised) (Photograph included) Finally, surely the infrastructure of the area must be dealt with before any more houses are built.</p> <p>Please see appendix for photos</p>		
1575	David	Hempsall	Limey Valley Residents Association	SHLAA16197	Not Applicable	<p>HS2.51 SHLAA16197 Land adjacent Laburnum Cottages, Crawshawbooth (3 houses):</p> <p>The association sees no issues with this site other than that any such development will take away a much used play area. Any future plans should include some provision of this facility. The narrow access is also problematical.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
1682	Grahame	Meeks			Object	<p>I object to the plan to build on the field and play area behind Laburnum cottages.</p> <p>The play area does get mowed and the kids play football and other games etc. As a kid myself we would come home from school and go to the (Molly Ring). At Crawshawbooth School we would play football on the field and go on the park, now you can't get on the field and there is nothing on the park. Should we be trying to get the kids of today playing out and not sat in front of a screen in their bedrooms. I have 5 grandchildren and 1 on the way of my own (where will they play).</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>The traffic and parking on Goodshaw Ave and nearby roads is horrendous and trying to get to Rawtenstall at certain times.</p> <p>School</p> <p>The school can't accommodate the influx of children and over crowding.</p> <p>Doctors</p> <p>The Doctors surgeries, dentists etc. You just can't get in.</p> <p>Wildlife</p> <p>There is a lot of different wildlife badgers, bats, owls etc on the land. The traffic and overcrowding can only get worse with all the development over the years and more to come.</p> <p>i.e. Penny Dell / Badger Court / Hammer Ave / Hawthorn Meadows / Goodshaw Fold / Saundesr Close / Crawshaw Grange / Reedsholme / Constablee.</p> <p>And another to come the sights at J.B Broadleys on Burnley Road.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.051	Further comment
1793	T	Meeks			Object	<p>As a resident, homeowner and valued member of this community I would like to formally object to the proposal of building 23 houses on 0.77 hectares' of Greenfield land.</p> <p>I strongly object for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effect on listed buildings and conservation areas Grade II listed Church of St Marys will be severely effected. Not only the setting of the church but its grounds, infrastructure and most importantly its graves. Some of which are those of the deceased from the world war. These could be disturbed if construction takes place as well as the church becoming at risk of decay and therefore loosing its historical value. 2. Archaeology A church has been stood on this site since 1542 with the current church being built in the later 1829 In relation to its architectural value this shows significance for its culture and history and therefore should be maintained. Construction and building on this site could potentially affect / damage archaeological findings that belong to or remain a part of the Grade II listed building. - Paying particular reference to the historical value of the church and its grounds many local schools and nurseries use this history for educational purposes. 3. loss of trees and wildlife (Nature conservation) The trees and woodland area provides a safe haven for wildlife. Building would mean the disturbance of protected species such as badgers, wild birds, foxes and bats not to mention their natural habitats. - Wildlife in this area has also become of a particular interest of local authorities- in the education of local schools and nurseries. To take this away from them would mean they have nowhere local to visit and learn about nature. 4. Road access Building of more houses would only create more traffic. This would create more congestion causing people to over park on roads. This is already an ongoing issue as emergency services can often struggle accessing properties due to residents blocking the roads access. Road users such as cyclists and pedestrians are finding it hard to use the cycle lanes and pathways due to residents over parking and blocking them. (This is only going to get worse if more people are housed in the area). 5. Traffic generation The generation of traffic is already a cause for concern. as many road users are finding it difficult to access certain areas causing more congestion and accidents on the roads paying particular reference to children and families trying to access their schools and local amenities. 6. Overcrowding population 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
						<p>Amenities such as schools, nurseries, doctors surgeries, dentists etc are already overcrowded. Resulting in individuals not being able to access their own resources as well as being refused local health care treatment and educational needs.</p> <p>7. Drainage and flooding Goodshaw lane is already at a medium to high risk of flooding particularly after a down pour. Building and construction of this land is only going to disturb the natural drains already underground to help prevent this. Blockages will occur and the flooding will increase posing the risk to residents homes. Blocked drains will create sewage and more flooding, which will not only have a devastating effect on the homes and family life of residents but also on the environment particularly if this sewage gets into the local rivers and streams.</p> <p>8. OVERLOOKING/LOSS OF PRIVACY Building 23 houses in an area which is well secluded and private accessible to local members of the community and used by local residents would have a negative effect on everyone. I.e. children will no longer be able to play on the fields, schools and nurseries would no longer be able to use the areas for educational purposes. Other members of the public i.e. dog walkers, wildlife enthusiasts, horse riders etc will no longer have access. Residents living in houses that overlook the fields will no longer have privacy. All of the current houses that stand are owned to families, many of which with young children. How can you assure the safeguarding of our children? To conclude There are many issues raised above that should be taken into consideration and the reasons to strongly object to the proposed plans. Therefore such planning should be reassessed.</p>	
Number of comments						15	HS2.051
Reference		HS2.052		Land south of Goodshaw Fold Road			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.052	Further comment
1061	Rachael	Rogers	-	HS2.50; HS2.52; HS2.49; HS2.47; HS2.51 and	Object	<p>The propped extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will further exacerbate traffic issues within the valley. - - In the first instance Goodshaw Lane is a single track road in beautiful surroundings which is currently used extensively by cyclists and walkers thus promoting a healthier lifestyle. The extra traffic already on the lane caused by the extensions at Willows, Wags and Whiskers is problematic when walking children to the primary school which backs into the lane - children have to squash against the sides as the cars rush past (There is little paved area). This is a concern for the safety of both children and cyclists not to mention a potential reduction in the number of people selecting to walk - when as one of the most unhealthy areas of the country we are seeking to promote healthier lifestyles. - - Secondly Burnley Road will also struggle to accommodate the extra traffic. The traffic on a morning queuing to get through Rawtenstall enroute to Manchester currently can extend as far as Reeds Holme. This will only become worse with the extra houses and subsequent vehicles. - - The propped extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will also need to be accommodated by the local Primary School. This year alone many local children were unable to access a place at Crawshawbooth School unless they had a sibling already attending. This results in children having to travel further to schools with the associated extra cars in the road. The only option would be to extend the school for which there is no facility. An extension would require a double form entry ensuring that the school lost its identity as a village school. In addition to this there have already been a number of 'near misses' involving children and cars around the school increasing numbers will only make the situation worse. - - Changing the urban boundary in the site near the Old Baptist Chapel and Hawthorn Farm will alter the whole setting for the Chapel (a protected English Heritage site). The Chapel is the oldest Baptist church in the country and enjoys visitors from across the world. This is a 'jewel' of Rossendale which should be preserved and protected in its natural setting.</p>		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.052	Further comment
1065	Julian	Rogers	-	HS2.50, HS2.52, HS2.49, HS2.47 & HS2.51	Object	My key objections to the above site allocation numbers are around the impact on Goodshaw Lane, the local school, Crawshawbooth Primary and the main road (A682). - - Goodshaw Lane - This narrow single track lane is already very busy. It is widely used by walkers and cyclists who often have to get into the gutter and hedges to allow cars through. This is particularly the case during the school run. There have been many near misses with cars going too fast up and down the lane. The proposals will only add much more traffic to Goodshaw Lane - , exacerbating an already dangerous situation. - - Crawshawbooth Primary School - As a governor at this school, I am very aware of the problems many parents are experiencing trying to get their children into this school. The scope of the proposals means that the school would need to be greatly extended to accommodate the extra children who would be living in the new houses. This would certainly impact on the family feel of the school but more importantly, add to the traffic chaos which exists around the school at the beginning and end of the school day. It would create much more traffic travelling up and down Goodshaw Lane. - - Main road (A682) - This road is extremely busy at peak times. Traffic can be queued up as far as Reedsholme in the mornings getting down to Rawtenstall. The scale of these proposals will only add to these problems.		No.
1106	sheila	newton	-		Object	This site is greenfield and is on the West side of Burnley Road which the Council has made an undertaking to protect from development where possible. - It is also at the top of Goodshawfold Road at the junction with Burnley Road which is already a traffic hazard. To add yet more cars coming out onto the Main road from there is dangerous.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.052	Further comment
1454	Vivien	Pascoe	-		Support	<p>I write as representative of the owners of the land (who are Rawtenstall residents), identified as the northern part of Land North of the Jester. The parcel of land is available for development, not held back by the owners, who are conscious of the need to meet the provision for new housing in the Borough. As identified by the Council in the draft report, it is suitable for residential development, being bounded on 3 sides by residential properties. There are local amenities in Crawshawbooth and a Social Club close by. Being situated near bus stops on Burnley Rd, there are good transport links to all amenities, with regular services to Burnley and Rawtenstall. Independent services and access off Goodshawfold Lane, are not dependent on other developments, with existing water and drainage services for surrounding properties. A draft layout produced provides firm evidence that a layout of 8 dwellings is achievable, without detriment to local amenity. The dwellings will be constructed in materials matching the local vernacular, with hard and soft landscape incorporating sustainable drainage design. Whilst taking into account overlooking, space standards, relationship to existing properties to provide a sustainable, attractive development, the visual amenity of the neighbouring properties is considered. - Ground, mining and contamination reports indicate that there are no prohibitive expenses to develop. A very small part of the parcel of land is within a Mineral Safeguarding area for sandstone and the owner has obtained a Mineral Safeguarding Assessment. The report concludes that given the significant risks of impact and the proximity of existing residential properties, the location is unlikely to be considered suitable for mineral extraction. The most significant potential air quality impact would be associated with fugitive dust emissions from extraction works and re-suspended dust from HGV movements. "The exemption requirements of Policy M2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local plan have been engaged."</p> <p>Letter received 09.09.2017: I represent the onwer of the northern parcel of the site identified as SHLAA16219 included in the draft emrging Local Plan document. Within the document, it is stated the the interest to develop has not been renewed, however, the letter of 15th December referrred to may have been sent to the previous owners. Please register my details as the contact for the landowner (of 3 years) who wishes to develop the site and record this interest. The parcel of land to the North has previously been considered as a separate parcel of land and it is requested the this site be considered seperately from the land forming the remaining part of SHLAA16219, as the intentions of the landowners has been stated as 'unknown'. In support of this, please see enclosed draft sketch proposals showing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.052	Further comment
						<p>alternative house types and numbers and I would appreciate your feedback on the same.</p> <p>If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Please see plans in appendix.</p>		
1575	David	Hempsall	Limey Valley Residents Association	SHLAA16219	Object	<p>Area B</p> <p>HS2.47 SHLAA16219 Land north of The Jester, Burnley Road, Rawtenstall (50 houses):</p> <p>It is a matter of record that residents have long been opposed to any significant development west of the A682 Burnley Road. In the past, both ward councillors and RBC planners have given undertakings to protect the rural outlook looking west from the A682. Equal attention must be given to the interests of those living to the west whose visual aspect looking east would be adversely affected by this proposed development.</p> <p>For this area to be considered for development represents an unwelcome U-turn, all the more significant because it flies in the face of two Appeal Decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate – APP/B2355/W/15/3130570 and APP/B2355/C/16/3158284 - both of which upheld the principle of retaining the rural aspect of the area.</p> <p>Moreover, what is outlined has the potential to launch a further 50-100 vehicles, twice per day, on to the already busy (and often congested) A682 Burnley Road. Any suggestion that access is possible via Goodshawfold Road is risible: the junction is already hazardous and has been the site of recent collisions and any number of near-misses. A new junction would simply compound existing problems with the main road.</p> <p>The association notes that the owner of the northern one-eighth of the land brought forward has shown no interest at this time. None the less, the prospect of RBC and its planners reneging on an understanding sustained since 2009 and upheld by two appeals to the Planning Inspectorate is disappointing in the extreme.</p> <p>It is the LVRA's view that for the reasons outlined, this proposal should be withdrawn in whole.</p>		
Number of comments						HS2.052	5	
Reference		HS2.053	Johnny Barn Farm and east of Johnny Barn Farm					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
74	Edmund	Dixon	-	ENV 1 and ENV11 Flood	Object	This policy says there should be no adverse impact on the natural environmental biodiversity and green infrastructure unless suitable mitigating measures are proposed. - - With reference to HS 2.53 I cannot see how mitigating measures can be effective for 40-year old woodland, in that it will take 40 years to replace this habitat elsewhere; if the woodlane can be replaced elsewhere, the houses could be built elsewhere - - and - Dobbin Wood is part of a stepping stone of habitat along the Valley side, such as is due for specific enhancement or protection under policy ENV 5. - The environmental network study para 5.57 highlights the benefits of woodland in reducing peak flows by up to 50%. Removal of Dobbin Wood will increase the flood risk UNACCEPTABLY for residents sited below this land.		POLITICS: both main parties have recently campaigned to 'Keep Rossendale Green.' If you have any integrity you will ensure that Dobbin Wood remains green and is not built on, in accordance with the original CPO (1983) 'for the purposes of preserving or enhancing the beauty' of this key local asset. - - METHODOLOGY: over 10% of homes in my road (BB4 7PD) appear to have been unoccupied for the last 5 years.The local plan should factor in the number of vacant homes and bring these into use before desecrating irreplaceable areas of woodland within the urban boundary. - - HOLISTIC PLANNING: the Council and local MP need to prevail upon the government to develop a holistic approach to planning, delegated to local level which respects our topography and local housing needs, not imposed national targets, and maintains police stations, health and education infrastructure and museums of national significance if the local economy is to be developed; or, if austerity is to be imposed, plan on building fewer houses and accept that the local population will shrink. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
502	Keith	Girling			Object	<p>I will leave it to others more qualified than I, to comment upon the generalities of the Draft Local Plan [DLP] and focus upon the inclusion within Housing Site Allocations of the Site SHLAA16171 Johnny Barn Farm Cloughfold. I am assuming that the recent announcement by Jake Berry in respect of mandated but reduced housing requirements for Rossendale will give rise to some review of the DLP.</p> <p>I will précis and update the detailed questions I submitted 5 July 2017 in respect of the "Evidence Base":</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is clear that this site cannot be developed in a environmentally sustainable and/or economically viable manner and should be removed from the list of available sites. 2. The Urban Boundary has been adjusted in the DLP to accomodate the proposals of Planning Application 2015/0517. On 16th July 2014 RBC Council resolved that the Urban Boundary should remain unaltered "unless developer can demonstrate impacts can be satisfactorily resolved". This is not the case, so the Urban Boundary remains as before. 3. Site Access is inadequate for development purposes [demonstrated during recent works] and to service a new built environment of thirty households. 4. Residents have made extensive responses to RBC on a revised Flood Risk Assessment [FRA] published for Planning Application 2015/0517, and these are not repeated here. This FRA proposes considerable changes from previous versions but these are entirely inadequate and seriously flawed in respect of a surface water management plan; existing and new infrastructure issues within the context of large civil engineering requirements and potentially serious land instability; and, management and maintenance. I would hope that Lancashire County Council as The Lead Local Flood Authority will not be able to agree these proposals. 5. You will be aware that the land is contaminated. From 21st August 2017 to 13th September the Applicant for 2015/0517 undertook excavations to remove asbestos from site without planning permission or other notice to agencies and the community. The applicant showed complete contempt and disdain for the planning process, asbestos removal protocols, and the authority of RBC whose Officers asked on two documented occasions for the works to stop. Other agencies including HSE and elected representatives are involved and independent investigation and verification of the safety of the site, including for the health and welfare of residents and their families are being sought. 6. The site remains for sale on Rightmove.com. 7. It is for others to judge whether the recent evidenced conduct of the Applicant, and/or their financial circumstances [in the public domain] would mean that any "conditions" attached to an Outline Planning Permission [were that to be granted] would have any likelihood of being satisfactorily 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

discharged - see:
<https://www.duedil.com/company/gb/04799896/hurstwood-holdings-limited>
and:
Best Regards

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	HS2.82,HS2.86,H S2.53,HS2.54,HS 2.58,HS2.54,HS2 .57,HS2.54, HS2.56,HS2.84 , Land at Marl Pits.	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
						<p>recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
						<p>established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -</p>		
591	G	Ashworth			Object	<p>Following discussions at the meeting at kay street baptist churc on Thursday 7th september, I am writing about the proposed planning development of the above site, and to formally object.</p> <p>At the meeting we were informed that Rossendale has been directed to build a further 3,500 houses to meet demand, however it was not clearly explained how this figure has been arrived at or where the anticipated inhabitants will come from. There are already lots of empty properties in Rossendale which should be filled before considering building more.</p> <p>According to the consultation documents, the baove mentioned area of approximately 3.5 hectares has been earmarkedfor the construction of just over 100 houses. The addition of so many houses and the associated vehicles, wo;; have a huge impact on the amount of congestion on Newchurch road, particularly at peak times, adding not only traffic delays but added stress to pedestrians trying to cross the road.</p> <p>It is unclear from the plans where the access to these properties will be from off Newchurch Road, but the road east of Johnny Barn Farm becomes considerably narrower in parts, and has already been the scene of traffic accidents.</p> <p>There is at present an abundance of houses for sale in Rossendale, and so it can be assumed that any new residents would be from outside the area. The industries for which rossendale was once famous have now all gone, so again it can be assumed that these new residents would be commuters, thus adding to the congestion.</p> <p>The existing schools throughout the Rossendale Valley are all either at or nearing capacity, thus begging the question where would all the potential additional children be educated?</p> <p>Likewise, all the doctors' and dentists' surgeries are all full and stretched to capacity. As noise, air and light pollution would all be increased by the construction of these properties; there is every chance that the health and wellbeing of all the residents will suffer, adding even more pressure to these health services.</p> <p>I trust that these observations will be taken into consideration.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
690	William	Hutchinson	-	HS2.53, HS2.54, HS2.56, HS2.80, HS2.82, HS2.83, HS2.86	Not Applicable	The seven sites listed above are all within areas adjacent to Newchurch Road and the assumption can be reasonably made that future residents of the 228 units projected will use Newchurch Road as their principal access. This could account for in the region of an additional 450 vehicles regularly using what is already a very busy stretch of highway. Considerable numbers of pupils of nearby schools either walk or are brought in cars to the Newchurch Rd./Union St./Hurst Lane vicinity to make their way to these schools. The current volume of traffic makes it dangerous for these young people. Elderly residents find it increasingly difficult to cross Newchurch Rd. in this area because of the volume and speed of traffic. Whilst local residents in vehicles can experience danger and frequent difficulty when negotiating the roads and junctions for the same reasons. - In my opinion it should be a condition of any of the proposed development that 'traffic calming' measures must be implemented to protect the safety, convenience and general well-being of all who live in or pass through this location whether on foot, on cycles or in vehicles. To not do so will be doing all concerned a great disservice and will be a dereliction of the 'duty of care' which is incumbent on all who may be deliberating on these proposed developments. - In terms of such 'traffic calming': 'speed-bumps', lower speed limit, road narrowing with priority restrictions and advance warning signs would all be measures I would hope to see introduced.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
779	Alison	Squire	-		Object	<p>I wish to object to the above proposed sites for housing which are close to Newchurch Road on the grounds that: - i) increased traffic will be unacceptable on this main road through Rossendale - ii) erosion of greenfield sites instead of using brownfield sites in the Valley - iii) increased demand on already overloaded education and health services. - - As a resident of Waingate Village, I have objected several times to planning applications on a plot of land off Hurst Lane (Ref: 2015/0308) and am extremely displeased that this land has received planning approval despite it continuing to be beyond the Urban Boundary. There were no opportunities for local residents to raise further objections and no communications following approval having been given. I do not feel that the Council supported local residents and instead allowed developers greater importance. I am therefore worried that despite this opportunity to comment on the Local Plan, residents' opinions will not be taken into consideration. - - It appears that the Urban Boundary may be moved to Balladen Clough (a stream) to include a field behind Marl Pits road. An earlier application to build on this land was refused on the grounds of lack of road access. I hope that any future planning applications on this land will continue to be refused and the original Urban Boundary will remain in place. Any development on this land would further increase traffic onto Newchurch Road. - - Having witnessed the gridlock in Bank Street and Angouleme Way on Saturday I do wonder where the increased traffic from all the proposed new housing will go. I appreciate that it is National Government Policy to increase housing and that sites have to be found in the Valley but hope that more brownfield sites can be found, consideration of health and education demands and transport/traffic difficulties will be addressed before adopting the new Local Plan.</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
1140	Cherry	Hughes	-		Object	<p>I have recently viewed the plans outlining proposals for housing (related to the Local Policy) in the Newchurch/Hareholme ward area and wish the following comments to be noted: - - * there is a proposed development of 7 - 9 houses at the top of St Peter's Road beyond St Peter's RC Primary School. A major concern is congestion particularly around school opening and closing times. The road becomes very congested as many children are dropped off/picked up by car (giiven the School's faith status and the catchment area). Frequently our driveway is blocked during the most congested periods as there is nowhere in the near vicinity for parents to park and walk their children the last few metres to the School Gate. Increased traffic past the School Gate will create a greater hazard. - - * the proposed site is part way down Seat Naze slope. There is already significant run off which impacts on the houses at the top of St Peter's Road and Heightside Avenue. There is also evidence of springs, one of which which percolates through the road that leads to the houses immediately above Newchurch Road. United Utililites has been called to this particular spot on numerous occassions and identified that it isn't a leak from a pipe. I am also aware of the proposed far more significant developments above Johnny Barn and below Marl Pits on land which has always been very wet (even in dry summers). How can developers guarantee good drainage both for the developments and for the existing developed areas downslope from them? How will that impact on the Irwell at the bottom of the Valley and the flooding dangers? - - * Finally I am really concerned that the area does not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional housing stock. Roads are already heavily congested at commuter times. The local primary schools have very limited capacity to take more students but there appears to be no planning for a new primary school. There is a 'play area' on Stacksteads, which I believe the Newchurch Village Association is planning to raise money to renovate, and this is the only one in the immediate area. The area is already due to have a significant development on what was the Rossendale Football Club Ground (up to 100 houses I believe) - and no mention has been made of infrastructure improvements for this development. - - * I live on a road where over the past 5 years, 3 properties were for sale and 2 of these were for sale for at least 4 years before they sold. The difficulty with sales does appear to have alleviated but there are always houses for sale in our immediate neighbourhood - so can we argue that there is a housing crisis in Rossendale (or at least in this part of Rossendale)?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
1303	JULIA	BARROW	-		Object	THIS IS ANOTHER RIDICULOUS PROPOSITION. THIS LAND IS EXTREMELY BOGGY WITH NUMEROUS NATURAL SPRINGS. ANYONE WHO WALKS LOCALLY WILL TELL YOU THIS AREA IS BOGGY EVEN IN THE DRIEST OF SUMMERS. THAT ASIDE, YOU REALLY ARE HAVING A LAUGH. GETTING DOWN NEWCHURCH ROAD AND OUT OF RAWTENSTALL CENTRE ONTO THE BYPASS MOST MORNINGS NOW CAN TAKE UPWARDS OF 20 MINUTES. OUR ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE JUST CAN'T COPE WITH IT - LORD ALONE KNOWS HOW ALL THE EXTRA CARS ARE GOING TO GET OUT OF THE VALLEY - AS MOST PEOPLE WILL BE COMMUTING TO MANCHESTER/BURY I WOULD ASSUME.		I AM VERY AWARE THAT IN ALL THE PROPOSED PLANS NOWHERE HAS THERE BEEN ANY MENTION OF NEW/IMPROVED ROADS/INFRASTRUCTURE? I REMEMEBER THE EDENFIELD BY-PASS BEING OPENED IN 1968 - TO CARRY TRAFFIC AWAY FROM EDENFIELD VILLAGE. IT WAS BRILLIANT, LIVING IN THE VILLAGE BECAME A JOY ONCE AGAIN! THE SAME SMALL BY-PASS NOW HAS ALL THE TRAFFIC FROM BURNLEY/BLACKBURN/HASLINGDEN/ HELMSHORE/CRAWSHAWBOOTH/RA WTENSTALL EMPTYING INTO IT ON A DAILY BASIS. GRANE ROAD NOW HAS AVERAGE SPEED CAMERAS INSTALLED - AN INDICATION AS TO HOW MUCH TRAFFIC THE ROAD NOW CARRIES. - ON ANOTHER NOTE, WE HAVE NO FREE DOCTORS OR DENTISTS, NO POLICE STATION, SCHOOLS ARE FULL AND WE NOW HAVE TO TRAVEL TO BLACKBURN TO GO TO HOSPITAL! AND YOU ARE PROPOSING TO PUT 4/5000 NEW HOUSES UP? WE HAVE NO PUBLIC SERVICES!! THE REFUSE SERVICES ARE STRUGGLING TO COPE WITH WHAT WE HAVE NOW. OUR ROADS ARE APPALING. - IT REALLY DOES SCARE ME! - I THINK WE HAVE MORE BROWNFIELD AREAS WHICH SHOULD BE EXPLORED BEFORE WE LOSE A LOT OF OUR GREEN SPACES, AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE AN ASSESSMENT OF EMPTY PROPERTIES AVAILABLE IN THE VALLEY WHICH COULD GO TOWARDS THE 4/5000 PROPERTIES NEEDED?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
1308	Emer	Killeen	-		Object	This is a precious greenfield site to local residents and any building would spoil the local view. - - Also, RBC's infrastructure document also points out that as an already urbanised valley the transport infrastructure is already stretched and only limited improvements can be made. The traffic oncoming onto Newchurch Road morning and evening is already very busy, the road bends in parts and there is often parking on both sides which increases risks of collision. In particular, the junction of Dobbin Lane and Newchurch Road is already extremely dangerous and any increase in the number of junctions in the surrounding area would increase the risks of collisions and further slow down traffic using the route between Waterfoot and Rawtenstall through Newchurch.		
1537	John	McGuinness	-		Object	I object to this site allocation for the following reasons: - - Loss of greenbelt land - This is only the first stage in a gradual loss of land as more houses will be built further up the hill - Issues with flooding - Increased traffic on Newchurch Rd especially at peak times - Increased traffic will increase localised pollution leading to a potential health risk to the local population - Increase to overall traffic density in Rossendale creating extra strain on an already struggling transport network - Increased population creating a burden on health provision and school places		You seem to be trying to implement a plan where nearly all patches of green within the urban boundary are built on. The hillsides may be green (for now) but all small breathing spaces seem to be a target for building on. Sustainable; how can building more houses on any green area be sustainable? Once land is lost to development, it's lost forever.
1619	Michael	Onley	Planning Sense NW		Object	(...)Clients fear cherry-picking of the most desirable sites. This is reflected in the abandonment of density target of 50+ dwellings per hectare appropriate to urban renewal [Rossendale Core Strategy policy 2, RBC 2011] in favour of a suburban 30+ figure [Rossendale Draft Local Plan policy HS5, RBC 2017]. Clients oppose planning blight upon precious greenfield sites such as achingly lovely meadows east of Johnny Barn (variously identified as HS2.53 and duplicated as HS2.54), and cinematic quality, rail-side pasture at Haslam Farm (HS2.60). Access and road safety concerns have been raised in respect of allocation HS2.86 (St Peter's School) - photos attached. (...)•Draft policy HS2 and specifically the proposed allocations of sites HS2.54/54 (east of Johnny Barn, north of Newchurch Road) HS2.86 (St Peter's School) and HS2.60 (Haslam Farm) in respect of unnecessary greenfield allocations(...)		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
1624	Michael	Gildert	Peter Brett Associates LLP		Support	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments as part of the consultation on the draft Rossendale Local Plan.</p> <p>As you are aware, we act for Hurstwood Holdings and have been promoting various sites in Rossendale as part of the consultation process on the new Local Plan. In June 2013, in response to the Green Belt and Urban Boundary Review consultation, we submitted a range of detailed development framework reports setting out how sites at Johnny Barn Close, Union Road and Hurst Lane could be sustainably delivered to provide much-needed new housing in the Borough.</p> <p>We followed up this work with a series of meetings with the Council and subsequently submitted two planning applications for the sites at Johnny Barn Close and Hurst Lane, together with a full set of supporting technical reports that demonstrate the suitability of these sites for development. The land at Hurst Lane now has planning permission for two dwellings (Ref: 2015/0308, granted on 22 June 2017). In September 2015 we also submitted further comments to the 'Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies' document. This document was then abandoned in favour of the production of a new Local Plan, which is the subject of this consultation.</p> <p>We would therefore like to offer the following comments in relation to the new draft Local Plan, insofar as it relates to the land in control of our client at Johnny Barn Close and Union Road. We note at the outset that the Council is proposing to allocate the Johnny Barn Close site for housing (Ref: HS2.53), but only a limited part of the Union Road site (Ref: HS2.62).</p> <p>HS2.53 – Johnny Barn Farm, Cloughfold</p> <p>The planning application in relation to the Johnny Barn Close site (Ref: 2015/0517) is currently in the determination process, pending resolution of comments from Lancashire County Council (LCC) in relation to drainage matters. A drainage solution has now been agreed with United Utilities (UU) which will resolve the comments raised, and UU has confirmed its agreement in principle to the scheme. On that basis we anticipate that the Council will be in a position to take the application to committee with a positive recommendation, given that there are no other outstanding planning matters to resolve. A draft Section 106 agreement has already been agreed, and therefore we expect this site to be granted outline planning permission imminently.</p> <p>With this background in mind, we welcome the proposed allocation of this site for housing, together with the corresponding amendment to the settlement boundary to include this land within the urban area. The proposed allocation is for circa. 30 houses across the site in the next five years, which aligns with the current planning application.</p> <p>We fully support the Council's assessment that the site is suitable, available</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
						<p>and viable for development. We have always maintained that the site could still accommodate a larger development without any significant adverse impacts, but nevertheless the current planning application accords with the proposed allocation in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>We would therefore like to emphasise that the site is deliverable in the early stages of the plan period and that there is confirmed market interest in the land. This proposed site allocation is therefore capable of making a genuine contribution towards meeting the housing requirements in the Borough and its inclusion will help ensure that the plan is robust and sound.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>We trust that these comments are helpful and will be taken into consideration. Please contact me if you require any further information, and in the meantime we trust that we will be kept informed of the next steps in the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
1632	Andrew	Ellis		Johnny Barn Farm	Object	<p>I have been a resident at X Newchurch Road, Higher Cloughfold since 1990 and would like to object to planning application 2015-0517 on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on the drainage infrastructure in Higher Cloughfold 2. Pedestrian Safety on Newchurch Road 3. Road safety at the Newchurch Road / Johnny Barn Close road junction 4. Impact on the Higher Cloughfold conservation area. 5. Ecology <p>1. Impact on the drainage infrastructure in Higher Cloughfold Surface water The drains on Edge Lane and at the junction with Newchurch Road cannot currently cope with existing volumes of water and on a number of times each year there is localised flooding on Newchurch Road in that location. There is at least one substantial culvert that runs across the proposed site but neither United Utilities nor Lancashire County Council have been able to trace the exact routing or source of these tributaries into the main culvert that feeds into the drains on, and the culverts under Edge Lane and the surrounding area. Foul sewers The sewers at the junction of Newchurch Road / Edge Lane cannot currently cope with the existing volumes during periods of significant rainfall due to this being a combined sewer. Any additional surface water or foul sewage that feeds into this system from the proposed development will exacerbate the existing problems. Any overflow from this sewer then discharges into the River Parrock in the garden of 449 and therefore into the Irwell with resultant impact upon the ecology of that stream.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Pedestrian Safety Approximately 50m to the west of the Johnny Barn Close / Newchurch Road junction there is no pavement on the south side of Newchurch Road (adjacent to No. 459). This stretch of busy main road is used by unaccompanied children, some as young as 11, walking to and from the local High Schools such as Alder Grange and Bacup & Rawtenstall Grammar School, or by parents and children going to / from primary schools such as Newchurch St. Nicholas's and St Peters. Any additional volume of traffic around that area could therefore potentially endanger children. It should also be noted that the section of pavement on the south side of Newchurch Road for approximately 50m to the east of the above mentioned section is also very narrow. This is immediately opposite the junction to Johnny Barn Close and therefore any increase in vehicle accessing or leaving Johnny Barn Close will also pose a threat to pedestrians. 3. Road Safety 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.053	Further comment
						<p>In winter, when the morning sun is low, drivers of vehicles travelling in an easterly direction along Newchurch Road are often partially blinded by the low sun. The area where this appears to be worst is around the Johnny Barn Close junction as the vehicles ascend the gentle hill and turn slightly to the right. It is not uncommon to see cars travelling towards Waterfoot needing to slow to walking pace to negotiate the blind spot.</p> <p>This already makes that road junction dangerous, but with added ingress and egress from a further 30+ houses, this situation will be significantly worse.</p> <p>4. Impact on the Higher Cloughfold conservation area</p> <p>The proposed development will impact upon the Higher Cloughfold Conservation Area in the following ways:</p> <p>It will block views of the conservation area from the fields to the north east of Sion Baptist church as well as obstructing views looking towards the north east from Sion Baptist church and other properties within the conservation area.</p> <p>In the published documentation about Higher Cloughfold Conservation area, the views to the north from Sion Baptist church get specific mention 'where fields and moorland provide a rural setting to the Conservation area'. This is documented as an 'important view' from the Conservation Area.</p> <p>This proposed development will add thirty plus properties to the north east side of the conservation area. That will detract from the Conservation Area which only has approximately fifty residences in the large area covering Newchurch Road, Edge Lane and Dobbin Lane down to its junction with Peel Street. One of the key documented positive features of the Conservation Area is that 'spacious plot sizes and a low density of development in most of the Conservation Area retains a more open, rural character'. As such this development will have an immediate detrimental impact upon the nature of the area that it will adjoin.</p> <p>5. Ecology</p> <p>Any development in the proposed area will have a negative impact upon the local ecology, such as birds and bats.</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	HS2.53 – Johnny Barn – A new access via Newchurch Road appears achievable with the loss of 2 possibly 3 mature highway trees in the verge and mature trees within the site. A pedestrian/cycle link should be provided through the site to Johnny Barn Close and the surrounding links.		
Number of comments		HS2.053		14				
Reference		HS2.054		Land between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road and west of Dobbin Lane				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
2	Matthew	Mackulin	-	SHLAA16174	Object	<p>Social and Environmental Impacts: the proposal to build 55 houses will have a major impact on local roads that at peak periods already frequently suffer from traffic delays & congestion, particularly Bacup Road and Newchurch Road, add to this and we will experience regularly congested routes. - This increases noise pollution and air pollution which is detrimental to the health and wellbeing of local residents. - Plus the condition of local roads is appalling and many roads contain unrepaired potholes, this will only become worse. - Conservation of Greenland: to the rear of properties on Newchurch road is a green corridor of over 1000 mature trees, a wide variety of flora & fauna, a rich habitat for wildlife such as nesting birds, bats and owls which promotes a biodiversity which will be at risk. - These types of habitat are continually lost for housing all over the Rossendale valley - once a green and pleasant land now overcrowded. - Geological considerations: the site sits on a series of deposits of silt, sand and fine clay, and studies have shown that these sediments have inherent structural weaknesses. - Previous resident requests to purchase land to the rear to extend gardens was refused on grounds that the area had to remain a green belt area. There appears to be a complete about turn by the Council on this point. - There are other brownfield sites (previously used for industry) that need to be prioritised ahead of this site. Has the Council truly exhausted these sites and if so where is the evidence? - If despite all the local opposition and objections outline above you still grant the proposal then I strongly urge you consider the plans such that the green belt stand of trees to the rear of properties on Newchurch road is preserved for a distance of 150m, allowing us to retain a green barrier and preserving all those wonderful trees and flora for the local wildlife - -</p>		Keep our valley a green and pleasant land not let it become an overgrown, congested extension of Manchester

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
47	Jeff	Stephenson	-		Object	<p>As residents of this property for nearly 20 years we wish to strongly object to the proposed private housing development of Greenland between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road notified as HS2.54 with the Hareholme Ward, Rossendale planning map. - - For background: - - Our family moved from a private housing estate in the North East of England to Rossendale, choosing to live in Newchurch Road and this particular house because of its beautiful views of the hills and rolling countryside which enjoyed a natural and non-estate setting for our growing family. We invested in this property for the long-term and were comfortable therefore with paying a premium council tax rate band for the privilege. At the point of purchase it was explained to us by the vendor that the house builder had applied for permission to extend the number of private properties to the rear but had this rejected by the council which we understand was on the grounds of the land being afforded protection both within its biodiversity policy and via an Act of Parliament. This was confirmed within our questioning and legal survey and as such, this gave immense comfort and assurances to us that our scenic views, any change of access to countryside and any subsequent turning of this beautiful Greenland in to another bland housing estate would never ever happen. - - Major concerns/objections: - - 1. The rear of our property which is accessible from an enclosed private garden gate is rich in wildlife and to date we have had badgers, hedgehogs, deer, squirrels, foxes, field mice, frogs, toads and numerous nesting birds visiting our garden. The hundreds of trees and steeped land to the rear do afford wonderful protection for animals but also create an exceptionally secure environment for residents as well as affording superb walks and an uplifting educational environment to access nature for our four young grandchildren on their regular visits. We even have pet names for trees and animals seen on our regular walks as each season changes. We feel this natural habitat would be completely lost by creating housing on the site and this should not be allowed to happen here. - - 2. The building site noise, pollution and utter mess will become an unwanted yet unavoidable disruption to current residents' lives because of the overall preparations, on-going building work and additional site traffic during all hours of the day and week and according to my reading of the plan, will last at least five years from the commencement of any work – this is entirely unacceptable and should not happen. - - 3. As the proposed plan for building so many houses is a major project we have little confidence that any proposal will be able to provide logical, properly researched and efficient (for all) geological considerations to ensure the site is suitable bearing in mind we understand previous historical studies show this land as unsuitable for building owing to potential subsidence and structural weaknesses going back over thirty years – no consideration should be approved until full safety evidence is published. A visual inspection will right now identify the numerous trees which have up-rooted in bad</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						<p>weather leaving their base of sand and silt - - 4. It is fact that often extremely heavy rain water running down each side of the valley is a regular occurrence as it finds its way from the top of the hills to the river outlet in the valley below and in order to get there the water must therefore flow through this proposed site. It should be a simple matter of common sense to question the legality and validity of building on potentially unsafe and unstable land with a marked sloping elevation. Therefore in any event we would expect the council to provide full disclosure including specific evidence that the site proposed has changed suddenly from previous data collected over the years and there by explain why on this occasion the new proposal is valid and therefore - causing a complete reversal of previously published council policies on Greenland building at this particular site. - - 5. We object to any proposed access for traffic to this proposed private housing development land from either Newchurch Road or Bacup Road owing to obvious disruption, noise and air pollution which we feel will no doubt be uncomfortable and even dangerous to the well-being of residents of all ages in an already congested part of Rossendale with only very narrow rural existing accessibility at present. - - Summary: - - The above objections and reasons are submitted to Rossendale Borough Council Planning Department in good faith and done so on the grounds of extreme concern over what may happen as a result of allowing central government to dictate to each of its residents that this wonderful Greenland has to become a cluster of houses. It clearly doesn't and there are many many other more appropriate sites which could be built on in order to meet any government led instructions. - - Please do not allow this destruction of a fantastic asset to the Rossendale Valley, something that heart breakingly can't ever be replaced and would therefore be gone forever. - - In the best interests of our Valley, our habitat and to maintain peoples' trust in the Council to do what is right and proper, then please reject this planning proposal once and for all. There are extremely legitimate reasons for doing so and we would ask that the Borough Council does not devalue previously held honest principles by agreeing to permit what can only be described as constructions of soul-less boxes designed to perhaps meet some ill thought through house building targets. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
51	John	Sikora	-	H13	Object	<p>See attached letter and petition from local residents that surround the proposed site. - PETITION - - We the residents and ratepayers of the houses immediately surrounding the woodland area in hareholm ward, most strongly object to the proposed plans by Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) to destroy any this natural habitat between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road on the following grounds: - - 1. This land was subject to a compulsory purchase order by RBC and declared unsuitable for any residential or other building construction on the basis that this land is known to be unstable and unsuitable for residential development. RBC have rightly prevented previous proposals by builders to build housing on this land on this basis. - 2. Any change in the current use of this land would be contrary to the declared intention by RBC as part of it's CPO to maintain it as a natural environment and for which RBC was able to obtain a grant from the EU to re-establish this land as a woodland area. - 3. This woodland area is part of Rossendale's heritage and provides a natural habitat that is home to, and supports a wide array of wildlife that is enjoyed by us the residents of RBC. The proposed development would destroy this natural environment. - 4. We the rate payers have bought our houses at considerable expense in the area immediately surrounding this woodland area because it offers such beauty and any change in use of the woodland area will seriously undermine the value of our houses. This is one of the main reasons we chose to purchase our houses. Surely as existing ratepayer's it is our voice that should be heard and not those of non-residents/non ratepayers or builders. The later is motivated solely by personal financial profit. - 5. The local infrastructure is not sufficient to support the construction of residential property on this land. The schools surrounding this area are full as are doctor's surgeries. The roads are already very congested. To knock an existing residential property down to gain access to this area if opposite to Marl Pits will present a major road safety risk. There has already been several accidents on both Newchurch Road and Bacup Road and 2 of these in the last 2 years have been fatal. - 6. Since this land (a glacial overflow sediment site) is known to be unstable, we the residents would hold RBC and the builders accountable for any subsidence caused to our houses or property that is directly attributable to any construction work and which may become evident immediately or over the next 10 years or longer. - The letter outlining local residents objections is too large to attach here and I will send a separate hard copy along with the residents petition to the planning department. (199 signatures)</p> <p>Letter received 05.09.2017: I am writing to you regarding the RBC Local Plan site allocations. The proposed plan identifies site H13, the woodland area between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road as a potential site for housing development. Please find enclosed a copy of a petition signed by the residents surrounding</p>		A detailed letter outlining local residents objections and the Petition against the development of site H13 (Woodland area between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road) will be sent separately as this survey does not allow for such large documents to be attached.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						<p>the woodland area objecting in the strongest possible way to the proposals put forward by RBC for the potential construction of housing on this site. I also enclose a copy of a letter outlining mine and other residents' objections to the possible destruction of the woodland area between Newchurch and Bacup Road.</p> <p>You will be aware that RBC when it issued the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) for this site stated that this land is unstable and is totally unsuitable for building purposes. RBC also obtained a grant from the EU to plant the woodland in order to help stabilise the land and create the natural habitat that now sustains a rich and varied wildlife.</p> <p>To destroy this woodland and to renege on the Councils previous declaration that this land is unsuitable for building is indefensible. It also goes against RBC's expressed commitment to maintain the woodland heritage of the Rossendale Valley.</p> <p>This woodland which provides a crucial natural habitat and amenity enjoyed us the residents (and rate payers) and our families.</p> <p>I and the other local residents hope that you in your role as Principal Planner will take due consideration of our objections and remove this site from the Local Plan.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Letter dated 28/09/2017:</p> <p>Further to the information already presented to RBC Planning Department objecting to the woodland area between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road being included as a possible site for residential development, please find enclosed a Quaternary Deposits and Landslide Report from Dr Catherine Delaney (Senior Lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan University). This report clearly identifies this site as highly unstable and prone to landslides and adds to the other academic study information previously presented by Durham University.</p> <p>Added to this, the Lancashire Badger Group have also conducted a study of the current Badger sets within the woodland area of which there are 5 sets. The Lancashire Badger Group have identified that in order to maintain the foraging rights of the Badgers any destruction of the woodland area will have a serious impact on the survival of the Badgers that inhabit these woods. I have been assured that the Lancashire Badger Group will also be writing to RBC Planning Department regarding this.</p> <p>I trust that all of this information will be presented to the RBC planning department members and taken into consideration in subsequent discussions about the draft plan.</p> <p>QUATERNARY DEPOSITS AND LANDSLIDES IN THE UPPER IRWEIL VALLEY BETWEEN RAWTENSTALL AND NEWCHURCH</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						<p>Introduction</p> <p>The Rossendale Valley between Rawtenstall and Newchurch consists of a bedrock-bounded trough, with an infill of sediments deposited during the last glaciation (the Devensian, 28-14,000BP). This report provides a brief description of the deposits and associated landslides.</p> <p>1. Quaternary Deposits in the Rossendale Valley</p> <p>Quaternary deposits within the Rossendale Valley date from the last glaciation. The Valley was covered by ice at the glacial maximum; subsequently ice recession caused the formation of an icedammed lake that persisted for some time, before draining during ice retreat (Crofts et al., 2010; Delaney et al., 2010). The lake acted as a sediment sink, and the bedrock valley was partly filled with a mixture of silt, clay, sand and gravel during its existence. Subsequently this infill was incised during lake drainage, and this process continued to a lesser extent during the Holocene (the last 11,000 years). This incision has resulted in a cliff, lying between the north bank of the Irwell River and the Newchurch Road (see figure 1 below). Between Rawtenstall and Rossendale, boreholes logs along the central axis of the valley (accessible at the British Geological Survey (BGS) GeolIndex site (below)) indicate that glacial sediments to a depth of up to 30m remains in the central part of the valley and consist mostly of silt and clay, with some diamictons. Along the northern margin of the valley, on either side of the Newchurch Road, the sediment is more mixed, with sand and fine gravel interbedded with silt and clay (borehole records from Grange Road, available through BGS GeolIndex). This variable particle size means that the hydraulic conductivity of the sediment changes with depth; in particular beds of silt and clay below beds with sand and gravel present are likely to act as aquitards and slow the downward movement of water, increasing the likelihood of sediment saturation and associated slope failures in this area.</p> <p>2. Occurrence of Landslides in the Rossendale Valley</p> <p>Landslides along the southern side of the Rossendale valley in the area were mapped by the BGS (Crofts 2004; Crofts et al. 2010). These large landslides are based in bedrock, and are unlikely to be active. Further landslides in the Quaternary infill have also been mapped by the BGS elsewhere in the Valley, using the NextMap Britain™ Digital Elevation Model and some fieldwork (OEM; Crofts,2004; Crofts et al.2010). The NextMap Britain™ OEM has a resolution of 5m per pixel, so smaller landslides are not easily identified. For this study LIDAR DTMs (Digital Terrain Models), available on open license from the Environment Agency (website given below) were used to map landslides in the area in question. Airborne LIDAR surveying involves the use of light pulses to accurately measure the height of the ground surface; using this technology height measurements have a vertical accuracy of +/-12cm and a horizontal accuracy limited by the pixel resolution; in this case horizontal resolution is 1m (Environment Agency 2016). As LIDAR pulses can penetrate</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						<p>through tree canopies, the data can be edited to remove buildings so that the ground surface without vegetation and buildings can be shown as a DTM. The resulting DTM has been hillshaded (a model created as if lit by low angle light (35°) from 16 directions around the compass. The result is shown below (Figure 1). Figure 1: LIDAR DTM (1m resolution) showing Rossendale Valley between Rawtenstall and Newchurch. Landslides mapped by the BGS are shaded with diagonal red lines. Previously unmapped landslides identified using LIDAR are indicated with red arrows.</p> <p>The image clearly shows the cliff cut into the glacial infill immediately north of River Irwell has been modified by a number of landslides. These are indicated by red arrows in Figure 1, and are characterised by a scarp along the upper margin of the landslide, succeeded downslope by undulating and hummocky terrain. Figure 2 is a closeup of the area proposed for development. There is evidence of a landslide immediately to the east of the proposed development area. Figure 2: Area around the proposed development, indicating position of landslide. Newchurch Road is visible immediately to the north.</p> <p>It is not possible to say from the data used in this report whether this landslide is currently active. Even if has not been active in the recent past, it is likely that disturbance of the ground above the slide margins may reduce slope stability and either reactivate this slide or cause further sliding along the southern margin of the site.</p> <p>I am unable to comment further on the likelihood of slope failure, as my expertise lies in glacial sedimentology and geomorphology, rather than hazard assessment. However, it is clear to me that this site would need considerable investigation prior to any building work commencing, in order to full assess the likelihood of slope failure.</p> <p>Dr. Catherine Delaney Senior Lecturer School of Science and the Environment Manchester Metropolitan University Chester St. Manchester M1 5GD.</p> <p>References and Websites British Geological Survey GeolIndex. Available at: http://www.bgs.ac.uk/Geoindex/home.html?src=topNav Accessed 28/09/2017 Crofts, R.G., Hough, E., Northmore, KJ. 2010. 1:50,000 Sheet 76 Rochdale Bedrock and Superficial Deposits; Geological Map and accompanying brief explanation. Natural Environment Research Council. Crofts, R. G. 2004. Lancashire landslides. Integrated mapping of potential geological hazards. Earthwise 20, BGS, NERC. Delaney C A, Rhodes E J, Crofts R G and Jones C D (2010). Evidence for former</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						<p>glacial lakes in the High Peak and Rossendale Plateau areas, Northwest England. North West Geography Vol 10 (1). Environment Agency (2016). Environment Agency LiDAR Data. Technical Note, Version S. Environment Agency LIDAR DTMs available to download at: http://environment.data.gov.uk/ds/survey/#/survey</p> <p>Letter received 09.10.2017: Enclosed is an additional attachment to the petition against the proposed building of properties as the land between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road. (32 signatures)</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
74	Edmund	Dixon	-	SHLAA 16174, page 466 +	Object	1 - WRONG PLACE FOR HOUSES. see p 30 of plan: 8500 people out-commute to work, so the houses should be closer to A56/M66 - 2 ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE: Policy ENV 5 states 'stepping stone habitats will be particularly protected' so replacing this woodland with trees elsewhere will not safeguard this stepping stone habitat; if the trees can go elsewhere, please put the houses elsewhere instead. The houses can be built in months, the woods will take 40 years to replace. - 3 FLOOD RISK: The environmental network study para 5.57 highlights the benefits of woodland in reducing peak flows by up to 50%. Removal of this woodland will increase the flood risk UNACCEPTABLY for residents sited below this land. - 4 POLITICS: both main parties have recently campaigned to 'Keep Rossendale Green.' If you have any integrity you will ensure that Dobbin Wood remains green and is not built on, in accordance with the original CPO (1983) 'for the purposes of preserving or enhancing the beauty' of this key local asset. - 5 METHODOLOGY: over 10% of homes in my road (BB4 7PD) appear to have been unoccupied for the last 5 years. The local plan should factor in the number of vacant homes and bring these into use before desecrating irreplaceable areas of woodland within the urban boundary. - 6 HOLISTIC PLANNING: the Council and local MP need to prevail upon the government to develop a holistic approach to planning, delegated to local level which respects our topography and local housing needs, not imposed national targets, and maintains police stations, health and education infrastructure and museums of national significance if the local economy is to be developed; or, if austerity is to be imposed, plan on building fewer houses and accept that the local population will shrink.		POLITICS: both main parties have recently campaigned to 'Keep Rossendale Green.' If you have any integrity you will ensure that Dobbin Wood remains green and is not built on, in accordance with the original CPO (1983) 'for the purposes of preserving or enhancing the beauty' of this key local asset. - - METHODOLOGY: over 10% of homes in my road (BB4 7PD) appear to have been unoccupied for the last 5 years. The local plan should factor in the number of vacant homes and bring these into use before desecrating irreplaceable areas of woodland within the urban boundary. - - HOLISTIC PLANNING: the Council and local MP need to prevail upon the government to develop a holistic approach to planning, delegated to local level which respects our topography and local housing needs, not imposed national targets, and maintains police stations, health and education infrastructure and museums of national significance if the local economy is to be developed; or, if austerity is to be imposed, plan on building fewer houses and accept that the local population will shrink. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
323	Anne	Dixon		SHLAA16174	Object	<p>I am objecting to the proposed housing development on the site of Dubbin Wood for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a) Increased flood risk. By cutting down valuable mature trees from the hillside, you would be making the land more unstable, and removing a valuable resource that helps soak up excess water. - b) Wildlife and natural habitat loss. The area was planted up by the Council in the early 1980's to serve as a wildlife corridor for animals and birds. It is a fantastic resource for the area, and offers a valuable safe haven for, badgers, bats, deer, gold finches, owls, etc, etc, and helps animals move safely around the area. - c) The ground is structurally unstable. A geological survey was conducted by a Durham University scientist which highlighted that the ground is very unstable, and that once these sediments are exposed, then severe subsidence would occur. - d) Green space loss and ecosystem destroying. The area needs to maintain and cherish it's green spaces and its mature trees. It is it's nature and woodland environments that attract visitors to the area, and help combat pollution in the local area. The trees are the lungs of the town. <p>Email received 09/10/2017: Over the past few weeks I have been collecting on-line signatures to help save Dobbin Wood from the proposed building of 55 luxury houses. Dobbin wood was established by the Council in the early 80's as a valuable wildlife corridor, and is now home to deer, badgers, foxes and countless species of birds, trees and wild flowers. I believe this area needs protecting for its value to local wildlife, and it's beauty in the local community. I am also concerned that the land is not stable for houses, and, if houses are built on this land, then it puts houses lower down in the valley at increased risk of flooding. The trees currently help to stabilize the land and absorb some of the run off from the hills. This issue means a lot to me, and I am passionate to help preserve Dobbin Wood. Please view the petition by clicking on the link below. It currently has 81 signatures. https://secure.avaaz.org/en/petition/Alyson_Barnes_Council_Leader_Rosendale_Borough_Council_Alyson_Barnes_Save_Dobbin_Wood_Rosendale/?eUGQqfb I would be grateful if you could confirm that you have been able to view this petition on-line. Many thanks for your help with this important community environmental issue.</p>		<p>Rosendale is a wonderful area to live in, and I am passionate about preserving the heritage and character of the place. I am a volunteer at Civil Pride and help maintain the flower beds that so many people in the area appreciate. People need green spaces, trees and interactions with wildlife for mental and physical well being. Housing should not be built on green field or forest areas - it increases the risk of flooding and land erosion, and takes away the lungs and soul of the area. We need a local strategy for housing that takes into account existing housing stock and old mills, etc that could be made habitable, and looks at the local needs, not just works blindly to meet a target set by Government officers in Whitehall. We need to consider what the local infrastructure can cope with, and we need to ensure that the houses built are suitable for the needs of disabled, and elderly, and flood resistant, and in keeping with the local environment. We need balance. The proposed plan also needs to be publicised more widely. A lot of people in the area do not know that housing is being proposed near to them, and therefore cannot comment on your proposals.</p>
433	daniel	Butterworth	-		Object	.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
453	Rebecca	Eves	-		Object	<p>I live in one of the houses on Newchurch Road which backs onto this land. It is mainly mature woodland which is an essential habitat and wildlife corridor for a number of species, including badgers, jays and goldfinches, all regular visitors to our garden. If the site was to be used for the proposed housing development (55 houses, plus 27 off Dobbin Lane), this would undoubtedly be lost. - In addition to this, we and many of our neighbours purchased our houses specifically because of the outlook from the rears of our properties. The majority of us have paid a premium for this. The woodland not only looks attractive, but also screens us from much of the noise and views of the traffic and industry on Bacup Road. If the woodland is replaced by housing, I fear that our properties may become devalued significantly and we will no longer be shielded from the noise of the main road in the valley. There would also be significant light pollution from the houses and street lighting. This proposed development would impact the outlook from the conservation area around Dobbin Lane/Higher Cloughfold; I notice that a section of the proposed housing site is also within the conservation area. As at least two planning applications have been turned down in this area in recent years, as they were thought not to be in keeping with the 'look' of the area in terms of building heights and sizes, surely a decision to build further homes in the vicinity is also inappropriate in this respect? - One further concern is access to the site and potential increases in traffic on Newchurch Road and Dobbin Lane/Peel Street. There are few points at which the site could have access roads laid down and this will place additional pressure on the already busy surrounding roads. - Whilst I appreciate the need for additional housing and the financial benefits of this for the area, I do feel that far too many of the sites chosen for housing developments are greenfield; this one being a prime example.</p>		<p>I am hugely concerned about the number of greenfield sites being used as proposed housing sites. I am also quite annoyed that I only stumbled upon this draft plan by chance (and too late to attend the meetings); as a resident of Rawtenstall, I feel all residents should have been informed, by letter or other means, so that they could read the draft plan, attend meetings and make their views known in good time.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
501		Miles			Object	<p>1. The land at this site is a mixture of silt, sand and fine clay. Studies by Manchester and Durham Universities have shown this type of land to be structurally very weak. This is the reason why the Local Authority planted the trees that now give this land it's biodiversity. All planning applications to date have failed in part for this reason.</p> <p>2. The Woodland is host to a huge variety of natural species. These include but are not limited to: the Lesser Redpoll, House Sparrow (these birds are on the RSPB Red List of species of conservation concern, due to a greater than 50% decline in breeding population over the last 25 years), Dunnock, Bullfinch (these birds are on the RSPB Amber List of species of conservation concern, due to a 25-49% decline in UK breeding population over the last 25 years), Goldfinch, Sparrow Hawk, Robin, Greenfinch, Blue Tit, Great Tit, Coal Tit, Long-tailed Tit, and Great Spotted Woodpecker. Mammals include: Badgers, Roe Deer, Foxes, Pipistrelle Bats, and Squirrels. Also amphibians including Frogs and Toads. Destroying this woodland area is a disgrace and will result in the loss of many beautiful species which live amongst us. As the National Planning Policy Framework states; Section 11 part 109 'Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...' apply to this precious woodland being not only protected from destruction but money spent on making it accessible for future generations to benefit from it.</p> <p>3. There would be a significant access problem. At the moment both Newchurch Road and Bacup Road are very congested especially at peak times, especially since Marl Pits Leisure Centre was upgraded. The addition of 90 houses to this area, with say 135 cars and an extra junction opposite Marl Pits is simply going to intensify an existing problem. Car accidents will undoubtedly increase (I personally can count 4 in the last 2 years I've lived here) one of which was at the Marl Pits leisure centre junction. Cloughfold does not have the road network infrastructure to safely cope with the amount of extra vehicles that would emerge from the proposed development.</p> <p>4. To destroy a thriving woodland for a development where each house will have a least 1 car is not in line with the national Government's environmental policies; NPPF Section 11 part 109 '...contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity...' and part 110 '...Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value...' and as it is self evident that this well established woodland has great environmental value it would be unfathomable to justify its destruction.</p> <p>5. The site is within a 3A Flood Zone and therefore not suitable for sustained development. In adverse weather conditions the future proposed development will be subject to significant drainage issues and possible</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						<p>flooding, which is already a known issue in this area.</p> <p>6. The main reason many people choose to live in Rawtenstall and the surrounding areas is it's natural beauty. The mix of rural areas, outstanding views and industrial heritage are what make Rawtenstall special to all of us. People who move here are attracted to it's small town charm and want to escape the large towns and cities. If Rossendale Council choose to build on these beautiful green areas, the whole area will become built up and destroyed, and will most probably deter people from wanting to live here.</p> <p>7. A quick search on Rightmove reveals thirty seven 2 bedroom houses up to a value of £125,000, currently for sale in a one mile radius of this area. There are also forty six 3 bedroom houses between the values of £125,000 and £250,000 for sale. Other estate agents reveal additional homes for sale not currently registered on Rightmove. Again, all of them within a 1 mile radius of this area. Why exactly does Rossendale Council feel the need to build more houses when there is already a plentiful supply of local homes and many of them have been for sale for a long time? There are also businesses for sale that lie within residential areas that can easily be converted to homes and apartments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
505	Rodney	Poucher	-		Object	<p>This is a greenfield site, designated early in the 1970s by the Council as important in terms of being a wild life corridor and walking amenity for local residents. The Council gave the area in question the name of The Cloughfold Greenway, planting hundreds of deciduous trees and enclosing the boundaries with fencing. - - The trees have now matured and several pathways have subsequently been evolved by users circumscribing the Greenway for dog walking, and various recreational purposes. - - The area continues to be the home for numerous wildlife species which over time has now grown to include roe deer, badger and fox as well as many nesting birds, most notably tawny owls. - Housing development on this area to the scale envisaged in the plan, some 55 houses in total, would be detrimental to the continuing presence of most of this wildlife. - - Another, and an extremely serious consideration that must be given concerns the vast number of land-drains crossing underneath the area from the northerly aspect, ie Chapel Hill, Marl Pits, and running down through the steeply sloping land to eventually empty into the river Irwell. Any disturbance of these land-drains will have an effect on the houses already built in the area to the northern side of Bacup Road, which includes several terraced rows, including my own house which has land-drains passing on either side of the property. An example of the effect of building anywhere in this area became apparent during the development in 1974 of the athletics stadium at Marl Pits. This construction work resulted in visible alterations to the water flow passing through and across the area. Even subsequent comparatively minor house extensions on Newchurch Road have made some impact on the water flow passing our property. The scale of development envisaged in the Plan could have serious consequences for a large number of properties. - - A final point to take into account must be the impact the occupants of 55 new houses would have on the existing infrastructure in the area, roads, access, schooling etc. Whilst these are points most of the developments in the Plan will need to consider, this proposal is geographically very close to the town centre and is in a position already chronically affected by volumes of traffic and over-subscription of schools. - - If you take these three points, wildlife, land-drains and infrastructure individually, they each provide a good case to scale down or abandon the proposal. Take them collectively and the case becomes compelling. I trust the Council will take this into serious consideration.</p>		No.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	HS2.82,HS2.86,H S2.53,HS2.54,HS 2.58,HS2.54,HS2 .57,HS2.54, HS2.56,HS2.84 , Land at Marl Pits.	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						<p>recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -		
531	Ian	Davidson	-		Object	I wish to strongly object to houses being built on a site that is green belt land and adds to the character of rossendale. More houses and more people using already overstretched infrastructure and facilities are symptomatic of a short sighted plan for an area of the country renowned for its character and beauty.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
551	John S. and Glenys	Holt	-	SHLAA16174 - SHLAA 2015 - H13	Object	Our Interest: - We have been residents of Newchurch Road since 1983 and our property backs onto green land, the proposed site of 90 dwellings and we have witnessed the changes that have taken place over the intervening years to this area. - The demise of the major industries, i.e. cotton; boot and shoe; felt and other manufacturing industries has allowed the valley to change to lighter forms of productivity whilst at the same time transforming the environment of the area. - - Planning Applications circa 1980 - With regard to application site H13 we are aware that an appeal by a builder to build houses at the east end of this site was refused due to the instability of the land. - This finding has been confirmed by a recent study carried out on a major part of the proposed site by both Manchester and Durham Universities which indicates that the site sits on a glacial lacustrine deposit of silt, sand and fine clay. - - CPO 1983 - Tree Planting - In 1983 Rossendale Borough Council Compulsory Purchased the site referred to in application site H13 for the purpose of tree planting. The financial support for this was a grant from the European Commission. Over a 1000 trees were planted including oak, willow, rowan and many others which are now well established. - - Environment (wildlife) - Site H13 has now been established as a biodiversity area not only regarding green land but also habitat to many wildlife species such as deer, badgers, foxes, rabbits, bats and an incredible variety of bird life. In addition, the area is affected by numerous water courses which create habitats for water based wildlife. - - Conclusion - The green land area that flows from Rawtenstall through to Waterfoot and continues through the Glen, following Newchurch Road to Stacksteads is an important corridor that must be protected. - Building on this site would cause the total destruction of this natural habitat. - We the residents of Rossendale rely on our elected Councillors to fulfil their duty and in view of the evidence provided from numerous sources it would be a dereliction of duty to approve this site for housing development. - To grant approval to this development would be the thin edge of the wedge which would give the green light for the Council to continue development along this corridor. - Reported in the Rossendale Free Press on 28th July 2017. The Council says – “As well as earmarking development sites, it proposes zones for environmental protection, including new and expanded conservation areas.” The public have been urged to have their say. - We ask why destroy well established Greenland sites, well habited by wildlife just to create elsewhere and at what cost when the Draft Local Plan seeks to acknowledge the importance of the Boroughs’ rural character? - More emphasis should be placed on seeking out Brownfield sites along the valley corridors. An example of which is the former Broadley’s Factory on Burney Road, Rawtenstall which some time ago planning permission was sought for over 150 properties. - Our lifetime spent in Rossendale spans from 1945 and, therefore, our concerns regarding the proposals are based on our		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
						desire not only to see the valley prosper economically but also to see that the work that has been achieved in recreating what was originally called The Forest of Rossendale is developed alongside any proposed developments whether they are for housing or for industry. - - - Please acknowledge receipt of this document to email address: - - 22nd September 2017 -		
690	William	Hutchinson	-	HS2.53, HS2.54, HS2.56, HS2.80, HS2.82, HS2.83, HS2.86	Not Applicable	The seven sites listed above are all within areas adjacent to Newchurch Road and the assumption can be reasonably made that future residents of the 228 units projected will use Newchurch Road as their principal access. This could account for in the region of an additional 450 vehicles regularly using what is already a very busy stretch of highway. Considerable numbers of pupils of nearby schools either walk or are brought in cars to the Newchurch Rd./Union St./Hurst Lane vicinity to make their way to these schools. The current volume of traffic makes it dangerous for these young people. Elderly residents find it increasingly difficult to cross Newchurch Rd. in this area because of the volume and speed of traffic. Whilst local residents in vehicles can experience danger and frequent difficulty when negotiating the roads and junctions for the same reasons. - In my opinion it should be a condition of any of the proposed development that 'traffic calming' measures must be implemented to protect the safety, convenience and general well-being of all who live in or pass through this location whether on foot, on cycles or in vehicles. To not do so will be doing all concerned a great disservice and will be a dereliction of the 'duty of care' which is incumbent on all who may be deliberating on these proposed developments. - In terms of such 'traffic calming': 'speed-bumps', lower speed limit, road narrowing with priority restrictions and advance warning signs would all be measures I would hope to see introduced.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
732	Andy	Hardman	Lancashire Badger Group	H13	Object	<p>Dear Sir or Madam, I am writing as Vice Chair of the Lancashire Badger Group to object to the proposed development of the land between Newchurch Road and Bacup road Rawtenstall (H13 on the Future Plan).</p> <p>We have on our database a number of established badger setts within this piece of land. Any future development would have to mitigate for the presence of the badgers, their setts and loss of foraging area.</p> <p>The site has roads on all sides, the two main ones being Newchurch Road to the North of the site and Bacup Road to the South, these are main arteries up and down the Valley with considerable vehicles using them daily. To the East of the site is Dobbin Lane, this lane is used as a cut through from Newchurch Road and Bacup Road in both directions. To the West is Greenbank Park the least used of all the roads.</p> <p>In order to develop the site the existing badger setts would have to be closed down and artificial setts built to replace the existing setts. The badger would have to be using the artificial setts before the existing ones could be closed down. The site is approximately 10 hectares, which for an urban badger clan is on the limit of what they can survive on for foraging. Rural badgers foraging areas vary from 30 hectares to 300 hectares which is dependent on availability of food. Any reduction in their foraging area will impact on the badgers and may lead to them starving or being run over as they look for other food sources beyond their current range.</p> <p>Badgers are territorial and as such each clan keeps to it's area, any badgers that stray into a neighboring territory are usually attacked and chased out of the area. Our database shows badger setts North, South and East of the site, all of which are sufficiently distant to be separate clans so would not accept any badgers from these setts.</p> <p>I am unable to see a suitable piece of land within the immediate vicinity where an artificial sett could be built with enough foraging area to sustain these badgers.</p> <p>It is also illegal to build around the setts and reduce the badgers foraging area if a suitable foraging area does not exist.</p> <p>We feel that there may be more setts than we have on our database but at present due to the depth of the undergrowth surveying the whole site would be better done between November and March when the foliage dies back. We have a long history of dealing with badgers and developments in Rossendale and have a pragmatic approach, but in this instance I cannot see a good outcome for the badgers if the land is developed</p> <p>We would ask that this particular site be removed from the future plan to save the badgers on the site coming to any harm and would welcome your thoughts on the matter.</p> <p>We will obviously work with you to find a solution.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
779	Alison	Squire	-		Object	<p>I wish to object to the above proposed sites for housing which are close to Newchurch Road on the grounds that: - i) increased traffic will be unacceptable on this main road through Rossendale - ii) erosion of greenfield sites instead of using brownfield sites in the Valley - iii) increased demand on already overloaded education and health services. - - As a resident of Waingate Village, I have objected several times to planning applications on a plot of land off Hurst Lane (Ref: 2015/0308) and am extremely displeased that this land has received planning approval despite it continuing to be beyond the Urban Boundary. There were no opportunities for local residents to raise further objections and no communications following approval having been given. I do not feel that the Council supported local residents and instead allowed developers greater importance. I am therefore worried that despite this opportunity to comment on the Local Plan, residents' opinions will not be taken into consideration. - - It appears that the Urban Boundary may be moved to Balladen Clough (a stream) to include a field behind Marl Pits road. An earlier application to build on this land was refused on the grounds of lack of road access. I hope that any future planning applications on this land will continue to be refused and the original Urban Boundary will remain in place. Any development on this land would further increase traffic onto Newchurch Road. - - Having witnessed the gridlock in Bank Street and Angouleme Way on Saturday I do wonder where the increased traffic from all the proposed new housing will go. I appreciate that it is National Government Policy to increase housing and that sites have to be found in the Valley but hope that more brownfield sites can be found, consideration of health and education demands and transport/traffic difficulties will be addressed before adopting the new Local Plan.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
798	Margaret	Johnson	-	H13	Object	<p>1,Flora & Fauna - There are a multitude of trees and wildlife inhabiting this area. Any plans to build here would destroy an important part of the ecological system for ever. LCC are encouraging native trees which formed the Forest of Rossendale and it is nothing short of vandalism to build on this green corridor which is home to a wonderful variety of wildlife which we have a duty to protect. - - 2. Unsuitability of land - We purchased this house nearly 40 years ago from Mr H Bower of Modern Homes. He informed us that he had tried to continue Lambton Gates up to the Greenland but the land itself is unsuitable due to springs and sediment. This land was then subsequently purchased in the 80s through a government grant to preserve green spaces. I know building methods have moved on but if the methods employed on Whinberry View are anything to go by then the noise and vibration of piling will destroy the balance of the eco system. - - 3. Traffic & Services - Where will access be? No-one seemed to be able to give a definitive answer. We strongly object to our cul de sac becoming a rat run. In addition roads, schools and surgeries are already struggling to cope - the valley does not lend itself to further building unless it is on brownfield sites. - - We were originally attracted to Rossendale as we were close to amenities yet in a semi rural environment. Visitors to our house always comment how lucky we are to see such a varied amount of wildlife. Since houses have been built on Whinberry View the wildlife activity has reduced . Badger and fox tracks which had existed for many years have been eroded and destroyed. - The number of birds and small mammals has diminished .This Greenland should be protected -otherwise we are in danger of becoming another urban sprawl. There are plenty of houses for sale in Rossendale - we don't need more just to satisfy central government.</p>		- Please do not ignore the wishes of the council tax payers in order to provide builders with - big profits and risk destroying our heritage for ever.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
947	Brian	Michael	-		Object	Object to 55 houses on 1.83Ha Greenland between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road, and 27 houses on 0.9Ha Greenland to west of Dobbin Lane: extending into C19 Dobbin Wood and Cloughfold Conservation Area. Question proposal to retain some of the Greenland's wooded corridor, too steep, without retaining the protection of its Green Infrastructure status as Greenland. - And note no relevant background, which is:- - 1. Urban Green Land in preparation of the Rossendale District Plan adopted in 1982, with a DOE Inspector's November 1980 dismissal of appeal against refused planning application 79/177 for housing. - 2. Borough of Rossendale (Lower Cloughfold, Tree Planting Site) Compulsory Purchase Order 1983 for these 12.5 acres of sloping land, it was stated to be: "a significant landscape element within the urban form which particular feature should, it is considered, be retained and, wherever possible, enhanced...so that: the creation of a more balanced landscape within Rossendale will also, it is anticipated, be instrumental in helping to attract a greater interest in the residential, economic and recreational development of the Borough". - 3. The main area: 12.5 acres / 5.06/Ha of land, LA509824, was purchased 21 December 1984 by Rossendale Borough Council, and landscaped by Rossendale Groundwork 1983/96, with a 50% Grant from the Countryside Commission for purchase, drains and plantings, as Phase 1 Cloughfold Greenway. Planning permission 14/85/321."The first stage of a long term plan to conserve and enhance the natural and physical environment of a strategically important two mile long urban fringe "necklace" along the main valley routeway", 3rd paragraph, Borough of Rossendale's 19 September 1984 grant request letter to CC. - 4. Open? It's mostly fenced with weldmesh topped with barbed wire. - 5. Grant Condition: Change of use or disposal. 21. The applicant shall not materially alter, or change the use of, or sell, or dispose of all or part of the grant-aided facilities, except with the prior written permission of the Commission, for 25 years from the opening date or the date on which grant is last paid, whichever is the later. - 6. Well know as a wet site:Springs, Issues, soft ground: note foundation piling, followed by sheet piling to wooded slope of this Greenland on redeveloped site of Whinberry View. -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
1140	Cherry	Hughes	-		Object	<p>I have recently viewed the plans outlining proposals for housing (related to the Local Policy) in the Newchurch/Hareholme ward area and wish the following comments to be noted: - - * there is a proposed development of 7 - 9 houses at the top of St Peter's Road beyond St Peter's RC Primary School. A major concern is congestion particularly around school opening and closing times. The road becomes very congested as many children are dropped off/picked up by car (giiven the School's faith status and the catchment area). Frequently our driveway is blocked during the most congested periods as there is nowhere in the near vicinity for parents to park and walk their children the last few metres to the School Gate. Increased traffic past the School Gate will create a greater hazard. - - * the proposed site is part way down Seat Naze slope. There is already significant run off which impacts on the houses at the top of St Peter's Road and Heightside Avenue. There is also evidence of springs, one of which which percolates through the road that leads to the houses immediately above Newchurch Road. United Utililites has been called to this particular spot on numerous occassions and identified that it isn't a leak from a pipe. I am also aware of the proposed far more significant developments above Johnny Barn and below Marl Pits on land which has always been very wet (even in dry summers). How can developers guarantee good drainage both for the developments and for the existing developed areas downslope from them? How will that impact on the Irwell at the bottom of the Valley and the flooding dangers? - - * Finally I am really concerned that the area does not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional housing stock. Roads are already heavily congested at commuter times. The local primary schools have very limited capacity to take more students but there appears to be no planning for a new primary school. There is a 'play area' on Stacksteads, which I believe the Newchurch Village Association is planning to raise money to renovate, and this is the only one in the immediate area. The area is already due to have a significant development on what was the Rossendale Football Club Ground (up to 100 houses I believe) - and no mention has been made of infrastructure improvements for this development. - - * I live on a road where over the past 5 years, 3 properties were for sale and 2 of these were for sale for at least 4 years before they sold. The difficulty with sales does appear to have alleviated but there are always houses for sale in our immediate neighbourhood - so can we argue that there is a housing crisis in Rossendale (or at least in this part of Rossendale)?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
1303	JULIA	BARROW	-		Object	THIS IS A DESIGNATED WILDLIFE CORRIDOR APART FROM ANYTHING ELSE! THE LAND IS VERY STEEP AND UNSTABLE - I WOULD ASSUME. RIDICULOUS IDEA. THE EXTRA TRAFFIC CREATED BY THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS WOULD CREATE MASSIVE PROBLEMS GETTING IN AND OUT OF THE VALLEY, OUT OF ALL THE PLANS PUT FORWARD NOT ONE OF THEM MENTIONS ROAD IMPROVEMENET SCHEMES OF ANY SORT - ARE WE ALL SUPOSED TO BE LEAVING THE VALLEY BY HELICOPTOR\ BY THE TIME THESE PROPOSED HOUSES COME TO BE? PATHETIC - BUT NOTHING I HAVEN'T COME TO EXPECT FROM RBC.		I AM VERY AWARE THAT IN ALL THE PROPOSED PLANS NOWHERE HAS THERE BEEN ANY MENTION OF NEW/IMPROVED ROADS/INFRASTRUCTURE? I REMEMEBER THE EDENFIELD BY-PASS BEING OPENED IN 1968 - TO CARRY TRAFFIC AWAY FROM EDENFIELD VILLAGE. IT WAS BRILLIANT, LIVING IN THE VILLAGE BECAME A JOY ONCE AGAIN! THE SAME SMALL BY-PASS NOW HAS ALL THE TRAFFIC FROM BURNLEY/BLACKBURN/HASLINGDEN/ HELMSHORE/CRAWSHAWBOOTH/RA WTENSTALL EMPTYING INTO IT ON A DAILY BASIS. GRANE ROAD NOW HAS AVERAGE SPEED CAMERAS INSTALLED - AN INDICATION AS TO HOW MUCH TRAFFIC THE ROAD NOW CARRIES. - ON ANOTHER NOTE, WE HAVE NO FREE DOCTORS OR DENTISTS, NO POLICE STATION, SCHOOLS ARE FULL AND WE NOW HAVE TO TRAVEL TO BLACKBURN TO GO TO HOSPITAL! AND YOU ARE PROPOSING TO PUT 4/5000 NEW HOUSES UP? WE HAVE NO PUBLIC SERVICES!! THE REFUSE SERVICES ARE STRUGGLING TO COPE WITH WHAT WE HAVE NOW. OUR ROADS ARE APPALING. - IT REALLY DOES SCARE ME! - I THINK WE HAVE MORE BROWNFIELD AREAS WHICH SHOULD BE EXPLORED BEFORE WE LOSE A LOT OF OUR GREEN SPACES, AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE AN ASSESSMENT OF EMPTY PROPERTIES AVAILABLE IN THE VALLEY WHICH COULD GO TOWARDS THE 4/5000 PROPERTIES NEEDED?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
1308	Emer	Killeen	-		Object	The proposed number of units of 55 is too many to be supported by the existing road network given that most households now have 2+ vehicles. Both Newchurch Road and Bacup Rd are extremely busy already. In particular, Bacup Rd area is densely populated and lots of children walk along the road to and from school. Any additional traffic will increase the risks to pedestrians on both main roads.		-
1323	Rachael	Gildert	Valley Heritage		Object	I feel this site has been put forward as a method to tidy up a scruffy site that is currently used for caravans and general 'waste'. It is bordered on 2 sites by a right of way and houses here would impede the views across the valley - St Peters is a busy school and access along St Peters Road and Newchurch Road at school times is really busy and already hectic for the existing residents. Adding 9 more houses to this site (and I imagine these would be 3-4 bed houses, each with around 3 cars) would significantly add to this trouble. St Peters Road is already often double parked too.		With regards to Conservation Areas, it was a shame Waterfoot Centre was not put forward. The town is slowly starting to regenerate and additional protection could help to prevent unsuitable shop fronts, UPVC windows and other inappropriate development
1384	Simon	Holland	-	SHLAA16174	Object	The proposed development on land between Newchurch Road and Bacup Road at Cloughold is unsuitable for a number of reasons. - 1) The area is a Green Belt area of Natural Beauty, home to Wildlife inc Deer, Badgers and Foxes. the land was previously labeled as unsuitable for building due to the nature of the soil and amount of water the land holds. - 2) The slope of the land rises to significant concerns of a land collapse as has been seen near Waingate close on a recent development - 3) Tree preservation are established in the area - 4) Newchurch Road is already extremely busy and would not sustain further traffic from this development. It is already unsafe to exit the drive by reversing into Newchurch Road. The Road infrastructure is insufficient, with Traffic lights at the junction with Boholt way already leading to congestion. - 5) the main Roundabout in Rawtenstall is insufficient for extra traffic and already causes congestion - 6) medical and Care facilities are insufficient for the influx with ST James Medical centre already over subscribed. - 7) lack of sufficient schooling in the local area. - 8) no parking facilities - 9) safety of school children walking home or via the sports centre due to increased road traffic - 10) increased Flood Risk to Bacup Road		There are significant Brownfield sites that are within the Rossendale Valley that should be utilised before consideration to using Green belt land is given. - - The infrastructure within the Valley in Terms of Public Transport, Road network, Care facilities and medical facilities are also insufficient to cope with significant increase in building and population. - - The targets given are unsustainable and represent significant damage to to the local environments and its population.
1537	John	McGuinness	-		Object	I object to this site allocation for the following reasons: - - Loss of greenbelt land. - This is only the first stage in a gradual loss of land as more houses will be built further up the hill. - Issues with flooding. - Huge increase in traffic on Newc		You seem to be trying to implement a plan where nearly all patches of green within the urban boundary are built on. The hillsides may be green (for now) but all small breathing spaces seem to be a target for building on. Sustainable; how can building more houses on any green area be sustainable? Once land is lost to development, it's lost forever.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.054	Further comment
1537	John	McGuinness	-		Object	I OBJECT TO THIS SITE ALLOCATION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: - - Loss of green land - This area of land is not farmland so there must be greater biodiversity due to this fact. There are a large number of trees on the site which would be lost. - Increased		You seem to be trying to implement a plan where nearly all patches of green within the urban boundary are built on. The hillsides may be green (for now) but all small breathing spaces seem to be a target for building on. Sustainable; how can building more houses on any green area be sustainable? Once land is lost to development, it's lost forever.
1540	David & Margaret	Barnes		SHLAA16174	Object	Rosendale once known as "THE FOREST OF ROSSENDALE". Reasons listed below against the destruction of woodland and the building of unnecessary houses. 1) LOSS OF NATURE and natural flora and fauna - bats, deer, birds, foxes and badgers. 2) TREES maintain ground structure to insecure land - remove air pollution and reduce flood risks 3) TRAFFIC directed onto Newchurch Road would cause more congestion. This is a problem already, the exit from Marl Pits sport centre is a dangerous area and very busy and accidents will occur and new garden centre access! 4) BROWN SITES should be used before destruction of green land and woodland. 5) More schools and GP's will be required.		
1742	Ingrid	Rawlins	Rosendale Valley Gateway Club	SHLAA16174	Object	Rosendale Valley Gateway Club are objecting to the possibility of the development of the land known as Dobbin Wood. The building of houses would impact on the forestry landscape and its habitat and possibly also on the allotment site known as Whinberry Wood, which is used by people with disabilities. The land is prone to flooding and the development of it may exacerbate the issue. We were unable to submit our objections online and therefore attach hard copies.		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HS2.54 – The vehicular access appears limited to Dobbin Lane with a potential pedestrian/cycle access via Co-operation Street. The access may be considered suitable to accommodate a limited number of houses, however the 55 houses that are proposed appears unlikely to be feasible. Further detailed design is required. 		
Number of comments						HS2.054	27	
Reference		HS2.056		Land at Hurst Platt, Rawtenstall				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.056	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	HS2.82,HS2.86,H S2.53,HS2.54,HS 2.58,HS2.54,HS2 .57,HS2.54, HS2.56,HS2.84 , Land at Marl Pits.	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.056	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.056	Further comment
						<p>recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.056	Further comment
						established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -		
690	William	Hutchinson	-	HS2.53, HS2.54, HS2.56, HS2.80, HS2.82, HS2.83, HS2.86	Not Applicable	The seven sites listed above are all within areas adjacent to Newchurch Road and the assumption can be reasonably made that future residents of the 228 units projected will use Newchurch Road as their principal access. This could account for in the region of an additional 450 vehicles regularly using what is already a very busy stretch of highway. Considerable numbers of pupils of nearby schools either walk or are brought in cars to the Newchurch Rd./Union St./Hurst Lane vicinity to make their way to these schools. The current volume of traffic makes it dangerous for these young people. Elderly residents find it increasingly difficult to cross Newchurch Rd. in this area because of the volume and speed of traffic. Whilst local residents in vehicles can experience danger and frequent difficulty when negotiating the roads and junctions for the same reasons. - In my opinion it should be a condition of any of the proposed development that 'traffic calming' measures must be implemented to protect the safety, convenience and general well-being of all who live in or pass through this location whether on foot, on cycles or in vehicles. To not do so will be doing all concerned a great disservice and will be a dereliction of the 'duty of care' which is incumbent on all who may be deliberating on these proposed developments. - In terms of such 'traffic calming': 'speed-bumps', lower speed limit, road narrowing with priority restrictions and advance warning signs would all be measures I would hope to see introduced.		No
872	Derek	Cropper	-		Object	The urban boundary was originally set where it is to protect this area of historic farmland and countryside. The reasons I am objecting to building on this site are: - 1.It would add considerably to the parking and access requirements already at Marl Pitts Sports Centre - 2. There would be the loss of a great local area which is currently used prolifically by walkers, runners, cyclists, etc. - 3. There are also concerns from residents with regard to the issues of drainage and flooding from the stream running through the land		no
1028	Yvette	Cairns	-		Object	I have objected on previous occasions to this plan, will they be taken into consideration, I submitted a petition also to council. - I object on the grounds of access to this field and also to the risk of flooding. - I also object as there is a risk of contamination due to hospital waste which I believe was dumped at Marl Pitts when it was used as a tip some years ago. - -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.056	Further comment
Number of comments		HS2.056		4				
Reference	HS2.057		Land at Conway Road, Higher Cloughfold					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.057	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	HS2.82,HS2.86,H S2.53,HS2.54,HS 2.58,HS2.54,HS2 .57,HS2.54, HS2.56,HS2.84 , Land at Marl Pits.	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.057	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.057	Further comment
						<p>recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.057	Further comment
						<p>established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.057	Further comment
1466	C/o Agent	C/o Agent	A Sutcliffe and Company		Support	<p>Please refer to letter submitted: CONWAY ROAD, RAWTENSTALL</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. This consultation is the first public consultation stage in the production of the Local Plan (Regulation 18) and includes the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement) and its accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Hourigan Connolly is instructed by A Sutcliffe and Company to submit and provide comment on the above in relation to land at Conway Road, off Edge Lane. We have previously submitted representations in response to consultation relating to the Local Plan Part 2 in 2015 and subsequently the 'Call for Sites' exercise relating to the preparation of the new Local Plan in 2016.</p> <p>Along with this letter, we also submitted an electronic consultation form via the Council's website and this letter should be read in conjunction with the submitted form.</p> <p>Submissions</p> <p>We note that within the draft Local Plan land Conway Road, Rawtenstall has been included within the settlement boundary for Rawtenstall. The changes to the Urban Boundary to include the subject site are welcomed. It has been demonstrated that the site, when assessed against the Urban Boundary Assessment Criteria results in a positive conclusion where the development could contribute to sustainable development in the Borough. In addition, it has been shown, within our previous representations, that the development on the site would not have a severe impact on highway matters.</p> <p>In conclusion, we agree with the Council's draft Proposals to include the subject site within the urban boundary. The site is capable of being developed for residential development without causing harm to neighbouring amenity. We have requested that the Conservation Area Boundary in this location be amended to reflect that of the Cloughfold Conservation Area Appraisal which identified the following within the Townscape Appraisal Map (Appendix 1): Fig 1: Extract from Appendix 1 of the Cloughfold Conservation Area Appraisal. The subject site is edged in red (the full extent of the site is not included on the Appraisal Map).</p> <p>Having regard to the recommendations contained in the Conservation Appraisal, it is submitted that the Council should redraw the Draft Proposals Map to accurately reflect the revised Conservation Area boundary for Cloughfold.</p> <p>We reserve the right to provide further supporting statements and evidence during the preparation of the Plan process and ask that we continue to be informed as the Local Plan progresses.</p>		Please refer to letter submitted

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.057	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

Please see appendix for map

Number of comments **HS2.057** 2

Reference **HS2.058** **Land at Higher Cloughfold**

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.058	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	HS2.82,HS2.86,H S2.53,HS2.54,HS 2.58,HS2.54,HS2 .57,HS2.54, HS2.56,HS2.84 , Land at Marl Pits.	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.058	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.058	Further comment
						<p>recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.058	Further comment
						established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -		
779	Alison	Squire	-		Object	I wish to object to the above proposed sites for housing which are close to Newchurch Road on the grounds that: - i) increased traffic will be unacceptable on this main road through Rossendale - ii) erosion of greenfield sites instead of using brownfield sites in the Valley - iii) increased demand on already overloaded education and health services. - - As a resident of Waingate Village, I have objected several times to planning applications on a plot of land off Hurst Lane (Ref: 2015/0308) and am extremely displeased that this land has received planning approval despite it continuing to be beyond the Urban Boundary. There were no opportunities for local residents to raise further objections and no communications following approval having been given. I do not feel that the Council supported local residents and instead allowed developers greater importance. I am therefore worried that despite this opportunity to comment on the Local Plan, residents' opinions will not be taken into consideration. - - It appears that the Urban Boundary may be moved to Balladen Clough (a stream) to include a field behind Marl Pits road. An earlier application to build on this land was refused on the grounds of lack of road access. I hope that any future planning applications on this land will continue to be refused and the original Urban Boundary will remain in place. Any development on this land would further increase traffic onto Newchurch Road. - - Having witnessed the gridlock in Bank Street and Angouleme Way on Saturday I do wonder where the increased traffic from all the proposed new housing will go. I appreciate that it is National Government Policy to increase housing and that sites have to be found in the Valley but hope that more brownfield sites can be found, consideration of health and education demands and transport/traffic difficulties will be addressed before adopting the new Local Plan.		
Number of comments						HS2.058	2	
Reference						HS2.060	Haslam Farm, north of Duckworth Lane	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
492	David	Nuttall	Residents and friends of Townsend Fold	RCGL(GB)5 and RCGL(GB)4	Object	<p>1. SHLAA16248 AND SHLAA16249 FORMERLY RCGL(GB)5 –ADDRESS HASLAM FARM, RAWTENSTALL</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>This formal response was first prepared June 2013 in response to the green belt review being undertaken at that time and was submitted to Rossendale Borough Council August 2013. Although the current review has changed some of the original proposals for the green belt situated at either side of Duckworth Lane and goes some way to recognise some of the points raised in the original submission there remains strong support in the area to leave the Green Belt boundaries unchanged. Many of the comments made in the 2013 submission responded to the documents issued at the time however they remain valid where they support the continuation of the Green Belt. The new proposals which leave the land to the South of Duckworth lane inside the Green Belt represent a significant improvement and are supported by the local residents. In addition the evidence collected by Forward Planning supports the continuation of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The new proposals for land to the North of Duckworth lane also represent a substantial improvement over the former assessment and recognise the value of the area and its importance as a “stepping stone” site.</p> <p>During the 2013 consultations proposal emerged which accepted the boundary for continuation of the Green Belt as Duckworth lane as this provided a natural conduit to the Rossendale green areas with green field on both sides and a country lane taking visitors into picturesque countryside providing open views of the Rossendale valley. The residents of Townsend Fold remain of the opinion set down in the report submitted August 2013 that the area is a natural green oasis and enhances the approach into Rossendale seen by road and rail (a view openly supported by East Lancashire Light Railway Co Ltd at the time who have stated:</p> <p>”We would object most strongly to any development in that area on the basis that it will degrade considerably the visual aspect of what is currently an attractive semi-rural location” (The full comments are reproduced as Appendix “A”).</p> <p>The area is one of natural beauty and of continuing importance to the development of tourism in Rossendale. Any change of use would damage this key approach into Rossendale and would be an act of environmental vandalism impossible to reverse. It is accepted that there is pressure on local councils to meet housing development targets; however, there are many sites which would provide these opportunities without damaging further Rossendale’s landscape and natural beauty.</p> <p>The following is a restatement of the report submitted and although four years have passed the comments in support of retaining the green belt remains as valid today as they did when the report was originally compiled.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>The residents sincerely hope RBC will appreciate the comments made in the original report which was supported by a petition which eventually exceeded 1000 individuals.</p> <p>Whilst appreciating forward planning have already amended the original proposals it is understood that the natural beauty of the area is attractive to potential developers and this update based on the original review is being submitted to ensure the opinions of the local residents are not overlooked. We also take note of the Rossendale Green Belt Review 2016 in which Land parcel 25 which includes the land to the South of Duckworth lane was assessed. The conclusion was that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose 1 – To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. Rating Strong • Purpose – 2 To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another Rating Strong • Purpose 3 – To assist in the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment Rating Strong <p>The conclusions reach in the Green Belt Review substantially support the opinion of the residents that the Green Belt should be retained and we support the recommendation of the various reports which supports this position.</p> <p>THE FOLLOWING SETS DOWN THE COMMENT MADE IN THE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION AUGUST 2013. IN SUPPORT OF RETAINING THE GREEN BELT AND ALTHOUGH PARTIALLY OVERTAKEN BY EVENTS REPRESENT THE STRONG SUPPORT FOR RETENTION OF THE GREEN BELT GREEN BELT BOUNDARY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</p> <p>Rossendale forward planning made a series of observations as part of their green belt assessment criteria. This took the form of a series of questions against which were set the forward planning departments' response. The responses are considered as incomplete and in some instances do not reflect accurately the position "on the ground".</p> <p>The following Table sets down the questions included in the forward planning appraisal document and a series of responses which reflects the opinion of residents and visitors to the area: (please see table in original submission)</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENT</p> <p>The "Appraisal".</p> <p>"Site has no special ecological status or wider constraints. It reads as part of the urban area and has no special value as part of the Green Belt. While it is Greenfield land it would contribute to the housing supply in Rawtenstall which is a Core Strategy priority"</p> <p>The "Response"</p> <p>The area is rich in ecological habitat, with buttercup meadows and bluebell woodland. It is home to numerous wildlife including butterflies, insects, bats,</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>badgers deer and owls.</p> <p>It is part of the green belt not the urban area and provides a hugely important and historical green setting to the village of Townsend Fold, the heritage railway and the Irwell Sculpture Trail.</p> <p>Rosendale is not without land suitable for development it has many Brown field sites, and in addition, there are substantial areas of land graded as countryside. It is our understanding that development should first use existing Brown Sites, then Countryside and finally (supposedly as a very last resort when other sources are exhausted and there is an overwhelming need) consideration may be given to use of the green belt.</p> <p>It is clear that Rosendale has not reached saturation levels where it is necessary to reclassify green belt land.</p> <p>RCGL (GB) 4 –BEHIND K STEELS</p> <p>The Forward planning proposal is to take some land from the Green Belt and bring it into the Urban Boundary, to enable it to be developed in the future. It is claimed that the present boundary is very difficult to read on the ground and that the proposal would represent a more logical and defensible boundary.</p> <p>The Green Belt Boundary assessment Criteria raises the same questions already set out in RCGL (GB) 5 and the responses to the questions in RGL (GB) 5 can therefore be considered as equally applicable to RCGL (GB) 4.</p> <p>The area included in RCGL (GB) 4 is divided from the proposed changes set down in RCGL (GB) 5 by the East Lancashire Rail line. Apart from this it is a contiguous part of the Green area accessed via Duckworth Lane. The ELR Timetable front cover for 2013 illustrates the continuous nature of the Green area as the photograph shows both sides of the area under threat.</p> <p>The Summary of the Green Belt Assessment statement prepared by Forward Planning makes the claim that the present boundary is very difficult to read on the ground and is confusing. This statement is refuted as access to the area via the level crossing at the bottom of Duckworth lane is clearly visible with footpaths well marked providing open access to the wooded area, grassland and the Irwell River pathway. There has not been any evidence of the delineation of the boundary creating any confusion other than the statement made by the Forward Planning department.</p> <p>Additional Comment- Response to Potential Developers Proposals General Statement</p> <p>Our detailed response and opposition to the Forward Planning proposals to release land set down on RCGL (GB) 5 and RCGL (GB) 4 apply equally to any proposals made by developers to build on these Green Belt areas.</p> <p>Area proposed by forward planning to excluded from Green Belt under RCGL (GB) 5</p> <p>It is understood that the land area set down in RCGL (GB) 5 represents approximately 1.6 ha (3.95 acres) and is considered by Forward Planning as</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>potentially suitable for development of up to 72 dwellings.</p> <p>Additional Area proposed by Turley Associates to be excluded from the Green Belt</p> <p>Turley Associates, acting on behalf of Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Limited made a submission to Forward Planning by Email on the 28th November 2012. In this submission reference is made to additional land to the south of the proposed Green Belt release that they state they believe should also be taken out of the Green Belt. The additional area of 1.9 ha (4.7 acres) is shown on the development plan submitted by Turley Associates under their reference PEEM2067 and is part of their development framework document submitted on the 28th November 2012.</p> <p>Turley Associates claim that the combined site represents a “logical” rounding off of this part of the urban area of Rawtenstall.</p> <p>The claim made by Turley Associates is difficult to reconcile (for all the detailed reasons set out in this response document) and is considered totally inappropriate by local residents.</p> <p>The proposed extension of Green Belt release takes a large piece of additional land which parallels the ELR and extends the exiting urban boundary.</p> <p>The Green Belt Boundary Assessment Criteria item number 3 (c) prepared by Forward Planning states that the Forward Planning proposal would “reduce distance within urban area but not between urban area”.</p> <p>The proposals made in the Turley associates submission is a clear breach of Forward Planning proposals and, if adopted, would impact the existing urban boundary by reducing the distance between the urban areas.</p> <p>The removal of any of the land situated In the Haslam Farm or K Steel area from the Green Belt is considered to be unnecessary to support the Core strategy and the request by Turley Associates that an extra piece of land is included for removal from the Green Belt is considered unacceptable for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simply because an area has been chosen for review and forms part of a Core strategy proposal does not mean that there should be an automatic presumption that housing development will go ahead or the land will be removed from the Green Belt. The consultation process, if it is to have any validity, must take into account opposing points of view and in particular those of the people of Rossendale and especially those of local residents most affected by any changes. 2. The site is an area of green land which would no doubt be of prime interest to any developer as it is an area of natural beauty and therefore a particularly attractive proposition to a housing developer. However, this does not make the area an appropriate location to achieve an early boost to housing supply as by doing so it removes permanently an area of Green Belt which is of particular importance to the locality and prevents the very urban sprawl for which the Green belts were first established. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>3. The site is approximately one mile from Rawtenstall town centre and local schools are within reach however their ability to cope with a substantial influx of pupils is questionable. The proposal by Turley Associates to build 155 dwellings in the enlarged area will severely test the road infrastructure especially at peak times. In addition, weather conditions during the winter months necessitate parking of cars (by local Residents) on Bury Road. (See photo gallery). There is a shortage of suitable space for this purpose and an increase in population to the area would simply exacerbate the problem. For these reasons the area is not as well related as is being suggested.</p> <p>4. It is claimed the enlarged site shares many of the characteristics of RCGL (GB) 5. It may do so in that it is part of a contiguous area of Green Belt land. This land is the first (or last) defence of the urban boundary which prevents the encroachment of urban sprawl into the remaining Green areas bringing with it the environmental damage referred to in this document.</p> <p>5. Turley Associates make the point that the SHLAA concluded that site RCGL (GB) 5 is “within a wider area of good desirability and within an immediate area of excellent desirability”.</p> <p>This statement absolutely supports the view of the community that the area is of particular importance in maintaining the integrity of Rossendale urban boundary and ensuring it remains of benefit to current and future visitors and residents of Rossendale.</p> <p>It seems clear from points made by Turley Associates that the economic value of the site is considered as the primary reasons for changing its status. It is hoped that Forward Planning and the Local Council will accept that an important decision relating to the maintenance of the Green Belt will not be made primarily on the basis of the economic argument presented by potential developers.</p> <p>6. It is claimed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is not in a sensitive landscape – this statement is contested on the grounds that the area is visited regularly by many groups who enjoy the proximity and access to the local natural landscape. • It is clear that a change of status from Green Belt to Urban Development land would lead to development similar to that proposed by Turley Associates which would have a major impact on the landscape and the visual character of the area. • The local area contains many habitats including woodland, grassland and has its own ecological system with an abundance of bird life. The adjacent woodlands provide sanctuary to a range of animals including small deer which would be adversely affected by development. • The development would place a severe strain on local road infrastructure. <p>7. The existing landscape represents an area of natural beauty and does not need enhancement by development and landscaping and is best left unchanged as a barrier against urban encroachment on limited green space.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>8. Turley Associates have also stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site does not perform a strategic Green Belt function: this point is strongly disputed for the reasons stated in this document. • They claim the development would not result in encroachment into the wider countryside- it is clear that the development will remove Green Belt land from the countryside so is clearly an encroachment into the wider countryside. • They claim it would not result in urban sprawl or lead to the merger of separate settlements- The proposed development is an example of urban sprawl and with the addition of the area shown in Turley associates plan reference PEEM2067 reduces the gap between settlements. • They claim that the proposals would create a logical defensible long term green Belt boundary- The existing boundary has been perfectly defensible since its inception and there is no logical argument to suggest this would not be the case in the future. To claim that a development (as proposed) and change of use as is being proposed by forward planning would improve the defensibility of the boundary is not credible. <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Development framework document pack submitted by Turley Associates is an attempt to provide justification for a substantial housing development on land designated as Green Belt. The arguments put forward are fundamentally for the benefit of the developer and do not take into account current use and the views of visitors and residents to the area or the visual impact upon a major gateway into Rossendale.</p> <p>Petition (Appendix "B")</p> <p>Included in support of our response to the proposals is a copy of a petition signed by more than 800 individuals who are strongly opposed to any changes to the green belt at Townsend Fold. (Full details will be made available to Rossendale Borough Council)</p> <p>General Summary</p> <p>This document has been prepared for submission to Rossendale Forward Planning department in response to the proposed change to the Green Belt at the Haslam Farm and K-Steel area of Townsend Fold. It sets down the objections to the proposals based upon a survey of the views of the residents and visitors to the area.</p> <p>The Residents and Friends of Townsend Fold Association are submitting these objections on behalf of the local community and all those parties who have shown support to the objectives of the association to protect Townsend Fold Green spaces.</p> <p>Appendix "A"</p> <p>Received by: greenbelt@townsend-fold.org.uk email dated 22nd May 2013</p> <p>Subject: Objection to revision to Green Belt</p> <p>Sirs</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

Would you please accept this email as the East Lancashire Railway's formal position regarding Rossendale Borough Council's proposals to revise the green belt boundaries in the Townsend Fold area.

We would object most strongly to any development in that area on the basis that it will degrade considerably the visual aspect of what is currently an attractive semi-rural location and one that provides a pleasant outlook for our visitors and customers. Indeed, the location provides an important backdrop for our prestigious evening dining train service which pauses in the vicinity to allow the service of the main meal during the journey to Rawtenstall.

The railway has previously suffered a degradation of the visual aspect in the area when the properties adjacent to the line in Holmeswood Park were built a few years ago and we would object most vigorously to any similar proposals that would result in a further worsening of the overall product offering for the ELR. Considering that the local authority is a key stakeholder in the railway and are pressing to improve the visitor experience in regard to the area and Rawtenstall in particular we would dare to suggest that the two issues are very much in conflict.

We wish you every success with the petition and are more than happy to help further with these objections, wherever we can be of assistance.

Kind regards

Andy Morris

General Manager

East Lancashire Light Railway Co Ltd

Mobile no.

Office tel. 0161 763 4340

The North West's Premier

Heritage Railway

Appendix "B"

PETITION

PROTECT ROSSENDALE GREEN BELT

I am signing this in support of the campaign to prevent changes to Townsend Fold green belt.

I confirm I do not think the changes proposed by Rossendale forward planning are acceptable and I do not believe there should be any change to the present boundaries.

Signature: _____

Please print: _____

Address: (including post code) _____

Photo Gallery

(i)  Bury Road January 2013 –Residents Parking!

(ii)  ELR at Duckworth Bottom

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						(iii) Approaching Duckworth Bottom Looking North (iv) Duckworth Lane looking towards The Chapel, Whitchaff, and Haslam Farm (v) View from the top of Duckworth Lane looking downwards across field South of Haslam farm (vi) The Irwell, ELR and Land behind K Steels and looking towards Duckworth Bottom (vii) Looking South from Duckworth Lane (viii) Bottom of Duckworth Lane (ELR Dining Train Stop!) (ix) ELR Train passing through Duckworth Bottom (x) Train approaching Townsend Fold Crossing		
588	Diana	Peacock			Object	<p>I am writing to complain about the proposed building of new houses and therefore removing our part of our dwindling Green Belt. The two sites in question that I am concerned about are at Haslam Farm, Townsend Fold and the proposals by Peel Holdings to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth Lane.</p> <p>My husband and I moved to this area as it was a beautiful and a relatively quiet and safe area to live, my husband having severe health problems made this essential to his well being.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt sites, when there are so many vacant Brown Field sites seems both unnecessary and short sighted. Green Belt areas promote a sense of well being for the inhabitants and should be respected by local councils not seen as a way to make money.</p>		
599	Kirsten	Broderick			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to you proposals to remove our green belt at Townsend fold under your reference Haslam Farm HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our green belt south of Duckworth Lane as part of the new plan because there are plenty of vacant brown field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our green belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
601	Greg	Farrow			Object	<p>I am writing with regards to the above mentioned planning proposal to remove green belt status around Haslam Farm and build new "executive" housing.</p> <p>I am writing because I wish to object, strongly, to these plans. I consider them to be entirely inappropriate and unacceptable.</p> <p>There are several reasons why I do not agree with these plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green belt land is a legacy and CANNOT be built upon for short term gain and especially not for purposes which do not directly benefit existing and future residents of the borough. Building "Executive" homes for wealthy Manchester commuters does not benefit the existing residents. • The East Lancashire Railway is the most important and positive asset this borough has. To diminish it by permanently spoiling one of its fine views would be short sighted and callous. Not everything comes down to money and the green fields around Townsend Fold are a particularly unique treat when travelling on the railway. • The M66/A56 road link between the borough and Manchester is already operating ABOVE CAPACITY. To consider building even more housing without having already solved the existing problems would be negligent. Before further housing is built in Rossendale each of the following should have been resolved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increased road capacity by means of a full third lane on the existing M66/A56 between Rawtenstall and Bury. o Improved bus capacity between Rawtenstall and Manchester, Rawtenstall and Burnley. o Massive improvements to traffic flow in Rawtenstall town centre during rush hour, which is critically over capacity. o A rail or Metrolink link to Manchester to help take commuter traffic off the roads. <p>Whilst I am sure this project would appeal to those members of the council who are managing increasingly pressured budgets as it may produce a little extra revenue, I would urge you to refrain from short-termist solutions and consider the wider picture. This project would in no way solve the budget issues but would PERMANENTLY destroy a beautiful part of our borough - a terrible legacy to leave.</p> <p>I am dismayed to think that you are considering allowing an enormous company, such as Peel Holdings, to stamp all over our lovely Green belt fields and destroy our heritage and our legacy. I cannot stress enough how utterly unacceptable this proposal is and that I hope you are able to see your way to making the correct and ONLY responsible decision and REJECTING THIS APPLICATION WITHOUT HESITATION.</p> <p>I trust you will make the correct decision.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
602	Caroline	Farrow			Object	<p>I wish to strongly object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth Lane as part of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>I consider them to be entirely inappropriate, unreasonable and unacceptable for our borough.</p> <p>There are several reasons these plans should not be permitted to go any further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and serves a local beauty spot for future generations and the character would be irreversibly eroded. • Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity • The M66/A56 road link between the borough and Manchester is already operating above capacity and this existing problem must be addressed before any consideration of any further new development in the borough. • The East Lancashire Railway is a tremendous asset to the borough, not only in supporting local businesses but it brings with it a proud community spirit, destroying a Green Belt area would only benefit Peel Holdings and would permanently destroy the unique setting when travelling on the railway. This in turn would no doubt severely damage Rossendale's tourist industry and have a negative impact on our wonderful community. <p>The proposed development would destroy a beautiful part of our borough forever - a tragic legacy to leave.</p> <p>I trust you will make the correct decision and reject this application immediately as it is completely unreasonable.</p>		
603	Gabriella	Denn			Object	<p>I am writing to object to your proposals to remove the above field at Haslam Farm, Townsendfold from our Green Belt and re-designate the land for a housing estate</p> <p>because there are plenty of brownfield and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion.</p> <p>The loss of our green belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale Tourist industry which brings jobs to the valley.</p> <p>Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
609	Helen	Cordingley			Object	<p>I wish to object to your proposals to remove our green belt at Townsend Fold under you reference Haslam Farm HS2.60, and the Peel Holding proposals to remove our green belt south of Duckworth Lane as part of the new Local Plan due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -There are plenty of vacant brown fields and previous developed site which should be used instead of sacrificing our green belt as well as there being many empty dwelling and building suitable for conversion -Our green belt prevent urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations -Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity with no plan to increase facilities -Ecosystems will be affected -Loss of our green belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway (in which I live behind) and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the valley -Increase the risk of flooding which is already an issue in Rossendale <p>Regards</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
730	Chris and Rita	Purnell			Object	<p>Email received 29.09.2017</p> <p>I wish to object to Peel Holdings proposal to add the removal of green belt status and adding this land to the urban boundary to your Rawtenstall local plan 2 for South of Duckworth Lane for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A large area of the land is densely wooded supporting wildlife and does include a number of TPOs. 2. Extensive infrastructure will be required as a large proportion of the area is very steep and wet and suffers from running water. 3. There are no sewers near the land at the lower level therefore extensive drainage will be required and is very much lower than the Haslam Farm site the access to the lower level would be a single track road only using part of Duckworth Lane, if Duckwoth lane is used as access gaining access onto bury road is very dangerous 4 The site backs onto a number of residential properties. 5 The lower part of the site site borders the EL Railway which is used as a stopping area for the dining carriages because of the natural beauty of the green area and the woodland views.. 6 There is a mine shaft abandoned in the early 1800's within close vicinity of the south boundary which could tunnel under the area . <p>finally development of this area would increase traffic on Bury road.</p> <p>Letter Received 09/10/2017: Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because Reasons below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
742	Janis	Wilson			Object	<p>I am sending this email to strongly object to the current proposals for development of green belt fields around Duckworth Lane, and Haslam Farm area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This area has been a local beauty spot and should be preserved for future generations. 2. There is not enough infrastructure to support this amount of housing, schools, Medical care, available parking in bad weather. 3. This area floods dramatically in heavy rain. Bury Rd is a death trap, and is known locally as Coroners ally. Speeding traffic is terrible. I live on Horncliffe close and it is literally pot luck if you are able to turn right onto bury road as you cannot see what is coming and the speed they are travelling at due to the amount of inconsiderate parking, and quantity of vehicles parked on bury road. 4. In the winter months Bury road is worse as traffic from Horncliffe Cherry crescent and surrounding areas park on bury rd as they are unable to get down very steep roads which do not get gritted anymore, grit bins are always empty and are not large enough for us to grit ourselves. Should further homes be built down hill off bury rd they will have the exact same problem and will have no chance of getting up a steep hill onto bury rd. <p>Members of the planning group should travel up horncliffe close about 6pm and see how difficult and dangerous it is trying to turn left and right onto bury rd. Likewise turning left and right out of duckworth lane.</p> <p>Edenfield village is, I would suggest at crisis point with the amount of traffic travelling through the village, how the busses manage to get through is amazing. At the end of clayton avenue is a roofer who parks three large commercial vans outside his house parking right at the corner, this is so very dangerous and traffic coming down meets traffic coming up is a nightmare as someone has to reverse and the only car that can has to reverse onto bury rd, an illegal manoeuvre. Someone needs to look into this irrespective of new dwellings being built.</p>		
750	Stephen and Angela	Nicholls			Object	<p>Rossendale is already over crowded, roads, doctors, schools etc are full and no plans to improve these or build new ones will make for a poor quality of living for existing residents</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
783	Lucinda	Dudarenko	-	Haslam Farm SHLAA 16248	Object	Regarding Green Belt Land at Haslam Farm Ref: H23 Townsend Fold - - Would you kindly consider my objections to the above land being removed from its present 'Green Belt' status. Whilst I am aware that you are obliged by a Government directive to build houses, I am also aware that there are lots of Brownfield sites available around the valley and I respectfully say these should be considered first before robbing people and the future generations of what little green space we have. This area in particular is, in my opinion, too small to be used for any other purpose than what it is used for namely 'it is grazing animals and a beautiful wildflower meadow. It has a plethora of wildlife (Hares, Bats, Rabbits, Foxes, Badgers and many different species of bird) All this would be lost if you closed this gateway into Rawtentall. - - Another major consideration would be logistics – namely entry and exit onto the site. The site on one side is too steep and the other side too narrow (and both ways Dangerous!!!) Parking on Bury Road especially in Winter is nigh on impossible, the first sign of frost and cars from the neighbouring hilly roads have to find space somewhere on Bury Road, if – as is proposed – 45 properties are build most of which would own one vehicle (maybe two) it would cause even more congestion on a massive scale. - - Schools places would also present a problem; it is a genuine concern for parents to find a place for existing children without adding to the situation with more youngsters to find places for. - - Visitors coming into Rawtenstall on the train (hopefully to spend money here) would I'm sure rather see the entrance to a lovely market town than a 'housing estate'. We have already lost out cottage hospital and what was replaced by the Asda monstrosity. If this goes on I fear for our cricket pitches. - - But seriously this small 'Green Belt' site at Haslam farm is like the lungs of the valley and should be left alone for everyone to enjoy.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
784	Doris	Paul	-	Haslam Farm SHLAA 16248	Object	The land at site ref H23 Haslam farm is currently legally designated as 'Green Belt' and I feel very strongly that it should remain so. It is currently grazed by sheep and provides a good harvest of meadow hay at least twice a year. I is a haven for native wildlife and It provides a beautiful backdrop to the East Lancashire Railway and the Irwell Sculptor trail, it is, without doubt, a beautiful gateway into the valley. - - Whilst I appreciate the need for the expansion of housing stocks in the next decade it would be tragic to trade in the 'Green Belt' of our green and pleasant land. Lancashire (and Rawtenstall) as a backbone of the Industrial Revolution still has a more than adequate number of Ex Industrial/Brown field site to more than supply the required number of properties as laid down by central government directives before we sacrifice the 'Green Belt' sites which are the lungs of our communities. - - The site itself is very steep and surrounded by protected trees (over 100 years old!). I personally feel access will be an issue especially in the Winter months when Bury Road is already clogged with vehicles who cannot ascend the hills of the surround housing developments, I just fail to see how Townsend fold could cope with this extra traffic. - - There are certainly currently insufficient school places within the catchment area and the lack of local employment opportunies will only exacerbate the already congested motorway links into Manchester and the surrounding cities. -		
997	Charles	Smethurst	-	Haslem Farm Site Townsend Fold	Object	It would be wrong to sacrifice valuable Green Belt land for the provision of Rossendale's Housing needs when there is already so much Brown Belt land available to be built on. There are also large numbers of unoccupied properties which should be used before any Green Belt land is built on! - - I understand that Ilex Mill is currently 20% unoccupied....would it not make sense to first use such vacant accommodation, - - The site in question is also not sufficiently supported with the required local infrastructure to make it viable.		I feel aggrieved that having invested large amounts of time and expense in this very subject c 4 years ago it is now being run out again!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1524	Robert	Bulman	East Lancashire Light Railway Co Ltd		Object	<p>Presently, the land between the railway-line and Bury Road around Duckworth Lane is pleasant green sloping farmland. It is immediately adjacent to the ELR railway track. The existing view is sufficiently attractive such that our 'Dining with Distinction' evening diner-trains stop and wait there for some time, while diners enjoy their meal. The ELR diner-trains attract visitors from all over the region, being constantly rated top on 'TripAdvisor' of over 5,300 restaurants in Greater Manchester. Presently, this view over the grassy farmland area is the 'first impression' of Rossendale for many new visitors. It's also the last view they have of rural Rossendale before entering the built-up retail-park areas approaching Rawtenstall Station. If this parcel of green-belt at the southern tip of Rossendale were to become building-land development, then the planned rural-stop for our prestige diner-train would have to be made around the still-green scenic areas north of Ramsbottom, in Bury. - - The East Lancashire Railway is a huge tourist attraction for Rossendale, having almost 200,000 visitors annually. We strive to bring in visitors to Rossendale from the urban areas of Rochdale and Bury, hoping that many will return independently of the railway to enjoy the rugged scenery of the Valley. Heritage-tourism is a significant part Rossendale's economy and the ELR is core to that. - - The National Planning Policy Framework argues that "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by, keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of the Green belt are their openness - and their permanence". Giving-up this parcel of green-belt, adjacent to one of the region's major tourist attractions, would be a clear statement by Rossendale BC as to their (lack of) priority for sustainable tourism.</p>		
1566	Anne	Hulme			Object	<p>I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm. H52.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth Lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion . - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>All the above are valid reasons for saying NO to this application for planning.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1567		Paul			Object	<p>I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm. H52.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth Lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion . - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>I have 2 small children both under 7 years old. We love to walk down the Irwell river and we moved here because of its natural beauty and greenspaces. Please don't build on our beautiful green spaces.</p>		
1568	Emma	Stillings			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new Local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations -Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity -There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion -Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley <p>121 times I had to call my doctor to get my last appointment not enough school places in the area with Ballenden or Edenfield being at full capacity each year without extra homes</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1569	David	Hulme			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new Local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations -Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity -There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion -Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley <p>All the above are valid reasons for saying NO to this application for planning</p>		
1570	Andrew	Paterson			Object	<p>I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new Local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations -Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity -There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion -Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1571	Kim	Skillings			Object	<p>I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new Local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations -Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity -There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion -Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>The roads are at full capacity, the schools are and I think more homes would cause more problems.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1572	Anne	Walmsley			Object	<p>I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new Local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations -Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity -There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion -Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>I personally think all of the above, no more housing is needed until further facilities are put in place elsewhere.</p>		
1619	Michael	Onley	Planning Sense NW		Object	<p>(...)Clients fear cherry-picking of the most desirable sites. This is reflected in the abandonment of density target of 50+ dwellings per hectare appropriate to urban renewal [Rossendale Core Strategy policy 2, RBC 2011] in favour of a suburban 30+ figure [Rossendale Draft Local Plan policy HS5, RBC 2017]. Clients oppose planning blight upon precious greenfield sites such as achingly lovely meadows east of Johnny Barn (variously identified as HS2.53 and duplicated as HS2.54), and cinematic quality, rail-side pasture at Haslam Farm (HS2.60). Access and road safety concerns have been raised in respect of allocation HS2.86 (St Peter's School) - photos attached.</p> <p>(...)Draft policy HS2 and specifically the proposed allocations of sites HS2.54/54 (east of Johnny Barn, north of Newchurch Road) HS2.86 (St Peter's School) and HS2.60 (Haslam Farm) in respect of unnecessary greenfield allocations(...)</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1641	Bob	Crawford			Object	<p>I write to object to the development of the above parcels of land within Townsendfold and Edenfield on the basis of the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At a high level the core strategy plan made reference in the 2010 consultation of the importance of the development of a rail commuter link to Manchester and the current core strategic objective number 1, SO1-makes reference to public transport improvements; • Both of these aspects therefore have to be considered vital to the sustainable development of the area; • By developing the land parcel within Townsendfold/Edenfield we immediately reduce at best or even potentially remove any future option for the communication corridor alongside the M66 to be able to accept a tramline or trainline enhance commuter system; • This strategic level error also does not support other strategic objectives such as S07-enhancement/protection of natural environment- we destroy the natural environment by developing houses on greenbelt land-removing soil/habitat/biodiversity which is vital to the ecosystem should we build on these landbanks; • We also do not include narrative that states we will deliver "no net loss of biodiversity" in the acceptance criteria for developments-therefore the commitment to such aspects in the plan is simply not strong enough or indeed well aligned between strategy and implementation plans; and • The plan states that we have 122 hectares (2008)-which is obviously not been fully developed in the period. The document states states some 300 brownfield sites have been considered but many have significant constraints (no details are supplied),which I consider to be insufficient information; and • By way of background I work for a business that deals with Sustainable Development (SD) and if we accepted such aspects without bringing new ideas and innovation to such projects on how to overcome the constraints, we would have no business. <p>I would suggest that the Council fully address such aspects in relation to the brownfield area before any amount of area of greenfield land is considered-no matter what pressure is on to provide additional affordable homes.</p> <p>I would equally suggest that the issues indicated with the current housing stock be tackled-even if it means private business money to improve the energy/carbon/quality aspect of the stock before more affordable homes are built. It is simple too easy to build more and not face the problem, head on. There are businesses out there that would consider funding and delivering such projects should the Council seek dialogue.</p> <p>I hope the feedback is considered in a positive light. It is not meant to be any criticism of the Council in any way.</p> <p>But to deliver ecological development of human ecosystems an approach known as the "Stadt-schaft principle" is best practice and I would recommend</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						that the Council consider such within the current approach to SD. Red, amber, green type assessments for SD as exhibited within the plan do not go far enough-even at outline levels. I am afraid to say I am unable to accept your development proposals.		
1688	Duncan	Lee			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. At the current rate of urban sprawl Rawtenstall will end up as yet another suburb of Manchester!		
1689	M	Doherty			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. We need affordable homes for Rossendalians NOT 'executive' homes for city commuters.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1690	John	Wilkinson			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Bury Road is congested enough as it is.</p>		
1691	Elaine	Ozard			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>All of the above! The only reason RBC want to use Green Belt is they will make more money from it - use browbelt land, that's what it's for. It was made Green Belt for a reason - to preserve it!</p> <p>PS: I want to know why brown belt land is not being used.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1692	Linda	Mottershead			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1693	Agnes	Lovick			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1694	M	Howarth			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Our children play in the fields and countryside. Building on this land will depleat the wildlife and ruin a small and peaceful community.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1695	V	Slater			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Rossendale is overwhelmed with too much traffic already. Our road infrastructure cannot cope with any more.</p> <p>We don't need more commuters who will not spend their money within valley but elsewhere.</p>		
1696	James	Haworth			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1697	G	Bancroft			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1698	S	Novak			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1699	Jock Paul	Craven			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>We need the Green Belt protecting.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1700	Richard	Hodgson			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Green Belt is there for a reason. Please save it.</p>		
1701	Jonathan	Paul			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Green Belt land is vital for our wildlife not for building on.</p>		
1702	Gill	Carter			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1703	Lee	Carter			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1704	M	Clawson			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. <p>We do not want any more houses down here because we have quite a lot of traffic already down here.</p>		
1705	C.B.	Paul			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>The valley and particularly the area round the east Lancashire railway and its route are I think as near to the Scottish Highlands as you can get. The wildlife, the views are worth the trip alone. Please don't allow it to be built on!!!!</p>		On a visit home to the valley

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1706	Heather M.	Paul			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Please think of our children's future!!!</p>		
1707	Joan	Clapperton			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1708	Gillian	Chapman			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1709	Margaret	Gray			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1710	M	Speechley			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>The water run off causes the proposed site to be water logged. The River is suffering erosion issues and the development would add to this issue.</p>		
1711	David	Speechley			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1712	Chris	Speechley			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion.		
1713	Charlotte	Collins			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley.		
1714	Moira	Speechley			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. I have concern about the water that runs off the hills - currently, the fields will absorb some of this. Once built upon, the water could rapidly go to the river and cause excess flow and damage to the banks etc.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1715	Jane	Balfour			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1716	Tom	Pound			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Strongly agree with all of the above and there is no need for executive houses!</p>		
1717	Lynne	Chatterton			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1718	Debra	Birtwistle			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Green field and Green Belt. Both land North and South need preserving for future generations, protect urbanisation ecological and numerous reasons for objections to build on both of these plots.</p>		
1719	Sandra	Hodgson			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Keep the valley greenbelt. Brownfield sites first</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1720	Andrew	Birtwistle			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Strongly object to planning on both North and South Greenfield / Belt for all the above and many more points of objections - there is enough Brownfield / Industrial sites.</p>		
1721	Patricia	Mc'Aleese			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because it will destroy our countryside and green belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1722	Joan	Pound			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>I agree with all of the above. No need for executive housing - affordable housing on Brown Field sites would be much more appropriate!</p>		
1723	M S	Gibson			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		
1724	Andrea	Bretherton			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1725	R.T and B.	Waddington			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>How much more will the despoiling of our Green Belt be allowed? Already close to our home on Clayton Avenue where we have lived 65 years we have lost fields replaced by Horncliffe Close and down Holme Lane Holme Close. Our family have enjoyed wildlife walking down Duckworth Lane to the rail crossing past Kay Steels to the signal box up Home Lane. All would be affected if proposals are accepted. Councillors please vote against, go for a brown field site instead.</p>		
1726	Lyndsay	Nicholas			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. - We will lose the status of a valley. - Already too much traffic in the area. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1727	Sean	Collins			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because Reasons below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>Bury Road already has a traffic issue and speeding cars and poor parking. These extra houses and increased traffic will add to this. Many people use the Duckworth Lane as an entrance for a nice stroll, this is handy for locals to work dogs. This is a nice county walk and enhances well-being and helps to destress. This area is known for the beautiful views that can be seen from Bury Rd - Duckworth Lane. All communities need green space for relaxation. Relaxation - county strolls have a good health benefit. Duckworth Lane also forms part of regular and event running evens.</p> <p>The train spotters also use the access area for quiet trainspotting on the East Lancs Railway.</p> <p>The East Lancs Railway is a toursit attraction, if you read Trip Advisor many of the comments refer to the beautiful views and county feel to the trip. This will also be lost.</p> <p>Why destroy something of natural beauty that gives joy to not just locals but tourists when there are so many disused - falling down buildings which could be used for example Stand Football Club. This building is falling down and dabgerous and an eye sore. Also the house "Horncliffe" again abandoned except for squatters.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1728	John	Larkin			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley.		
1729	Roger	Wood			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because Reasons below: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. It will upset and destroy the character fo the village.		
1730	Glenys	Wood			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because Reasons below: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1731	Pam	Thomas			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because Reasons below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>I have seen what Peel Holdings has done in other areas where it operates - especially the West Midlands. I feel they are "bad news" if they are allowed to come into this lovely area which we have made our home.</p>		
1732	Rebecca	Onley			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because Reasons below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1733	Audrey	Nicholas			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because Reasons below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>How green was our valley</p>		
1734	Linda	Barker			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because Reasons below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>In view of the fact that the borough Council is elected to act on behalf of the people who live within the borough, will you please weigh the number(s) of objections to this proposed development, (against) the number(s) of people who live in the immediate vicinity of the area in question.</p>		
1735	Lesley	Porter			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1737	Darren	Briggs			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley.		
1738	D	Kenwick			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations.		
1739	Elizabeth	Briggs			Object	Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because: - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools. doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. Our valley is a beautiful place, we don't want to spoil it with more housing, eating into the lovely green fields.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1740	Christine	Gill			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>1.1 This representation is prepared by Turley on behalf of our client Peel Holdings (Land & Property) Limited (hereafter “Peel” or “our client”). It provides comments to Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) in respect of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan1 (July 2017) (‘DLP’) which is currently the subject of public consultation.</p> <p>1.2 This document relates exclusively to the promotion of land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall, as a development opportunity. It should be considered in conjunction with the overarching representation submitted by Turley on behalf of Peel.</p> <p>Draft Rossendale Local Plan</p> <p>1.3 As set out in the overarching representation submitted, Peel has continuously and historically engaged with the plan-making process for Rossendale. This has included the submission of detailed representations to the previous Core Strategy and the draft Lives and Landscapes DPD (since withdrawn), including Development Frameworks that set out the development potential at four sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden (allocated in part) • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall (allocated in part) • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield (allocated) • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield (not allocated) <p>1.4 Peel welcomes the progress which has been made on the emerging Local Plan and supports, in principle, the proposals for development within it. In particular, Peel strongly supports the allocation of land at Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden, Haslam Farm in Rawtenstall, and Blackburn Road in Edenfield, which include some or all of three of the sites previously put forward (as above).</p> <p>1.5 It is noted, however, that additional work is required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is capable of meeting the full development needs of the Borough. Additional land will need to be allocated for residential development, above that which has been identified in the DLP.</p> <p>1.6 This opportunity is being taken to make representations in relation to the sites previously identified by Peel as capable of accommodating development in the Borough that have not been put forward in the DLP for allocation and/or Green Belt release. Peel is preparing updated Development Frameworks which will promote and justify its landholdings within Rossendale. Matters addressed below and in the overarching representation which directly affect its landholdings will be discussed in detail in each Development Framework.</p> <p>Additional Site Allocations</p> <p>1.7 In the context of the need for the Rossendale DLP to allocate additional land for development, Peel wish to reiterate the development opportunities at each of the four sites previously identified, as well as proposing a further</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>potential site at Rossendale Golf Club.</p> <p>1.8 These sites can each provide a deliverable housing development site in sustainable locations adjoining existing settlements. Initial reviews of site constraints and opportunities, landscape and highways have indicated that there are no significant barriers to development.</p> <p>Development Frameworks</p> <p>1.9 Further site appraisals are being undertaken to inform updated Development Frameworks which will be provided to the Council in due course.</p> <p>1.10 The updated Development Frameworks will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide analysis of the site constraints and opportunities. • Where relevant provide details of the findings of further technical assessment (such as highways, flood risk, ground conditions). • Consider the key principles for development of the site. • Present a proposed site layout plan illustrating development parcels, access, landscaping, etc. • Comment on the economic benefits of development. • Address comments / observations made within the recently published evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. <p>Proposed Development Opportunities</p> <p>1.11 In advance of the full Development Frameworks, the individual site representations are submitted providing initial reviews of the development opportunities.</p> <p>1.12 The Sites are represented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall (this document) • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield • Land at Rossendale Golf Course, Helmshore <p>1.13 This representation relates to land at Haslam Farm and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2: A description of the site and its location • Section 3: Details of the consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA)2 and a review of the planning policy context including the Draft Local Plan • Section 4: A Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review • Section 5: Concluding comments <p>1.14 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted here for residential development.</p> <p>2. Opportunity Site</p> <p>Site Description</p> <p>2.1 The land at Haslam Farm is located to the west of Bury Road and is</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>surrounded by built development on three sides. An existing industrial estate forms the northern boundary of the site beyond which is an area of housing. Residential properties and a public house fronting Bury Road run along the eastern boundary with further housing to the east of Bury Road. The East Lancashire Railway line creates the western site boundary, with industrial buildings on the opposite side of the tracks.</p> <p>2.2 Duckworth Lane divides the two parts of the site. South of this lane is a detached residential property and an open field. The northern part of the site extends to 1.6 ha (3.95 acres); the southern part extends to 1.95 ha (4.82 acres).</p> <p>2.3 The site is located in a river valley – the River Irwell lies west of the site, along the western boundary of the adjacent industrial site. In the wider context, land rises steeply to the north west and south east.</p> <p>Local Facilities</p> <p>2.4 The site is c. 1.5 km south west of the town centre of Rawtenstall which provides a number of traditional town centres uses including a supermarket, national banks and building societies, dental surgery, high street chemist and a number of restaurants and bars.</p> <p>2.5 The Rawtenstall Balladen Community Primary School is the closest primary school to the site, located c. 0.75 km east of the site. All Saints Roman Catholic High School is c. 2.5 km west of the site.</p> <p>2.6 There are a total of 5 secondary schools and 19 primary schools within 5 km of the site.</p> <p>2.7 There are bus stops located on Bury Road, c. 150 m north and 150 m south of the site respectively. These stops are served by the half hourly 482 and 483 bus services, which connect the site with Bury in the south and Burnley and Bacup in the north. The nearest train station is located 12 km south of the site in Bury. The site is well placed to take advantage of the aspirational reintroduction of passenger services on the East Lancashire Railway line which passes the site.</p> <p>2.8 The site is also well connected to both the local and national highway, with the A56 west of the site (connected via the A662, 1 km north of the site) which connects to the M66 (3.3 km) leading to the M62 and M60 (19 km).</p> <p>3. Planning Policy Context</p> <p>Consideration in SHLAA</p> <p>3.1 The Draft Local Plan evidence base includes the 2017 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which aims to identify the land supply for housing within the administrative boundary of Rossendale within the next 15 years (2017 – 2032).</p> <p>3.2 The northern part of the Site (North of Duckworth Lane) is promoted in the SHLAA (Site Ref 16248). The SHLAA Site Assessment confirmed that it is a viable and achievable site for up to 21 homes in the short term (1-5 years).</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>Peel consider the site could accommodate 72 units. It is noted in the SHLAA that the site has a moderate gradient up to Bury Road and requires new vehicular access. An ecological impact assessment would be needed to assess the ecological function and biodiversity value of the site. The SHLAA yield has been reduced by 50% to allow protection of the habitat; although this has not been justified and the site could accommodate an increased number of units.</p> <p>3.3 The southern part of the Site (South of Duckworth Lane) is also promoted in the SHLAA (Site Ref 16249) as viable and achievable site for up to 37 homes in the medium to long term (6-10 years, 10+ years), once the following site constraints have been addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the new vehicular access is provided with a limited felling of trees, • the ecological impact assessment concludes that the site suitable for a residential development with appropriate mitigation, • the land contamination report does not find any contamination or if it does that it can be adequately remediated • there is no land instability in relation to the presence of a tunnel on the site. <p>Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management DPD</p> <p>3.4 The Draft LP Part 2 was withdrawn however, it is worth noting that the plan proposed to release and allocate the northern part of the site – comprising 1.6 ha of land north of Duckworth Lane, with an estimated yield of 45 dwellings – for residential development (site ref. H23). The southern part of the site was proposed to be retained within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Saved Policies</p> <p>3.5 As the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management DPD” (LP Part 2) was not taken forward by Rossendale BC, in relation to site allocations and designations, the Proposals Map and Saved Policies³ remain relevant as part of the development plan.</p> <p>3.6 The Proposals Map identifies the Site as outside the Urban Boundary (Policy DS1) and in the Green Belt (Policy DS3)</p> <p>3.7 However, Policy 1 of the Core Strategy states that the Urban Boundary defined in Local Plan Saved Policy DS1 and the Green Belt boundary defined in Saved Policy DS3, will be reviewed and where necessary amended in the Site Allocations DPD. The reviews would take into account criteria set out in Policy 1 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where small scale selective rounding off of Green Belt boundaries would promote sustainable development opportunities. • An extension/amendment to the urban boundary would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment. <p>3.8 Core Strategy Figure 15 identifies Rawtenstall as an area for Green Belt review.</p> <p>Rossendale Draft Local Plan</p> <p>3.9 As discussed in the overarching representation, the Draft Local Plan (DLP) recognises that some release of Green Belt land will be required to meet the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>housing requirements and the NPPF requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites (DLP, page 12).</p> <p>3.10 The evidence presented in the DLP indicates that 4,425 dwellings will need to be delivered over the period to 2034. Considering the under provision of 425 dwellings since the adoption of the Core Strategy and the potential land supply from non- Green Belt sources of 2,907 dwellings, there is a significant gap of approximately 1,518 dwellings.</p> <p>3.11 The DLP proposes areas for release from Green Belt, allowing for a delivery of a further 715 dwellings. It is therefore evident that the Green Belt releases proposed by the DLP need to be more than doubled - to accommodate 1,518 dwellings - if the emerging Local Plan is to be found sound.</p> <p>3.12 In relation to this Site specifically the DLP identifies the northern section of the site allocated for housing development under Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations, identified as: – Site HS2.60 ‘Haslam Farm, north of Duckworth Lane’, site size 0.71ha, 21 units, delivery in 1-5 years.</p> <p>3.13 This allocation would bring the northern part of the Site within the Urban Boundary and effectively remove it from Green Belt. Policy SD2: Urban Boundaries directs all development within such boundaries ‘except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area.’</p> <p>3.14 The southern part of the site remains within the Green Belt in the DLP. The DLP notes the NPPF requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites that can meet housing needs. It recognises that some release of Green Belt land will be needed to meet this requirement (page 12) and a Green Belt review⁴ forms part of the evidence base for the DLP.</p> <p>3.15 As above, it is clear that there is a significant gap between the housing land supply identified in the DLP and the demand, which cannot be met by non-Green Belt sites alone.</p> <p>3.16 This housing allocation HS2.60 is wholly supported by Peel, but it is considered that the designation should be expanded to include the land to the south of Duckworth Lane. This would conclude a logical extension to the development plot which will offer the opportunity for a greater number of new dwellings in this sustainable location, without compromising the wider Green Belt to the south.</p> <p>3.17 The following section considers this in greater detail.</p> <p>4. Green Belt Appraisal</p> <p>4.1 The Site is currently designated as Green Belt. A Green Belt review⁵ (GBR) forms part of the evidence base for the DLP which has informed the plan’s proposed removal of the northern part of the Site from Green Belt (Site Ref.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>HS2.60). The DLP does not propose to release the southern part of the Site from Green Belt.</p> <p>4.2 The strategic purpose of this area of Green Belt, is to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall in the north from Edenfield to the south.</p> <p>4.3 The Site sits on the western side of the Green Belt to the south west of Rawtenstall. The northern part of the Site (north of Duckworth Lane) corresponds with GBR Parcel P21. The southern part of the Site forms the northern most tip of a linear parcel P25 that meets the settlement of Edenfield to the south.</p> <p>4.4 The GBR rates the contribution of the land parcel to the five Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>4.5 It is important to note at the outset that there are very clear and accepted exceptional circumstances which justify the release of significant amounts of land from the Green Belt to meet Rossendale’s housing and employment needs. All land within the current Green Belt, fulfils at least some aspects of Green Belt purposes. As such, it will not be possible to meet the identified housing needs of Rossendale without some impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.6 It is also important to note when considering what land to release from the Green Belt to be clear that the “golden thread” which runs through plan making and decision taking is the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF confirms this at paragraph 84 when it states that “...when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development...”. In considering the release of land from Green Belt it is therefore essential to consider what releases of land will achieve sustainable development while minimising the impacts on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p> <p>4.7 The GBR identifies that this is not applicable to P21 as the parcel lies adjacent to Rawtenstall, which is not considered to be a ‘large built up area’.</p> <p>4.8 In relation to P25, the GBR considers that the parcel as a whole plays a strong role in checking the unrestricted urban sprawl from Edenfield which is part of the large built up Land south of Duckworth Lane (approximate) area of Ramsbottom/ Bury to the south. It is noted that there are a limited number of urbanising features within the parcel; these include a small number of isolated detached houses. The influence of these urbanising features is very limited with the parcel displaying a strong sense of openness. However, the A56 dual-carriageway defines the western boundary and detracts from the sense of openness in parts.</p> <p>4.9 It is considered that, in taking the northern section of the P25 parcel in isolation, this land is discrete from the wider Green Belt and could be released from Green Belt for development alongside the land to the north of Duckworth Lane without significant harm to this purpose. The site is contained</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>to the east and west by the railway and Bury Road, and a landscape boundary to the south could form a new permanent and defensible edge to the Green Belt. The remainder of P25 would continue to check the unrestricted sprawl of the built up area to the south.</p> <p>Purpose 2 - To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>4.10 The GBR considers that the role of P21 in this respect is weak. It notes that the parcel has a limited visual or physical relationship with the neighbouring settlement of Haslingden. Although it forms a gap between the settlement area of Wood Top and the Riverside Business Park; these are both of urban areas from part of Rawtenstall so not relevant.</p> <p>4.11 Peel supports this assessment and is in agreement that the development of this land would fit within the settlement of Rawtenstall and would not merge this with Haslingden when considering P25. For P25 the contribution is classified as 'strong'. The GBR notes that the north of this parcel forms part of the settlement gap between Rawtenstall and Haslingden/ Helmshore, which are within close proximity (within 1km) at this point and have good intervisibility across the parcel.</p> <p>4.12 For this reason it - along with neighbouring parcels to the west - is noted as being of 'critical importance and plays an essential role in preventing the erosion of the visual and physical gap between the two settlement areas'. It is considered in the GBR that the parcel forms the majority of the gap between the settlements of Rawtenstall and Edenfield, where new urban development could lead to the perception of reducing the physical and visual gap between the neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>4.13 Peel disagrees with this assessment. The release of the Site from the Green Belt, as part of a distinct and contained extension to Rawtenstall, would not result in significant harm to the contribution of remaining Green Belt land to this purpose. Remaining Green Belt land would sufficiently separate Rawtenstall from towns to the west and south. Separation from encroachment to the west would be maintained by the physical barrier of the East Lancs railway and the river beyond.</p> <p>Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>4.14 The GBR found that there is a sense of encroachment within the P21 parcel (north of Duckworth Lane) as a result of the visual influence of urban development which bounds the parcel on three sides and therefore it is weak in respect of this Green Belt purpose. The parcel is a single agricultural field associated with Haslam Farm; it that contains no urban development, but lacks a strong rural character or characteristics of the open countryside.</p> <p>4.15 Peel agrees with this assessment.</p> <p>4.16 In relation to P25, the contribution was considered by the GBR as 'strong', although urbanising features of the A56 at the western boundary and residential properties in the north gave a limited sense of encroachment. Despite this, the parcel was identified as clearly displaying the characteristics</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>of the open countryside; set within river valley landscape comprising pastoral farmland and is rural in character. The Green Belt designation in this parcel was considered to be making an important contribution to safeguarding of a large area of open countryside to the east from encroachment.</p> <p>4.17 As above, there is logic to the release of the Peel site at the northern part of the P25 parcel in response to the GBR. Whilst it is accepted that a large proportion of parcel P25 does make a contribution to the open countryside, the northern part is where more urbanising features have the greater impact and have the opportunity to form part of the developed area of Rawtenstall, whilst leaving the more open countryside intact.</p> <p>Purpose 4 - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p> <p>4.18 The GBR recognised that neither P21 nor P25 made any contribution to this purpose. As, in practice it would not be visible from the historic settlement area of Rawtenstall Town Centre (P21 and 25) or Ramsbottom (P25). The openness of the land within the parcels was not considered to be important to setting or historic significance.</p> <p>4.19 Peel agrees with this assessment.</p> <p>Purpose 5 - Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p> <p>4.20 The GBR notes that all parcels make an equally significant contribution to this purpose.</p> <p>4.21 The DLP proposes to optimise the re-use of brownfield sites to meet development needs and in doing so support ongoing urban regeneration.</p> <p>4.22 As noted above, and in the overarching representation, the supply of deliverable brownfield land is insufficient to deliver the number and type of new homes and employment land required. As such, the extent of urban regeneration which can be achieved is not enough to meet Rossendale's sustainable growth needs and must be accompanied by development on Green Belt land. Exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt release have been proven through the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. The release of land from the Green Belt will not therefore undermine this purpose.</p> <p>Green Belt Appraisal Conclusion</p> <p>4.23 The strategic purpose of this area of Green Belt is to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall in the north from Edenfield to the south (with Ramsbottom/ Bury urban area beyond).</p> <p>4.24 Release of the entire site from Green Belt and allocation for housing would allow for a distinct and compact extension to Rawtenstall, which would not result in significant harm to the Green Belt. Green Belt land to the south, which has a greater value in maintaining openness and land of countryside character and in separating Rawtenstall from the towns to the south, would remain. The site has no bearing on historic towns.</p> <p>4.25 It is considered the Site is suitable for development and is in a highly</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>sustainable location. Its release from Green Belt will therefore contribute to a sustainable pattern of development which makes the most of proximity to nearby highway infrastructure. There are therefore clear exceptional circumstances to justify its release from the Green Belt as shown, in part, within the DLP.</p> <p>4.26 Peel strongly supports the allocation of the northern land and recommends the Council allocate the southern land to ensure sufficient land is allocated to support the housing needs of the borough.</p> <p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>5.1 In relation to Peel's land interests in the Borough, this document concerns one of four sites which have been subject of previous Development Frameworks and representations in the context of the Local Plan development. Updates to these frameworks will be provided to RBC in due course, setting out a clear vision and proposals for the development of these sites.</p> <p>5.2 This representation provides an initial review of the development opportunity at Haslam Farm, including details of the site and its location, consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA) and planning policy; and a Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review which forms part of the evidence base to the DLP</p> <p>5.3 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted for residential development.</p> <p>5.4 The northern part of the Haslam Farm site has been allocated for housing development in the DLP. Peel strongly supports this allocation.</p> <p>5.5 The SHLAA identifies the remainder as having potential for development in 6-10 years subject to addressing site constraints. The Green Belt Assessment has included this land within a far larger plot extending to the south. The land to the south has a greater value in Green Belt terms, and considering the Peel site in isolation, release for development would not have a significant impact on the Green Belt. Peel supports the SHLAA conclusion and considers that the site should be included as an allocation in the DLP to meet the Borough's housing needs. The updated Development Framework to follow this representation will further illustrate the opportunity for a comprehensive development at Haslam Farm.</p> <p>5.6 Peel requests the designation of land at Haslam Farm in its entirety as a housing allocation.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities		Not Applicable	<p>HS2.60 – Haslam Farm, north of Duckworth Lane</p> <p>United Utilities has various water and wastewater infrastructure assets through this site including significant water infrastructure with associated easements. All UU assets will need to be afforded due regard in the masterplanning process and you should be aware that complications could arise as the infrastructure passes straight through the site, which may impact future layout proposal or reduce the developable area.</p> <p>As this site has a timescale in the plan of 1-5 years, we would require early consultation due to the engineering difficulties that could be encountered.</p>		
1804	Anne Ruth	Graham			Object	<p>Dear Rossendale Borough Council, I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt at Townsend Fold under your reference Haslam Farm, HS2.60 and Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth lane as part of the new local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations. - Our schools, doctors and roads are already at full capacity. - There are plenty of vacant Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt as well as there being many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion. - Loss of our Green Belt would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. <p>It would also affect the number of walkers who regularly visit the area and affect the wildlife. Our roads are also congested and dangerous.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
1810	Alan and Beatrice	Stocks		Haslam Farm	Object	<p>We welcome the Council's plan to maintain the Green Belt status of the land immediately to the south of Duckworth Lane, notwithstanding the attempts of Peel Holdings to have the land designated for housing. We own a very small part of this land, which contains many wild flower species including several self-seeded orchids. However, we must express our strong opposition to the proposed removal from the Green Belt of the Haslam Farm land to the north of Duckworth Lane. The following points are advanced in the hope that the Council will maintain the status quo:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Duckworth Lane itself provides an attractive and much used route between Bury Road and - across the East Lancashire Railway - the riverside footpath along the bank of the Irwell. It is popular, not only with walkers and joggers but with naturalists, photographers and steam railway enthusiasts. Any substantial housing development to the north of Duckworth Lane is bound inevitably to detract from this rural amenity provided through open countryside. 2. The sub-rural views afforded to travellers on the E.L.R. as trains approach and leave Rawtenstall at slow speed would become decidedly sub-urban should the proposed development take place. The E.L.R. is a steam heritage railway which, since its restoration and subsequent re- opening in the early 1990ies, has been a large component in the Valley's efforts to attract tourist business. 3. It is legitimate to query the alleged need for so much Green Belt development, for several reasons. Rossendale still has plenty of brownfield land and derelict properties (e.g., how much longer will it be before the derelict Horse & Jockey pub at Edenfield is demolished and the site developed?). On Bury Road itself the truly magnificent Horncliffe House is going to rack and ruin when it could be turned into a number of superb period apartments. One could go on. It is understood that Rossendale's current domestic property non-occupancy rate is considerably higher than the national average. The paucity of employment opportunities in the borough is well known to anyone glancing through the situations vacant columns of the local Rossendale Free Press. Without decent jobs to go to, what sort of people are likely to be attracted to the borough, however many houses we build? 4. So far as Bury Road is concerned, traffic volumes - especially at rush hour periods or as a result of any M66/A56 closures - are growing all the time. The proposed Haslam Farm development will merely augment the problem, wherever the vehicular access to it is located. The old Townsendfold Chapel site is rumoured to be the favoured option. Such an access would inevitably involve an uncomfortably steep descent from Bury Road. Should the 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
						<p>access be via the area of Haslam Farm itself, the problems will be nearly as bad. Further traffic will of course be generated by the proposed housing developments elsewhere, especially those in the Edenfield area. In winter all these traffic problems will be exacerbated, since residents living off Bury Road understandably tend to park on Bury Road whenever ice and snow are forecast. This is because most of the side roads feeding onto Bury Road involve ascents or descents of varying gradients.</p> <p>THE WORST CASE SCENARIO</p> <p>If the worst comes to the worst and the Haslam Farm land is removed from the Green Belt, we recommend that serious consideration be given to a number of proposals designed to mitigate a few of the appalling effects of such a decision. The new houses must be quality builds commensurate with the character of this part of the borough. Holmeswood Park immediately to the north of Haslam Farm is a good example of the type of development which should be aimed at, though use of considerably more real local stone would help to enhance the attractiveness of the houses. New green screening along the north side of Duckworth Lane is vital and should be interrupted only by a well designed pedestrian access to the lane. Preservation orders should be used to protect most, if not all, of the fine mature trees in Duckworth Lane. The provision of traffic lights where Bury Road joins Rawtenstall's Fire Station roundabout must be a sine qua non, preferably in advance of the commencement of building works. It is astonishing to many present residents that this has not been done already, especially since the recent construction of the MacDonald's access road has made a bad situation even worse. Unless lights are provided there is no doubt that sooner or later there will be a dreadful accident at this roundabout. Bury Road is not only a major road but it also carries several bus routes. Driving safely into the roundabout is becoming more and more of a nightmare, especially at peak times. From Bury Road no fewer than three lanes must be crossed in order to access the town centre. In view of the race track speeds indulged in by some drivers and motor cyclists along Bury Road (in both directions), the speed limit along the whole length from Edenfield to Rawtenstall should be reduced to 30 m.p.h and effective speed cameras should be installed. In the past there have been serious accidents on this stretch, including one immediately outside our house: the latter involved not only damage to the property but the death of a completely innocent pedestrian. Finally, close scrutiny will need to be given to all the infrastructure implications. It will not simply be a question of providing a few extra drains and street lights - the additional pressures on local schools, medical facilities</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.060	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

and social services are serious issues which cannot just be swept beneath some bureaucratic carpet.

Number of comments HS2.060

79

Reference	HS2.062	Former Hospital, Haslingden Road
-----------	---------	----------------------------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.062	Further comment
1624	Michael	Gildert	Peter Brett Associates LLP	Former Hospital	Not Applicable	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments as part of the consultation on the draft Rossendale Local Plan.</p> <p>As you are aware, we act for Hurstwood Holdings and have been promoting various sites in Rossendale as part of the consultation process on the new Local Plan. In June 2013, in response to the Green Belt and Urban Boundary Review consultation, we submitted a range of detailed development framework reports setting out how sites at Johnny Barn Close, Union Road and Hurst Lane could be sustainably delivered to provide much-needed new housing in the Borough.</p> <p>We followed up this work with a series of meetings with the Council and subsequently submitted two planning applications for the sites at Johnny Barn Close and Hurst Lane, together with a full set of supporting technical reports that demonstrate the suitability of these sites for development. The land at Hurst Lane now has planning permission for two dwellings (Ref: 2015/0308, granted on 22 June 2017). In September 2015 we also submitted further comments to the 'Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies' document. This document was then abandoned in favour of the production of a new Local Plan, which is the subject of this consultation.</p> <p>We would therefore like to offer the following comments in relation to the new draft Local Plan, insofar as it relates to the land in control of our client at Johnny Barn Close and Union Road. We note at the outset that the Council is proposing to allocate the Johnny Barn Close site for housing (Ref: HS2.53), but only a limited part of the Union Road site (Ref: HS2.62).</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>HS2.62 – Former Hospital, Haslingden Road</p> <p>The previous draft 'Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies' document included land behind the former hospital site off Union Road for residential development (ref: H27). The was proposing to remove this land from the Green Belt and bring it within the urban boundary, reflecting its proximity to the major developed site and the very limited impact this would have on the openness of the wider Green Belt in this location. The draft Local Plan anticipated the delivery of approximately 66 houses across the site, albeit in the middle part of the plan period (years 6-10). This was informed by the landscape and visual assessment undertaken by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects (February 2015), who concluded that the site was suitable for development with mitigation.</p> <p>Although it is difficult to decipher clearly from some of the published plans, it would now appear that only the extreme western part of this site is proposed for allocation as part of HS2.62, which also covers land outside our client's ownership. The remainder of the land is proposed to stay within the Green Belt. We are extremely concerned about this unexpected and unjustified</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.062	Further comment
						<p>change to the status of the Union Road site, and we must therefore object strongly to this part of the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>We previously supported the Council's decision to remove this land from the Green Belt, which corresponded with our previous representations and robust assessment that the site is performing a very limited Green Belt function. This land represents one of the most appropriate locations for the release of Green Belt, and this is clearly required to meet some of the development needs of the Borough. This accords with the Council's own published evidence base, whereby the site was assessed as part of 'Land Parcel 14' in the Green Belt Assessment (LUC, November 2016) as performing as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purpose 1 – not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purpose 2 – strong <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purpose 3 – weak <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purpose 4 – no contribution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purpose 5 – equally significant with all other parcels <p>The site was therefore found to perform a 'strong' function against only one of the five purposes of the Green Belt. The site was otherwise assessed to make either a weak or no contribution against two of the other purposes. One purpose was not applicable, and the assessment against the fifth purpose is the same for all sites and therefore this land fares no better or worse than others.</p> <p>The site was also assessed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA, May 2017) under site Ref: SHLAA16318 ('Kirkhill Rise (C), Land behind Hospital site, Rawtenstall). This concluded that the land is available, viable and suitable for residential development in the medium term. However, we also note that the site has recently been identified as a 'Wetland and Heath Stepping Stone Habitat', and that the area available for development was reduced by 50 per cent to protect part of the habitat. Firstly, we have serious concerns about the transparency of this designation – as far as we are aware there has been no published evidence to support this, or opportunity for our client to challenge the designation. Secondly, the SHLAA only reduces the site capacity by half, and does not suggest the entire site should be ruled out on this basis. With this in mind, there is no good reason why the Council should remove this previously proposed housing allocation in almost its entirety.</p> <p>Furthermore, we also question the decision not to extend the urban boundary around the wider former hospital site, which is now largely redeveloped for housing. This land is performing none of the Green Belt purposes following its redevelopment, and therefore we cannot understand why the Council has not taken this opportunity to propose a sensible amendment to the urban boundary to reflect the new extent of the built up area in this location.</p> <p>We would therefore request that the Council reconsiders its approach to this site, and reverts back to allocating the Union Road site as it did in the previous</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.062	Further comment
						<p>draft 'Local Plan Part 2'. To be clear, we consider that the Council should extend the urban boundary to include the former hospital site and the land to the rear in control of our client. The Council has previously recognised that the site is suitable for development, and we maintain that the site can accommodate a high quality scheme that will sit alongside the current development on the former hospital site. We also previously emphasised that the site is fully deliverable in the early stages of the plan period with confirmed market interest, and would like to take this opportunity to reiterate these points. This site is capable of making a genuine contribution towards meeting the housing requirements in the Borough and its inclusion will help ensure that the plan is robust and sound.</p> <p>We trust that these comments are helpful and will be taken into consideration. Please contact me if you require any further information, and in the meantime we trust that we will be kept informed of the next steps in the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>		
Number of comments		HS2.062				1		
Reference		HS2.064		Land at Oakenhead Wood				

319	Andrea	Cappelli	-		Not Applicable	<p>If the above housing sites are agreed then the following areas need to be addressed: - 1. Access to the sites and car parking space. Haslingden Old Road is already a very busy road especially in the mornings and evenings and when the schools finish for the day. Traffic is often queued back to where these sites are identified and more traffic will have an impact on this as well as on the access to and from Schofield Road. It is already difficult to move on and off local driveways at these times and can take upwards of 10 minutes for there to be a gap in the queue because of the quantity of vehicles and the traffic lights at the bottom of the hill. Sometimes it is not possible to enter or reverse into the driveways across from the schools because of the number of cars blocking the road. - 2. Despite being on a hill when there is heavy rain there have been occasions when the descending driveways of the houses at the lower end of Haslingden Old Road have taken the brunt of the overflow from the drains on the road. More housing, even further up the hill, is likely to create a situation where there is less land to absorb the water flow from the hills resulting in more water passing down the hill bypassing drains that are already struggling to cope and entering drive ways and possibly homes.</p>		<p>Whilst it is clear that more housing is necessary a priority must be to look at the infrastructure to support this. The roads and traffic flow is already a significant problem throughout the valley owing to the limited number of alternative routes.</p>
-----	--------	----------	---	--	----------------	--	--	---

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.064	Further comment
814	Andrew	Marwood	N/A		Object	I strongly object that this site is included within the draft local plan for Rossendale. - - I enjoy walking in and around the Rossendale area and have done for many years - this site is bordered by two public rights of way which I use to gain access to Oakenhead Wood / Cribden End and Cribden Hill beyond. I believe this site and proposal to expand the urban boundary further into this rural landscape will erode the green space which is vital to both the local community and for recreational purposes. - - Currently the land and bordering public rights of way are protected in planning by the fact that they are designated as 'greenfield'. I am concerned that by including this plot so that it is within the urban boundary it will mean that the site is no longer acknowledged for its importance to the areas local character. - - There are a number of references to this area to promote tourism and recreation. Development of this plot will have a detrimental impact on being able to promote walking in this area, both during any construction period and following the sites completion. From starting a walk in Whitaker Park you only have to cross Haslingden Old Road to then use the path via Cribden view / Old Hall Barn - any housing development and associated access road would mean the rural feel to this walk is reduced. - - I am in favour of sustainable development on existing brownfield sites to address housing shortages but am strongly opposed to the movement of the urban boundary specifically in this location as part of the local plan.		-
1255	matthew	Waddington	-		Object	THERE IS NO SUITABLE ACCESS. - HASLINGDEN OLD ROAD IS GRIDLOCKED AT PEAK TIMES WITH TRAFFIC QUEUES FROM SKI SLOPE TO BURNLEY ROAD.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.064	Further comment
1314	Rebecca	Coombes	-		Object	<p>I strongly object to this site being included in the proposed local plan. - I live on Haslingden Old Road and regularly use the public right of way which allows access to Oakenhead Wood and further footpaths within the local area. I believe the Council should be protecting these footpaths and the adjacent rural landscape so that they can be enjoyed both by the local community and people who visit Rawtenstall. - By proposing to extend the urban boundary in this location and therefore creating an overall larger urban conurbation, I feel the Council are diminishing local cultural identity. I consider any proposed development on this land to be unnecessary and inappropriate, as this currently is an open 'greenfield' site which links to the green belt and important recreational land / farmland. Once converted to be within the urban boundary this land will no longer be protected and strictly controlled by planning regulations. In July 2014 the Council released the document 'Rossendale Local Plan Part 2, Lives and Landscapes' in this document it states on page 2: - 'The countryside around the settlements of Rossendale is highly valued and provides not just a setting for the urban areas but an important recreational resource, which has tourism value'. - Also Appendix A2 (criteria for Urban Boundary Changes): - 'Land will be considered for inclusion where; b) it would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment unless it is capable of full mitigation, and e) it is capable of being developed without a significant adverse impact on local views and viewpoints, including where appropriate the use of appropriate mitigation measures'. - Also Appendix A2 point 3: - 'Open land on the edge of existing settlements will be excluded from the urban boundary where it has existing recreational or community value to ensure it remains undeveloped' - Inclusion of this land would therefore not be in keeping with the criteria set out in this document and further erode valuable green community land and recreational space. - To gain access to the site it is suggested by the Council's assessment sheets (Ref: SHLAA16229) that the access/egress, which is a public right of way, be widened. This I feel would further diminish the rural character of the area. The cobbled lane would be lost and adjacent farm buildings / existing house potentially demolished to provide an adequately wide highway, which meets the requirements for visibility from the Council's highway department. Any road to the site would also impact on the open countryside feel which starts behind the current row of houses on Haslingden Old Road. - The assessment form, referenced above also provides information on access to local services and amenities. As there is currently only a very infrequent (1 an hour, number 11 bus service) it is likely that the main transport use will be by private vehicle. This therefore makes access to and from the site by sustainable travel a problem and increases cumulatively (together with the adjacent site) vehicle trips on to Haslingden Old Road. - Crashmap.co.uk indicates there have been 8 accidents (1 serious, 7 slight since 2010) in close proximity to the proposed site entrance – adding</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.064	Further comment
						further trips by private vehicle into this location is therefore likely to also add to this poor safety record. - In summary I propose the Council removes this site from the local plan so that it can continue to be enjoyed by the local community, visitors to Rawtenstall and future generations as the 'greenfield' site it has always been and not absorbed by the urban boundary and any future development. -		
1437	Joanne	Finn	-		Object	I object to the proposed allocation of this site as housing land as it is what I consider to be within the countryside outside the urban boundary and so I also object to the redrawing of the urban boundary to include this. Aside from the potential access difficulties of this site it's development along with the proposed housing site to the rear of 173 to 187 Haslingden Old Road would put considerably more traffic onto Haslingden Old Road and cause potential accidents due to the lack of visibility onto the road and the speed at which traffic flows along it.		I'm not sure that this is the right place to put it but I'd also like to comment on the Consultation process for this and plans etc including Lives and Landscapes .Whilst I'm sure you will comply with the legal minimum requirements Most people I spoke to didn't know about the Consultation we only found about because a neighbour knew there was a proposal for the field but didn't know the process. We've found out about things retrospectively in the past. People generally feel this is deliberate to minimise likelihood of objections. I'd expect it to be better advertised, including more often in the local paper and on the front page on your website. Even knowing of it's existence you have to hunt to find it on the website.
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Object	HS2.64 - Vehicular access to Haslingden Old Road between 203 – 205 is unsuitable to accommodate the development traffic due to its narrow width and limited visibility splay onto Haslingden Old Road. The existing access between 191 – 193 is unsuitable for the same reasons		
Number of comments					HS2.064	6		
Reference		HS2.066		Land behind no. 173 to 187 Haslingden Old Road				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
319	Andrea	Cappelli	-		Not Applicable	<p>If the above housing sites are agreed then the following areas need to be addressed: -</p> <p>1. Access to the sites and car parking space. Haslingden Old Road is already a very busy road especially in the mornings and evenings and when the schools finish for the day. Traffic is often queued back to where these sites are identified and more traffic will have an impact on this as well as on the access to and from Schofield Road. It is already difficult to move on and off local driveways at these times and can take upwards of 10 minutes for there to be a gap in the queue because of the quantity of vehicles and the traffic lights at the bottom of the hill. Sometimes it is not possible to enter or reverse into the driveways across from the schools because of the number of cars blocking the road.</p> <p>2. Despite being on a hill when there is heavy rain there have been occasions when the descending driveways of the houses at the lower end of Haslingden Old Road have taken the brunt of the overflow from the drains on the road. More housing, even further up the hill, is likely to create a situation where there is less land to absorb the water flow from the hills resulting in more water passing down the hill bypassing drains that are already struggling to cope and entering drive ways and possibly homes.</p>		<p>Whilst it is clear that more housing is necessary a priority must be to look at the infrastructure to support this. The roads and traffic flow is already a significant problem throughout the valley owing to the limited number of alternative routes.</p>
480	John	Grady		SHLAA16227	Not Applicable	<p>Re Document SHLAA 16227</p> <p>The land behind 173 to 187 Haslingden Old Road</p> <p>I would like to point out some incorrect statements in the above document as follows:-</p> <p>1. Topography: the report states the land is a "flat site or very gentle slope" when in fact a large part of the land is of a steep slope 1:4 according to the ordinance survey maps.</p> <p>2. Landscape value: the landscape impact would be High as stated in your own landscape assessment as referenced in the above document.</p> <p>I would also like to seek clarification as to the current land use being described as "grassland" as the field has and is currently used for the grazing of sheep and cattle as well as lambing and calving.</p> <p>Further to this I should also raise problems that have started to arise re the drop in water pressure which at various times of the day are now below the required minimum and have been decreasing. More houses in the immediate area would clearly add to this problem. This problem is being taken up with United Utilities.</p> <p>It would be appreciated if you would advise me of the outcomes/developments of the document SHLAA 16227</p> <p>Regards</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
787	Ian	Stanney	-	SHLAA16227	Object	<p>I object to the construction of housing on the above site for the following reasons - . - The land slopes considerably in two directions. - The land is seriously waterlogged . - Their is no easy access and any access would have to be onto Haslingden Old Road which is conjested several times a day from Burnley Road and beyond Schofield Road , Drainage and underground services would put a greater strain on an already over stretched service. -</p> <p>Submitted 03/10/17: This site slopes in 2 directions and is completely water-logged. I would suggest this could be of great expense to rectify, but I would be more concerned as to where the land could be drained to. - Access to this land would have to be from Haslingden Old Road, which would mean a long access - road from Unity Way, or by the demolition of, or part of Spring Bank Farm. - This area, from Whitaker Park and the Ski-slope,down towards Crestmoor childrens home, gives an uninterrupted wild-life area which then continues to Crawshawbooth. The bird life in this area is - plentiful and varied. - All roads in Rawtenstall converge in two locations. Queens Square, and Haslingden Old Road,at it's - junction with Burnley Road. Congestion, not just at this location but throughout Rossendale, is making car travel slower and also more dangerous for children and parents at the two Primary schools, plus the children at Crestmoor childrens home, Further development would make matters far worse.</p>		No.
1241	Frederick Stephen	Tomlinson	-	(SHLAA 16227)	Object	<p>Having lived at 171 Haslingden Old Road for seventy three years I strongly Object to the proposed development listed. - On a personal basis my outlook and view of Cribden Hill and surrounding countryside will dissappear. - The loss of privacy in my garden and northern elevation of the house will be greatly compromised. - Coupled with the fact, I will suffer noise pollution from any development. - The loss of wildlife such as badgers, roe deer, foxes and numerous species of birds. - The local infrastructure is not able to cope at this moment in time. With Haslingden Old Road being used as a shortcut to and from Burnley Road avoiding the congested town centre and Haslingden Road, the subject of a similar development at the Hospital Site. - Traffic backs up from Tup Bridge to the Ski Slope on a regular daily basis. This is due to sheer volume of traffic caused by morning and evening commute along with the addition of school traffic for pupils attending St Mary's and St James' Primary schools and Crest Moor Children's Home. - Haslingden Old Road has become an Accident Waiting To Happen. Any Increased traffic can only make the situation more Dangerous. - I've also been informed that the two Primary Schools in question are already over subscribed does this mean to accommodate the families of the new development will there have to be increased development of the school sites, again causing more disruption to our local environment. -</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
1251	Louise	Haworth	N/A	(SHLAA 16227)	Object	As a resident of Haslingden Old Road for twenty three years, I strongly object to the proposed development plan. - My grounds for objection is the amount of traffic on Haslingden Old Road which has considerably increased over the recent years. - Haslingden Old Road has become unbearably congested at peak times backing up from Tup Bridge to Whittaker Park on Haslingden Old Road. - Peak congestion occurring at morning and evening due to school traffic to and from St Mary's and St James' Primary Schools and Crest Moor children's Home. Also commuter traffic at these said times. - Haslingden Old Road is increasingly over used as a route to avoid congestion through the Centre of Rawtenstall. - My main personal concern will be the loss of view looking north, over Cribden Hill. Which will result in the loss of natural habitat and local wildlife such as badgers, roe deer, foxes and numerous species of birds. - I also have concerns that the land slopes in to my rear garden which floods seventy five percent of the year. A situation that is of concern to me regarding the proposed development.		-
1255	matthew	Waddington	-		Object	THIS SITE WAS ORIGINALLY EARMARKED FOR DEVELOPMENT IN PREVIOUS LOCAL PLAN AND WAS SUCCESFULLY OBJECTED. - THE DESCRIPTION OF SITE IS FULL OF FULL OF INACCURACIES. - THE PHOTO OF THE SITE IS NOT FROM WHERE IT IS STATED. - THE LAND IS GRAZING PASTURE NOT SCRUBLAND. - THE LAND IS NOT FLAT. - THE LAND HAS MANY LAND DRAINS. - HASLINGDEN OLD ROAD IS ALREADY GRIDLOCKED AT PEAK TIMES QUEUES FROM SKISLOPE TO BURNLEY ROAD. - WHERE IS THERE SUITABLE ACCESS TO THE SITE? IS THIS FROM THE SIDE OF 187 SURELEY NOT THROUGH THE SCHOOLS CAR PARK!! - THE LANSCAPE WILL BE SERIOUSLY AFFECTED AS THE LAND IS STEEP GRADIENT -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
1437	Joanne	Finn	-		Object	<p>I object to the proposed allocation of land behind 173 to 187 Haslingden Old Rd, as follows (and the proposed redrawing of the urban boundary to include it) . - Slope – I feel it is inaccurate to class it as a flat site or very gentle slope, it slopes uphill from S to N and particularly E to W impacting upon surface water, drainage and feeling overlooked and hemmed in as properties would be higher than mine. Planting a few trees etc wont mitigate for this or our loss of view which you may class as having low landscape impact but residents don't. - Re drainage as access is at the highest point I'd assume it would need to be pumped or some other complex solution. - Re surface water whilst it has been classed low surface water flood risk it is a boggy marshy field on the side of a hill and in heavy rainfall surface water can sometimes run down the hill and through the field like a small river. The grass in our garden rarely dries out. The road to the schools (Unity Way) is regularly under water with a small river flowing through the field behind Crestmoor , presumably some of it having run down from the proposed adjoining site. I'm concerned that once there is lots of hard landscaping this water has to flow somewhere possibly into our gardens. - We would suffer a substantial loss in the enjoyment of our homes which have an uninterrupted view up the hillside, no houses visible. I feel this proposal has a more substantial impact than many others because our main living areas face onto it. Many other houses have other properties around them and a new development is more of an infill in a gap , or they are above the development, face side onto it, are screened by trees etc rather than a complete loss of view. - The site is fertile pastureland , has many wild flowers, frogs or toads and is probably rich in insects which will all be lost and impact upon the environment. It is Greenfield and what I consider to be a natural boundary to the countryside. - -</p>		<p>I'm not sure that this is the right place to put it but I'd also like to comment on the Consultation process for this and plans etc including Lives and Landscapes .Whilst I'm sure you will comply with the legal minimum requirements Most people I spoke to didn't know about the Consultation we only found about because a neighbour knew there was a proposal for the field but didn't know the process. We've found out about things retrospectively in the past. People generally feel this is deliberate to minimise likelihood of objections. I'd expect it to be better advertised, including more often in the local paper and on the front page on your website. Even knowing of it's existence you have to hunt to find it on the website.</p>
1508	Rachel	Cornwell	-		Object	<p>I object to the proposed building of houses on this site. The land is part of the farm next door and is used for grazing - it should not be used for housing development. Haslingden Old Road (as well as most of the other roads in rossendale) is already massively busy without adding further traffic to the roads with this development and proposed site further up the road. The rear of the properties which face onto the main road is rural green land which offers a peaceful haven for residents away from the speeding vehicles or standstill traffic jams at the front of the properties.</p>		<p>Drainage/run off and flooding is already a problem for the valley and I feel all this building will increase that problem.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
1652	Stacey Joan Brailsford	John-Luke Smith		Land between 173 & 187 Haslingden Old Road	Object	<p>We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the proposed development on agricultural land.</p> <p>As a local residents living close to site of proposed development, we are of the view that the proposed developments on the agricultural land will have a serious negative impact on our standard of living and should be excluded from the plans. Our specific objections and concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current potential access routes via Hollymount way and the access between 187 and 189 Haslingden old road is narrow and would not accommodate a safe access double lane road onto the proposed sites from an already busy main highway, further to this neither access route would allow safe passage for emergency vehicles or refuse vehicles to access via either of the routes. • A high number of properties on Haslingden old road do not have the benefit of off road parking and therefore there are a number of parked cars up and down Haslingden old road with a large volume of speeding traffic regularly travelling along the road. Increasing the amount of traffic and creating junctions along the road will increase the risk of serious incident and increase traffic noise to the area. Safety concerns regarding the road traffic has already been highlighted to Lancashire county council and the local MP. • Inability for surrounding roads to manage an increase in traffic and compromise safety. The core strategy plan has already highlighted this as an area of concern for the future. • The agricultural land proposed has had livestock continually use the fields, which local and hobby farmers utilise to keep sheep, cows and chickens. Wild deer, bats, owls and foxes have all been spotted in the area and the proposed building would lose surrounding natural habitats and reduce the free roaming space for these animals. • The current lightly used access road is also a pedestrian access to public right of way footpaths and the current access is not big enough to accommodate a road and path for pedestrians to safely gain access to these public right of ways. • Drainage and local flooding risk to Haslingden old road residents. The field is already boggy and current land drains passing underneath properties would be greatly affected, which would have potentially adverse effects to the residents due to the high water run off from the valley side loss of natural soakaways. • High density of housing in very small area would increase noise from the new homes. This would come from the added stop start nature of traffic noise behind and on the main road from new residents and visitors. There will be a total loss of privacy to front and back of the current properties from slow moving traffic at the front; and properties situated on the higher plain overlooking bedroom windows and living areas. There will also be a definite 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
						<p>loss of daylight and overshadowing to current properties due to the increased height of the land and then housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design appearance and chosen materials may not be in keeping with surrounding properties where the majority are stone. • There will be an increased risk on the current infrastructure like schools and medical facilities in the Rossendale area. • As local residents who would be directly affected by the proposed plans we have had no direct notification of the proposals and we're only made aware by local word and mouth. A simple letter drop to the homes backing onto the proposed development should have been completed. The only notification we were made aware of was planning permission to change the current barn to a same footprint , single level dwelling. The Rossendale core strategy already highlighted concerns about congestion of traffic in Rawtenstall and that boroughs landscapes need to be conserved. The building of these homes would increase traffic volume and lose part of the borough landscape and valuable space in which people gain access to the natural countryside and pursue outdoor activities. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
1773	Stephen	McGrail		SHLAA16227	Not Applicable	<p>The current housing proposals for this site are the culmination of a series of previous decisions and documents from Rossendale Borough Council. Each stage in this process has contained significant errors and factual inaccuracies to an extent that I believe renders them invalid. The planning department are aware of these errors but continue to rely upon the documents as the basis for the proposals being submitted to the council for consideration. As such both the members of the council and the public that they represent are being knowingly misled. The documents to which I refer are as follows:</p> <p>1) Adopted Proposals Map for Rossendale Core Strategy DPD: The Way Forward (2011-2026) Adopted Version 8th November 2011</p> <p>This map has been referred to during public consultations regarding the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and is posted on the RBC website in connection with that assessment. It has been used by the council throughout this process and the previous (now abandoned) proposals in 2015. It was published under the auspices of the Core Strategy for Rossendale which was adopted in November 2011. The key on the accompanying map used to produce that strategy had been updated in 2007 but the map itself was that used as the proposals map for the Local Plan that was adopted on 12th April 1995. However, even when used in 1995, that map was an older OS Map and considerably out of date.</p> <p>Examples of just how obsolete that map now is include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ Both the Valley Centre and Rossendale & Accrington College are still shown standing. ☒ The Ski Rossendale dry slope is not shown on the map despite having opened in 1973, some 44 years ago. ☒ The housing development at Holly Mount and the adjacent Asda store do not feature because the previous mill is still shown occupying the site. ☒ Unity Way does not exist because on the map, St. James the Less and St. Mary's primary schools have not yet been built, despite having been in their current locations for over 24 years. This is relevant to this particular proposed housing site because the landscaping assessment by Penny Bennett refers fields marked as 'Community Space' on this map; In fact that area houses the two schools in question. <p>This means that the current Rossendale Borough Local Plan, and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment now being undertaken, are based upon mapping that is probably 40 or more years out of date. Not only has this caused confusion and errors (such as that by the landscape architect) it also means that decisions flowing from that strategy cannot be expected to withstand future legal challenge should either residents or developers wish to oppose them.</p> <p>It is not acceptable for the planning department to insist that current mapping will be used in any eventual planning development. The fact is that although</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
						<p>this map is known to be factually incorrect, it is being used as one of the official documents in a process upon which decisions are made with significant repercussions.</p> <p>2) Landscape Assessment – Oakenclough, Rawtenstall Produced by Penny Bennett, Landscape Architects on behalf of Rossendale B.C. This document was produced in 2015 in support of the proposed housing site Ref. RCGL61 in the now discontinued Lives and Landscapes process. The first page of the document contains an aerial photograph and a map, both of which have been marked to show the site under assessment. However, the area marked differs considerably from the proposed site at that time. Penny Bennett had erroneously included the pasture forming part of Spring Bank Farm (that had been excluded by the council) in the map, aerial photograph and description of the site. However, most of the land that formed the extended grounds of the original Crestmoor children’s home, was excluded from the landscape assessment despite those grounds being included in the council’s proposed site (RCGL61). The architect had therefore produced a draft landscape assessment for a significantly different site to that subject of the council proposal. In doing so they had made numerous other factual errors in the report, rendering it so inaccurate that it should not have been regarded as fit for purpose. Full details of those inaccuracies were submitted to the council by me in my written comments on the Draft Local Plan (Part 2) in September 2015.</p> <p>3) Site Assessment – Site Ref SHLAA16227 Published by RBC in June 2017 The current proposal by RBC for housing on site ref. SHLAA16277 only relates to the single field of farm pasture that was wrongly included in the above landscape assessment. Appendix ‘A’ (attached) depicts the areas of the sites and the extent to which they differ. Conclusions reached by the landscape architect in respect of the whole area assessed (some of which were proven to be wrong) have now been taken out of context and referred to by the council in the current proposal for site SHLAA16277 despite the fact that the two sites are significantly different. The result is that statements in the current site assessment document are also incorrect. I note that, following my representations on these points to the planning officers at recent public consultation events, an ‘Errata’ document was published in September 2017. However, that still fails to correctly assess the site or to reflect the potential effect of the proposal. Specific items of note are as follows. ☐ The initial published site assessment stated that the topography of the site was “Flat site or very gentle slope”. This was amended by the errata document to “Gradient present but can be mitigated”. This conveniently fails to state</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
						<p>that the gradient is very steep in places (as evidenced by Google Earth and O.S Maps), a condition which, under the council's own guidelines would have resulted in a 'Red' grading for topography, thus removing the site from further consideration. Furthermore, the topography cannot be mitigated (as suggested) without considerable landscape changes to the site. However, this option is precluded by the extensive land drains under that field which are necessary to cope with the many natural springs present.</p> <p>☒ The presence of the many springs, and the water rights in respect of them, are referred to in the house deeds of all of the residents whose homes adjoin the field in question. These are the subject of numerous legal documents dating back to the construction of the houses in 1920 and remain current. The previous owner of Spring Bank Farm regularly maintained the land drains under the field, but these have been neglected in recent years with the result that the lower areas of the field now contain reed beds, such is the extent of the water flowing through it. Water run-off from the field now regularly swamps my garden and the lower area of the field has been waterlogged for much of the year. As such the comments in the site assessment in respect of: i) Flood Risk ("low surface water"), ii) Land Instability ("No known issues") and iii) Constraints due to Utilities ("No known utilities infrastructure on site") are all incorrect.</p> <p>☒ The Landscape Value in the site assessment was "Low landscape impact". This was amended by the published errata document which lists it as "Medium". That reflects the overall assessment given by the landscape architect in their 2015 document, referred to previously. However, that assessment was aggregated from the differing impacts at the various places of the large site considered. In respect of the visual impact of the development, the landscape architect highlighted the fact that it would have a "Major Impact" on residents of properties on Haslingden Old Road where its effect cannot be mitigated, referring to this as the "Worst Case". Given that the current (greatly reduced) proposed site now only affects those specific properties on Haslingden Old Road, then quite clearly the correct Landscape Value is 'High', i.e. Major Impact as recognised by the landscape architect. Again this would result in a 'Red' grading for Landscape Value, thus removing the site from further consideration.</p> <p>☒ In respect of the Suitability Summary, the errata document refers to traffic around the schools being severe at school time. What has been omitted but should also be taken into consideration is the fact that traffic on Haslingden Old Road is severe during morning and evening rush hours. This is especially so between 17:00 and 18:00 on weekdays when stationary traffic queues down the hill from outside Spring Bank Farm all the way to the traffic signals at the junction with St, Mary's Way. The addition of further vehicles travelling to or from a new housing development would exacerbate that situation. The above points should be corrected in the document prior to it being</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.066	Further comment
						submitted as supporting material in the next stage of the planning process.		
						<p>Policy</p> <p>In July 2017 the RBC published the Rossendale Draft Local Plan - Regulation 18 Consultation. Included on page 5 of that document was:</p> <p>Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt</p> <p>All new development in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundaries, defined on the Policies map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area</p> <p>The proposed site (Ref. SHLAA16227) is situated on what is currently a farm pasture located outside the urban boundary. The proposed housing development does not meet the required criteria that would justify it being located within the countryside i.e. farm diversification or certain types of tourism, and as such the site proposal is directly in contravention of the council's own policy.</p> <p>Three years ago, on 12th September 2014, I met with Mr Adrian Smith and Councillor Patrick Marriot to discuss proposed urban boundary changes. Mr. Smith accepted that the above field did not meet the government guidelines for inclusion within the Urban Boundary. The field was therefore removed from consideration of being included within the Urban Boundary when the boundary changes were being reviewed in 2015, hence its omission from the proposed housing site RCGL61 at that time. Since 2014/15 there have been no changes to that site that would justify any change to that status and as such it remains outside the urban boundary.</p> <p>Please see appendix for map.</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Object	HS2.66 – Vehicular access is limited to the access points as detailed above for HS2.64 and therefore is unsuitable. Vehicular access via Unity Way would require access through LCC owned land (Crest Moor Childrens residential home). The additional vehicle movements are unlikely to be supported by the Highway Authority due to the existing vehicle and pedestrian movements on Unity Way in connection with the 2 primary schools, children's home and employment site.		
Number of comments						HS2.066	11	
Reference						HS2.068	Land east of Lower Clowes Road	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.068	Further comment
4	MICHAEL	MURPHY	-		Support	I would like the delivery timescale for this site to be 1 to 5 years, as opposed to the 6 to 15 years stated in the Draft Local Plan. As an owner of land within this Housing Allocation, we would make the land available for delivery within that timescale. - With regards to housing numbers, due to the topography of the land and the style and character of surrounding housing we would propose the number of dwellings achievable on this allocation is less than 5.		No

Number of comments HS2.068

1

Reference HS2.071 Horse and Jockey Hotel, land to the west of Moorland View, land between Blackburn Road and A56, land west of Market Street and land off Exchange Street

36	Paul	Bradburn		SHLAA16256	Object	Taken as a whole these proposals with other smaller sites around Edenfield represent development on an unprecedented scale. Edenfield currently has over 900 houses and it has taken several hundred years to reach this number. If all these proposed sites are developed this will represent an increase of approximately 55% in the number of dwellings in the village in a period of fifteen years. This is simply unacceptable.		Development on the scale proposed will cause enormous disruption to village life while it is in progress.
36	Paul	Bradburn		SHLAA16262	Object	Taken as a whole these proposals with other smaller sites around Edenfield represent development on an unprecedented scale. Edenfield currently has over 900 houses and it has taken several hundred years to reach this number. If all these proposed sites are developed this will represent an increase of approximately 55% in the number of dwellings in the village in a period of fifteen years. This is simply unacceptable.		Development on the scale proposed will cause enormous disruption to village life while it is in progress.
36	Paul	Bradburn		SHLAA16255	Object	Taken as a whole these proposals with other smaller sites around Edenfield represent development on an unprecedented scale. Edenfield currently has over 900 houses and it has taken several hundred years to reach this number. If all these proposed sites are developed this will represent an increase of approximately 55% in the number of dwellings in the village in a period of fifteen years. This is simply unacceptable.		Development on the scale proposed will cause enormous disruption to village life while it is in progress.
36	Paul	Bradburn		SHLAA16263	Object	Taken as a whole these proposals with other smaller sites around Edenfield represent development on an unprecedented scale. Edenfield currently has over 900 houses and it has taken several hundred years to reach this number. If all these proposed sites are developed this will represent an increase of approximately 55% in the number of dwellings in the village in a period of fifteen years. This is simply unacceptable.		Development on the scale proposed will cause enormous disruption to village life while it is in progress.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
37	Angela	Bradburn	-	SHLAA16256	Object	I am using my husbands computer to make my comments. I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield incorporated in these particular sites plus anumber of smaller ones. This will transform the village and that is not what I want and I suspect most of my fellow residents.		I note that the Council insists as part of this document that an overall plan will be require but how will that be acheived with multiple developers? This (if carried out) would require considerable infrastructure work, sewers, water, electricity, gas and schools. How is that to be co-Ordinated?
37	Angela	Bradburn	-	SHLAA16255	Object	I am using my husbands computer to make my comments. I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield incorporated in these particular sites plus anumber of smaller ones. This will transform the village and that is not what I want and I suspect most of my fellow residents.		I note that the Council insists as part of this document that an overall plan will be require but how will that be acheived with multiple developers? This (if carried out) would require considerable infrastructure work, sewers, water, electricity, gas and schools. How is that to be co-Ordinated?
37	Angela	Bradburn	-	SHLAA16263	Object	I am using my husbands computer to make my comments. I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield incorporated in these particular sites plus anumber of smaller ones. This will transform the village and that is not what I want and I suspect most of my fellow residents.		I note that the Council insists as part of this document that an overall plan will be require but how will that be acheived with multiple developers? This (if carried out) would require considerable infrastructure work, sewers, water, electricity, gas and schools. How is that to be co-Ordinated?
37	Angela	Bradburn	-	SHLAA16262	Object	I am using my husbands computer to make my comments. I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield incorporated in these particular sites plus anumber of smaller ones. This will transform the village and that is not what I want and I suspect most of my fellow residents.		I note that the Council insists as part of this document that an overall plan will be require but how will that be acheived with multiple developers? This (if carried out) would require considerable infrastructure work, sewers, water, electricity, gas and schools. How is that to be co-Ordinated?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
38	Paul	Bradburn	Edenfield Village Residents Association	SHLAA16262	Object	As a group we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. 489 houses will transform the village in several ways and not in our opinion for the better. In an assessment of possible sites for development in 2015 The Council assessment of the one off Exchange Street (SHLAA16263) said that the site should not be considered because it alone represented development of more than 5% of the existing village. Bearing in mind that this is by no means the largest site proposed, what has changed? - If these plans were implemented it would represent an increase in the size of the village by approximately 55%. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.		We deplore what is proposed in that if impemented it would seriously disrupt village life for years with the house building itself plus infrastructure improvements which would be necessary. And what is in it for existing residents? there is only a downside for them.
38	Paul	Bradburn	Edenfield Village Residents Association	SHLAA16256	Object	As a group we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. 489 houses will transform the village in several ways and not in our opinion for the better. In an assessment of possible sites for development in 2015 The Council assessment of the one off Exchange Street (SHLAA16263) said that the site should not be considered because it alone represented development of more than 5% of the existing village. Bearing in mind that this is by no means the largest site proposed, what has changed? - If these plans were implemented it would represent an increase in the size of the village by approximately 55%. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.		We deplore what is proposed in that if impemented it would seriously disrupt village life for years with the house building itself plus infrastructure improvements which would be necessary. And what is in it for existing residents? there is only a downside for them.
38	Paul	Bradburn	Edenfield Village Residents Association	SHLAA16255	Object	As a group we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. 489 houses will transform the village in several ways and not in our opinion for the better. In an assessment of possible sites for development in 2015 The Council assessment of the one off Exchange Street (SHLAA16263) said that the site should not be considered because it alone represented development of more than 5% of the existing village. Bearing in mind that this is by no means the largest site proposed, what has changed? - If these plans were implemented it would represent an increase in the size of the village by approximately 55%. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.		We deplore what is proposed in that if impemented it would seriously disrupt village life for years with the house building itself plus infrastructure improvements which would be necessary. And what is in it for existing residents? there is only a downside for them.
38	Paul	Bradburn	Edenfield Village Residents Association	SHLAA16263	Object	As a group we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. 489 houses will transform the village in several ways and not in our opinion for the better. In an assessment of possible sites for development in 2015 The Council assessment of the one off Exchange Street (SHLAA16263) said that the site should not be considered because it alone represented development of more than 5% of the existing village. Bearing in mind that this is by no means the largest site proposed, what has changed? - If these plans were implemented it would represent an increase in the size of the village by approximately 55%. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.		We deplore what is proposed in that if impemented it would seriously disrupt village life for years with the house building itself plus infrastructure improvements which would be necessary. And what is in it for existing residents? there is only a downside for them.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
38	Paul	Bradburn	Edenfield Village Residents Association		Object	<p>We write to supplement our comments made online in September. You I am sure will appreciate that the provisions of the Draft Plan which affect Edenfield have come as a profound shock to people in our village and as a result we feel bound to ask a number of questions.</p> <p>1) What is the Greenbelt for? As laymen we understood that it is to protect towns and villages from excessive development which sounds very sensible until we discover that if the Council wishes it can redraw it to allow the building of up to 500 extra houses which would completely alter the character of our village.</p> <p>2) What is in this plan for the existing residents of Edenfield? On the positive side the answer is nothing! On the negative side there is much to weigh against it; their lovely village changed out of all recognition, up to an extra thousand cars on the village streets, the built up area almost doubled and the population increase by over 50%, several hundred more children to find school places for, almost certainly a set of traffic lights on Market Street and of course not forgetting probably twenty years of building with all the noise, muck, fumes and heavy vehicle movements which this will entail, can the Council seriously be claiming to represent this village if it wishes to visit all this upon us.</p> <p>3)The Plan includes a prominent section about a "Master Plan" for Edenfield we assume because the largest piece of Greenbelt in Rossendale scheduled for change of status is in Edenfield, (your reference HS2.71) and we pose the question, bearing in mind Rossendale's limited budget, has this borough the human and financial resources to manage this over the plan period? Or is it perhaps the intention to "tap" the developers to pay for the management as we understand has happened elsewhere. If that was the case how could these people, charged with managing this process be independent of the developers when it is those very companies who are indirectly paying them?</p> <p>4) Is there any evidence that there is a demand for up to 500, probably 3/4/5 bedroom houses in Edenfield. Are houses selling quickly, are prices rising steadily, if there is evidence it is news to us and if there is no evidence why allocate land here for all these extra houses.</p> <p>5) If we look at previous assessments of potential sites for new houses in Edenfield we find inconsistencies with what is included in this latest plan. For instance in 2015, "land off Blackburn road" was ruled out because of the effect development would have on "View and Setting" so what has changed? The site now designated "land off Exchange Street" had this following comment set against it; I paraphrase, development of this site would in itself increase the built up area in the village by more than 5% and should be discounted. Again what has changed when the whole plan seeks to increase the number of houses by over 50% and the built up area by almost 100%.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>We would add that completing the online consultation has proved difficult for many people who have reached for instance, question 4, Site allocation or Local Plan Policy and have been completely flumoxed and not pressed on. Only when they became aware that we could help were they able to continue, and of course we don't know how many have simply abandoned the exercise as a result.</p> <p>It may be thought by some that we are against all development in Edenfield but that is not the case, however we believe that the scale of what the Council proposes is "off the scale" and a more modest number of houses should be considered. To that end we would suggest that our Village could accommodate a similar percentage of new houses to the existing stock as the rest of the Borough which is around 12% and that would come to about 110 houses to be built over the 15 years of the plan. It is our opinion that such a figure is sustainable and could be achieved without affecting the essential character of the village.</p> <p>And to close, it should be clear to the Council that if they insist on implementing this plan they will be doing it against the wishes of the great majority of the people of who live here.</p>		
44	John	Johnson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is being proposed. This will transform the village, and not for the better.		I do not have a computer of my own and have completed this using Paul Bradburn's computer.
52	Jenifer	Mead	-		Object	I am objecting to the scale of development in this village. The infrastructure cannot cope with all the new properties which the Council is proposing to build. The village would lose it's character and the lovely green areas which surround the village will be 'lost'. The main reason given is that Edenfield is a desirable place to live, well that won't be so if we are inundated with all these houses. Why not spread them more evenly accross the Rossendale Valley? Also, what about all the empty houses in the Valley, can these not be used to reduce the figures? I guess that the developers will only include small quantities of 'affordable housing' and most of the properties will be 4/5 bedroomed detached houses as there is more money to be made from these large properties.		I strongly oppose the areas being brought out of 'green belt' as this would completely destroy the 'open' aspect which surrounds the village. - I realise that the main developers i.e. Taylor Wimpey Homes will push and push until they get permission to build on the 31 acres which they have purchased, but if local opinion is taken into consideration by the planners, then they should be denied approval to build on this land.
75	Peter	Valentine	-		Object	I object to sheer size of development that radically alter edenfield and the roads cannot cope with extra traffic		Roads will not cope with extra traffic
76	Lesley	Valentine	-		Object	Devastating effect on the village that totally change the place I live		This cannot go ahead
77	Jack	Valentine	-		Object	This will destroy this lovely quiet village .		-
78	Lucy	Valentine	-		Object	The village will be ruined and too busy		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
79	Janet	Campbell	-		Object	I object to the sheet scale of the proposed developments for Edenfield. Not only will the character of the Village disappear, from what was a desirable village will no longer be so. There is one road through the village which cannot cope with the sheer volume of traffic that already passes through it. Parking is already a huge issue in the village and this will be vastly exasperated with the addition of 489 houses. Doctors and dentists have no spaces. The infrastructure of the village just simply not cope with such a large amount of new houses being built.	-	
80	Ian	McAllister	-		Object	We object that the scale of what is being proposed for Edenfield is far too large and would ruin the village. - Some properties that families have invested a lot of money in would also be de valued due to the loss of countryside views. I also believe that the local schools would not be able to cope with an increase as large as suggested in the local population.	-	
81	kathleen	shaughnessy	-		Object	I object to the proposal to increase the size of the village by 50% and destroy Edenfield as a village and as a desirable place to live . - I also object to the planned destruction of green belt when there are so many brownbelt and derelict areas in Rossendale which would benefit from being built on (Edenfield seems to be the main development area proposed). The infrastructure in Edenfield simply will not support the planned numbers of properties or the amount of additional traffic that will be created. I live on the main road through Edenfield & it is already very busy, especially when the bypass is closed. Parking is already in short supply & will become extremely difficult. - Additionally, where would the children from the new properties go to school? I don`t see any planned increase in provision in the local plan.	-	
82	richard	shaughnessy	-		Object	I object to the proposal to increase the size of the village by 50% and destroy Edenfield as a village and as a desirable place to live. - I also object to the planned destruction of green belt when there are so many brownbelt and derelict areas in Rossendale which would benefit from being built on (Edenfield seems to be the main development area proposed). - The infrastructure in Edenfield simply will not support the planned numbers of properties or the amount of additional traffic that will be created. I live on the main road through Edenfield & it is already very busy, especially when the bypass is closed. Parking is already in short supply & will become extremely difficult. - Additionally, where would the children from the new properties go to school? I don`t see any planned increase in provision in the local plan.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
83	Elizabeth	Latham			Object	I object very strongly to the scale of the proposals for Edenfield. It will completely alter the character of the village. How can you possibly substantiate increasing the number of houses by over 50 per cent. You have a duty to look after our village and Rossendale as a whole, you should not be taking away its identity. Also, the roads will be chaotic with so much extra traffic. It is already very difficult on roads around Edenfield, particularly Market Street. GPs and schools will also not be able to cope, which will affect us all. Please do not do this.		-
84	ADELE	FINNERTY	-		Object	I am objecting to the massive scale of these proposals and the effect this will have on our lovely village!!!! -		I am informed that Edenfield is being singled out as the main development area because it is a desirable place to live, well in my opinion it won't be very desirable if this goes ahead!!!! - This is an absolutely ridiculous proposal and needs to be terminated. There's nothing wrong with a few more houses being built here but who has come up with this plan..... obviously someone who doesn't live in the village!!! -
85	Trevor	Latham	-		Object	The scale of the proposals is completely unacceptable and would radically change the character of this village. Volume of traffic would unmanageable and parking in the village, already a major issue, would be impossible. The GPs and schools would not be able to absorb the additional numbers, our schools are already over subscribed. Please do not destroy our village.		-
86	Alan	Ridehalgh	-		Object	I object to the high number of houses proposed for such a small village, with limited facilities and roads that are unsuitable for the high volumes of traffic that would be created should these plans come to fruition.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
87	ERIC	FINNERTY	-		Object	I am objecting to this proposal mainly because of the sheer amount of houses being proposed. This would change our village for the worse in my opinion.		I understand the need for more housing but why has no one ever suggested that the derelict houses we already have in numerous area's be renovated. eg. Rawtenstall, Haslingden, Accrington, Burnley, Blackburn etc. These properties are already there so to renovate them would surely be cheaper and wouldn't upset anyone in the process. - I was born and brought up in Edenfield so I have seen all the changes that have already been made to my village, in my opinion if this plan goes ahead I won't be living in a village anymore I will be living in a TOWN!!!!
88	Ruth	Clayton	-		Object	I object to such a high number of houses for such a small village, which would drastically alter the character of the village forever. The roads are already too small for the vast increase of traffic that would ensue. Comment received via online questionnaire (14/09/2017): I wish to object to the scale of the proposed development. This is far too many houses to build in the small village of Edenfield. It would mean an increase of over 50% of the total housing stock.		We - do not have the infrastructure in place for such a large housing development. It would mean double yellow lines around the village and the parking is already at a premium. Also traffic lights somewhere on Market Street which is a very congested road already.
89	Philip	Kushner	-		Object	We strongly object to the very extensive scale of these proposed developments because they would completely change the entire nature and character of the historic village of Edenfield and destroy its heritage . There also seems little or no thought has been given to providing local services eg, schools, dental and GP practices, shops, to support such a massive extension of housing in such a small area. - - There are also serious problems with traffic flow and management through Edenfield and the construction of such a large number of additional houses would overwhelm traffic through the village and make it dangerous and unpleasant. What are the routes by which additional traffic, particularly in the rush hour and school times, would join and leave the main road ? Presumably there would have to be traffic lights which would cause additional congestion during busy periods - - We have lived here for 30 years and love the village life and the area but we would seriously consider moving out if these plans come to fruition in there current form. - - We do not object to some development but certainly not on the scale proposed and we would make strong representations to our elected politicians to defend the residents interests and that of the wider community		No but we trust common sense will prevail

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
90	Trevor	Boothman	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-
91	Jacqueline	Boothman	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-
92	Chris	McCool	-		Object	The quantity proposed for all of Edenfield is far too much for the current infrastructure to cope with. - I am not against new homes, but the number of proposed new houses is not realistic and is certainly going to alter the village in a negative view.		-
94	Gerry	Murray	-		Object	Firstly, I would like to state that I am not opposed to any development in Edenfield per se, but it is the sheer scale of the proposed plan and the resultant pressure on the villages infrastructure that worries me most. To increase the number of households in the village by 50% would require substantial investment in new roads, better management and maintenance of existing roads, a new school, services such as a GP practice, a dentist, etc, which would destroy the very reason why people want to live here in the first place. It is the unique character of the village, the peaceful location and the abundance of green space which makes this village so nice to live in. The current infrastructure just about manages as it is; any increased pressure to this would be extremely detrimental to the well being of the village as a whole.		-
95	Sandra	White	none		Object	I very much object to what the council is proposing to do to Edenfield. - The sheer scale of it is unbelievable. - The whole character of Edenfield would be radically altered. - Edenfield is an exceptional nice area of Rossendale of which the council is proposing to ruin with their unprecedented plans for this village. - In addition, as a full time, life long user of public transport the disruption this will cause for myself and other bus users in the village is beyond acceptance. Rosso Transport is the worst bus company I have ever had to use and I have used many around Lancashire and Yorkshire.		No thank you.
96	Brian	Sutton	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield.		No
97	Stephen	Roberts	-		Object	I own a property in Edenfield on Market st and have done for 25yrs which I am hoping to retire to and the sheer scale of the houses proposed is detrimental to human quality of life, its difficult with all support services being closed as it is, what will come to pass when the burden is doubled with less access to buses, Doctors,Schools et. - this cannot be allowed to happen.		-
99	Walter	Ogden	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
100	Robert	Affleck	-		Object	We Strongly Object to The Sheer Scale of What is Proposed For Edenfield And The Impact It Would Have On Our Village Which As More Than Enough Houses For A Small Village At This Present Time.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
101	Derek	Brennan	-		Object	<p>The sheer scale of the proposals seem incredible to me. Apart from infrastructure issues such as school, GP services and the like, the additional volume of traffic is probably not manageable. - - If traffic lights and parking restrictions are put in place on Market Street, it would have serious implication for me. I am disabled due to a severe heart condition and it is bad enough now to park outside my house. If this became worse then i would be housebound as walking any distance carrying anything at all is impossible. - - Market Street itself already struggles with the amount of buses, wagons, tractors and general traffic and an increase in volume of even modest proportions would cause havoc. - - I live here because it is a village on the edge of green belt land and not in the center of a small town. - - I am sure surveys will be done to justify the increased traffic but nothing other than living through normal rush hours, or even worse with A56 bypass closure, would give you the scale of the impact on local people. - - Even the small development on the site of the Horse and Jockey will cause local problems. - - The scale is such that I would have to leave a village which my family has lived in for over 120 years.</p>	-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
102	GEOFF	BLOW			Object	<p>I object to all aspects of this proposal on the grounds that it would add almost half as much again to the number of houses and therefore traffic in Edenfield. This would drastically alter both the nature of the village and the desirability of it as a place to live. - The two local schools are already oversubscribed and the plan seems to contain no plans to expand them. The access to all the proposed sites is very limited and the plan seems to contain no plans to enhance it. - The plan seems to be asking the village to sacrifice its character with no quid pro quo. Whilst the land under the proposal may not be top grade agricultural land, it is useful grazing land. There is much more land only a short drive furthe into the valley which would provde similar housing opportunities whilst not removing grazing land from the green belt, and with more possibilities of satisfactory access.</p> <p>Comment received by email on 13.09.2017: Dear Sirs, having attended the consultation evening on the Rossendale Local Plan at Edenfield Community Centre last night I should like to make the following amendments to my previously registered objection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst several of the council representatives were pen and helpful, at least one was seen hiding her ID badge beneath her clothes; 2. One of the more helpful representatives explained, if I understood correctly, that the reason there is as yet no suggestion for access and egress routes for the proposed development is that the Highways Committee will not discuss these unless there is a proven need. This seems to me to make a mockery of the “forward planning” part of your title. A lot of breath, time and anxiety was wasted last night on this very matter, which could have been saved if at least some plans had been suggested as to the traffic problems which the proposed development would inevitably cause; 3. The colouring of the map was appalling. The key showed housing and similar developments in three VERY similar colours. As a result, some people interpreted Housing HS2 areas as Gipsy and Traveller areas. This again caused unnecessary anxiety among those who studied the map online or at the consultation. A simple variation in colour-coding would have been much more useful and helpful to your representatives. 4. The online map was described as “with Street names”. This was patently not the case when I looked at it online. There was no facility to zoom in sufficiently to examine the proposal in terms of street affected. 5. One of the main causes for concern among residents is the lack of space in the local schools, both of which are, I believe, currently full, and projected to remain oversubscribed for the foreseeable future. When questioned on this matter, one of your representatives replied that you are in consultation with the Education Committee, and that there is capacity in the primary sector “within the borough”. She was unable to specify where this capacity is or will 		<p>I do not object to some development. My son has just bought a house in a very large new development in Huddersfield, as his first step on the property ladder. However, - 1. the land used for this development was poor quality pasture land for horses, not food livestock. - 2. the large development on the fringes of a University City comprises a far smaller proportion of the area of Huddersfield than the proposed development in Edenfield. - 3. there was an exiasting access infrastructure, which is not the case in Edenfield. - - A smaller development, in the region of 10% of the current number of homes would be perfectly acceptable in my view, but the overwhelming development proposed is far too large.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>be, but it is certainly not in Edenfield itself. Several matters arise from this reply:</p> <p>a. Perhaps the development should be where there is capacity;?</p> <p>b. Why is somebody so underprepared allowed to represent the council at such an important meeting?</p> <p>c. Why is the "Forward Planning" department allowed to put forward such suggestions without considering these matters?</p> <p>The only reason I can come up with is that the council is using base Scare Tactics regarding the number of houses to be built and the lack of facilities, so that when it inevitably has to reduce the number and improve the facilities, the residents can feel they have scored a "victory", or that the council has "listened to our concerns". The fact of the matter is that the council has fomented these concerns either deliberately or through crass inefficiency. I would like to repeat my assertion that I am not against SOME development, which the country needs. What I object to is the size of the proposed development in Edenfield, and the slapdash, lazy manner in which the council has presented it.</p> <p>I would like these comments added to those I made in my online objection, and I would like an acknowledgement that this email has been received.</p>		
103	Henry	Botham	-		Object	<p>I object to the scale of the proposals for the development of this land. I live on market street, the main road through Edenfield. This road is already extremely busy and more houses will result in greater volume of traffic. Edenfield is a beautiful village and to build more houses on our green belt land would completely ruin the character of the village and make the lives of existing residents considerably worse. I would seriously consider leaving the village I have loved living in for 10 years. I seriously doubt that the local schools, health service, public transport and other public services in the village could cope with the massively increased resident population. We are already busting at the seams and more populated than at any point in the villages long history. - Irwell Vale has flooded many times in recent years. There is a great deal of evidence to suggest that the prevention of natural drainage through land development causes flooding in low lying areas. The developers are proposing a massive development directly adjacent to Irwell Vale, on land situated above it in the valley. This development would have massive flood implications for Irwell Vale and the residents of the village would have legal recourse on the developers and the council when it inevitably happens. - No houses should be build on our precious, diminishing green belt. Rossendale council has been guilty of allowing some seriously questionable developments to go ahead in recent years, something I doubt neighbouring councils would have done. - Please don't allow this development to become the next hideous example of Rossendale's lack of foresight and chasing quick fix profits.</p>		<p>I am unavailable for the tiny 3 hour window you have allocated for consultation at the community centre but please don't take my non attendance as a sign that I don't feel strongly on the subject. I register my objections here and attend the event in spirit.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
104	john	Valentine	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield it would alter and radically change the village character of Edenfield	-	
105	SUSAN	VALENTINE	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically change the character of the small village of EDENFIELD.	-	
106	Elizabeth	Sanderson	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of the house numbers that are proposed to be built. It would bring far too much congestion to the village, and change the character of Edenfield.	-	
107	Carol	Miles	-	SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256, SHLAA16255, SHLAA16263	Object	I object to the amount of houses being proposed for Edenfield on the grounds of additional traffic (each property perhaps having three cars) - the fact that Market Street has a traffic and parking problem already, and the two schools are already near capacity. The village is known as being a great place to live and these proposed developments will have a detrimental effect on the character of the village.		The joy of living in Edenfield is the access and views of open country and the prospect of this large development with its accompanying infrastructures i.e. sewers, water, gas and electricity and roads will change its character, and not for the better.
108	Glyn	Swain	-		Object	This objection is to the scale of the plan proposed for Edenfield which would change the character of the village to an unacceptable degree. - Questions are also raised concerning the provision of school places available locally and, not least, the management of traffic / parking which is already at saturation levels.	-	
109	Tom	Sanderson	-		Object	We object to the size of the proposed plan, it would build far too much congestion, change the character of Edenfield for the worst.	-	
110	Lisa	Sanderson	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of the proposed plan for Edenfield, it would change the character of the village for the worst and bring far too much congestion.	-	
111	Sandra	Swain	-		Object	This objection is to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. It would radically change the character of the village. Huge concerns are raised regarding the provision of schools and the management of traffic which is currently a major problem.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
112	Colin	Mablesen	-		Object	I am personally horrified at the plans proposed by the council to convert Edenfield Village into a town. I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed, to turn a village which is already suffering too many parked cars on public roads, combined with the accompanying road noise into an even busier town. - - The removal of land from the Green Belt resulting in such a discontinuation of the green landscape that we live in is an unacceptable change to our environment. - - I feel the council have singled out the village of Edenfield in their overall plan for Rossendale, and the sheer scale of house building is disproportionate to the the rest of Rossendale. - - There is no existing infrastructure to support a further 489 houses, in terms of schools, doctors, roads etc and I would not welcome further larger schools and road traffic management schemes to support the increase in housing as this will completely ruin the existing character of the village. - - I feel our lives, community and surrounding landscape will be ruined and I find this proposal utterly unacceptable.		-
113	Leslie	Miles	-	SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256, SHLAA16255, SHLAA16263	Object	The number of houses being proposed for Edenfield will obviously mean that there will at least 3 times as many cars.as houses to provide accommodation for and if these are the all the modern trend of 4 x 4 cars that are being bought today then we will have a major shortage of road space in the area. Are all the houses going to be built with adequate on site parking space and, if not, where are the cars going to be parked? How many free car car parks are to opened and where will they be? - Edenfield may be a desirable place to live at the moment but if the proposed plans are allowed to go ahead then will the end of any reasonable hope for the future. - -		I do not think that much thought for the lives of residents has been taken into account because the very reason that Edenfield is the place that it has become is because nobody has come up with such a radical idea before. The area proposed requires a lot more work on providing facilities for all the extra inhabitants to be absorbed in this area. We have no Post Office, very little Public House space, a very inadequate bus service and not enough other local services to satisfy a lot of people who require more - in their daily lives. The extra number of people expected requires more infrastructure to support the housing planned.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
114	David	Hudson	-		Object	We are objecting to the massive increase of housing numbers and vehicles this will bring to the village of Edenfield. The village already has traffic flow problems with large commercial vehicles from various quarries in the area without adding the potential for another 500 to 1000 cars (average of 2 per household these days). It can be stated that Edenfield is a desirable place to live but I doubt the extra housing will help this character one bit and will, in fact, detract from it's desirability. Development on this scale confined to a small village like Edenfield will have a negative consequences.		Our property and some of those each side of us are bordered by a small stream. The majority of bungalows on the northern side of Eden Avenue and a couple of houses further up have erected fences within their boundaries, in our case, to keep out intruders and dogs. - - According to law we are partially responsible for keeping this stream clear and disposing of cleared materials on our side of the stream, which effectively defines the land between the centre of the stream and our fence-line as being our property. This effectively defines the land, hedgerow and trees on the outside of our fence and on our side of the stream are ours. If a building contractor were to decide to culvert this portion of the stream we would object very strongly because it would open that small but contested portion of our land to being exploited by them. - - Our personal position on this is guided by my wife and I being naturist, e.g., a preference for being nude in our (currently) private and secluded garden when weather allows. If this hedgerow and the trees on what is our land were removed so would be our privacy. If houses were built close to this boundary, our privacy would be gone.
115	Jane	Adams	-		Object	I understand you are planning to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. - - I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. - - There are not enough schools to meet this additional demand, Traffic will be a nightmare due to sheer volume of extra cars/traffic.		-
116	Joyce	Griffiths	-		Object	We do not have the inforstion in Edenfield to accommodate the number of houses you want to build also ther would be - Traffic problem as the roads would not take the volume of cars		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
117	Dominic	Rathmill	-		Object	I wholly object to the proposed building plans, the scale of the plans is far too large and would ruin the character of our village	-	
118	Kim	Roberts	-		Object	This plan is of too larger scale and would disrupt the area and fully spoil this beautiful village	-	
119	Tracey	Staines	-		Object	I absolutely object to using greenbelt land in Edenfield for building the amount of houses that is proposed. Edenfield is a much sought after area however it won't be once you have ruined it by a huge housing development. - Edenfield does not have the social/physical/educational/financial infrastructure to support that amount of houses. We don't have the road system, shops, schools or any other amenities to support that kind of development. - Greenbelt land is earmarked greenbelt for a reason and that is to preserve some environmentally green areas. Building that amount of houses will fundamentally undermine our sense of environment, community and potentially increase crime or introduce more unemployment. - Building that amount of houses will undermine the sense of village and most probably lead to a fall in the cost of house prices. This means that my house will be worth less than what is now. Some people may find themselves in negative equity. - I wouldn't mind but I expect that these houses are not 'affordable' so won't be contributing to the shortage that we have in housing. The shortages apply to those that can't afford to buy expensive houses. Why not build in more affordable areas that are currently already being invested in such as Rawtenstall. That would increase the appeal for people to buy in that area rather than detract from it.	No	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
120	Kirsty	Brennan	-		Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed housing development plans for Edenfield, the reasons for my objections are: - - 1. Edenfield is a small village community and it is for that reason like many others that my husband and I moved here. Increasing the village by the level of development you propose means this will not be a village anymore but a small town. The little road through the village can't cope with anymore extra traffic on it. There is already a development to build 10 properties on the old Horse and Jockey site that is going to be bad enough. We do not have sufficient or sustainable parking for the residents we have now never mind what this development will create. The M66 is already overwhelmed and is a constant source of accident and traffic problems. We do not have a sufficient support network available in the form of bus services, doctors, dentists, schools especially nursery care and primary schools as Edenfield Primary and Stubbins are already fully subscribed. - - 2. My husband and I bought our house specifically for the rural nature of the property, especially the open views that we have out the front of the property looking over the valley from main street. I have often looked out of my window to see foxes and deer in the field opposite and watch the lambs in the springtime playing as the sun sets. This development will have a significant impact on our emotional wellbeing not only as we will lose our view, it will impact the local wildlife but the level of development will significantly increase the noise, dust and debris. I also believe that this will impact the value of our property as this is one of the main selling points of our house. - - 3. My husband has severe heart failure and other complex health issues and is therefore classed as disabled. This development will have a significant negative impact on his health. Firstly the noise, dust and muck from the building works will be excessive and inhibitive especially considering how long it will take to complete the work. Secondly, the level of vehicles and deliveries the site will need will limit our parking access – do the developers plan to compensate residents of market street with a long term private parking solution. Thirdly, my husband can't walk far so if he can't park outside our house potentially you limit his ability to get out and carry out normal daily activities, god forbid the day we may need to call an ambulance. - - 4. We experience enough road debris thanks to the Quarry traffic resulting in excessive window cleaning and also damage to our vehicles as we need to park on the main road. If the development goes ahead this is only going to get worse especially for the duration of the building works. Are the property developers prepared to compensate local residents for this? - - Please, I implore you to leave our green spaces alone.</p>		-
121	Stephen	Swift	-		Object	<p>I object to the erosion of green belt land, and the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.</p>		None

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
122	Norma	Hewitt	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		The village of Edenfield has already got a traffic problem namely the vast number of tipper lorries and other heavy goods vehicles which are constantly running through the village from the quarry from early morning until early evening. Not all but quite a lot NOT observing the 30mph speed limit. To add more heavy traffic to the already high number of vehicles will cause untold damage to the roads and endanger the lives of other road users and pedestrians as the village roads are not designed for this amount of heavy traffic. Add to this the number of extra cars from the proposed houses and it will be catastrophic.
123	Graham	Hewitt	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		At present following the trend in house sales in Edenfield village it is apparent that any properties for sale that are facing the proposed developments are now stalling. Adding more traffic to the already congested road through Edenfield by the tipper lorries from the quarry and other heavy vehicles is not acceptable and very dangerous to other vehicle users and pedestrians. The extra heavy vehicles needed in the building of these properties will only add to the vibration of the surrounding properties as well as the noise and pollution.
124	christine	Hemmings	-		Object	I wish to object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. This would radically alter the character of the village - in fact it will no longer be a village. - - I am not against the development itself - Just the sheer scale of what is proposed.		-
125	Lorna	Mcglynn	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is being proposed for edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
126	Frank	Hemmings	-		Object	I wish to object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. This would radically alter the character of the village - in fact it will no longer be a village. - - I am not against the development itself - Just the sheer scale of what is proposed.		-
127	John	Ayers	-		Object	Edenfield is a village of approximately 1000 houses. Currently, there are problems with parking, particularly on Market Street and Exchange Street, that restrict vehicle movement that, in an emergency situation, could have a significant effect. - - Whilst any future development will no doubt provide for the additional parking requirements, the extra flow of traffic along the afore mentioned streets will only compound the already fragile situation. - - The proposals suggest the possibility of an increase in housing of around 50% in Edenfield. Whilst I appreciate that additional housing may well be required, I consider that the proposals will totally change the character of our village, and for that reason, I object to them. - - Furthermore, the requirements of additional school, medical and other social facilities need to be addressed.		-
128	Angela	Mead			Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
129	michelle	Letchford	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. i live on bury road and we already have much traffic on this road where parking is on the street and cars have to stop at various points to let other car up or down, more traffic would make this road horrendous and very noisy. I also do not believe we have big enough schools in edenfield to cope with the amount of families that may move to the area.		-
130	james	Letchford	-		Object	i object to the scale of what is being proposed for edenfield which would radically change the the character of the village. I feel it would bring to much traffic into an already very busy village especially with the amount of quarry lorries that also drive through the village. There will not be enough school places meaning more people will have to commute their children out of the village for schooling.		-
132	Sarah	Vause	-		Object	The plan would completely alter the character of Edenfield village. The support services would be inadequate eg schools. The infrastructure eg roads would be overwhelmed. At present there is a distinct community within Edenfield, where families know and support each other. Such a large development would destroy this.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
133	Ann	Jones			Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for our village. 489 more houses on an existing stock of a little over 900 houses will transform Edenfield for the worse and totally alter the character of the village.</p> <p>I wish to object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for our village. 489 new houses on an existing stock of a little over 900 will transform the village for the worse and totally change its character which surely should not be what development is about.</p>		<p>No.</p> <p>I do not have a computer but Mr Bradburn has kindly allowed me to use his to make these comments.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
135	Rebecca	Gregson	-		Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed fro Edenfield which would radically alter the character of our village. Traffic is already a problem, not to mention the lack of space in schools and doctors and the effect on house prices. I live here as I want to be surrounded by fields NOT other houses and cars! The proposals are ridiculous and very disappointing.</p> <p>##### LETTER COMMENTS #####</p> <p>I am writing about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove substantial amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt so that it can be built on. It was my misunderstanding that greenbelt land was such that it should be preserved and not built upon? How can it be that suddenly it is ok to release such land for building? The areas I am concerned about are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map that accompanies the plan and are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield <p>I attended a consultation yesterday evening which detailed the various plans for the borough and this only served to escalate my concerns when it is obvious from the maps that the scale of the plans for Edenfield are preposterous! There were various other developments around the borough highlighted but nothing on such a large as Edenfield and the most ridiculous point around that is the other areas are towns of considerable size with less development planned than our small village!</p> <p>The sheer scale of the plans for Edenfield are far too large and would not only ruin the character of our village but life in the village generally as we would lose our currently beautiful surroundings and there is simply no infrastructure to support the plans. The roads are already overcrowded with parked cars and traffic, the schools are full and small, there is no doctor for us already in the village, we must travel to various surgeries. There have been various small developments over the years and these are on a scale that is manageable and not destructive. The very reason it is a desirable place to live is the size and surrounding countryside. If this is lost then surely the current residents will see a considerable decrease in the value of their homes also. With all this in mind I would like to state my objection to these proposals.</p>		Save our greenbelt!
136	stephen	higginbotham	-		Object	<p>I strongly object to the magnitude of the proposals. They are completely impractical , particularly regarding traffic and parking , and would destroy the village character of Edenfield</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
139	Granville	Barrow	-		Object	My family and myself are strongly objecting to the sheer scale of what is proposed for our lovely little village of Edenfield and the radical alteration to the character of Edenfield itself. We have lived here for almost 48 years and have seen many changes in this village but these plans would severely transform Edenfield into a "city like environment" causing untold problems to parking,traffic,overcrowded schools and wildlife, just to name a few of many problems this plan would bring.		-
140	Donna	Cryer			Object	I'm stunned by the Local Plan published by Rossendale Borough Council. Has anyone involved in this plan actually visited our village of Edenfield? - I find it very difficult to believe that anyone could propose a village of approx 900 houses could withstand a further 489!! - Edenfield village would change beyond recognition - and certainly not for the better. It would be unacceptable to allow this village to become a giant car park, to lose the village character and have a huge visual impact on the village. Our close proximity to the by-pass and motorway network should not mean that Edenfield lose what makes it a beautiful village. - This would also have a huge effect on the wildlife in the area. Each of these areas are full of wildlife, evident by taking just a walk around them! - It is evident that the country as a whole requires adequate affordable housing, and I'm certainly not against development - but on the scale planned? - absolutely not. Rossendale Borough Council would be truly foolish to allow this to happen. - - -		-
141	David	Cryer	-		Object	Each school day, I leave the house to drop our daughter at school in Ramsbottom. This is a 3.7mile journey which should take 16 mins. On numerous days this journey is hampered by the sheer amount of traffic that is a direct impact of traffic issues on the by-pass and motorway networks and has taken me up to an hour! The plan to increase housing in Edenfield by over 50% is a move of insanity. It's being driven by Edenfield's close proximity to the motorway network, without the slightest consideration to the full impact on local traffic, local infrastructure (complete lack of!!) and local people. - Edenfield would change beyond recognition. This beautiful village deserves more from it's local council. The loss of land, the noise disturbance and extra traffic would also have a huge negative impact on local wildlife. - Rossendale Borough Council seem to have completely forgotten what green belt means!		-
142	Patrick	Armstrong	-		Object	I am objecting to the size of this development and the lack of increases in local services it would inevitably need		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
143	Christopher	Allen	-		Object	I strongly object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for the village of Edenfield which would radically alter the character, size and dramatically increase the population of the village.	<p>I have spent the past few hours retyping my thoughts on the proposed plans trying to put my views across unfortunately i dont seem to be able to calmly put across how outraged the proposed plans for the village make me. I am 33 and with a 9 year stint living away in the army but still returning when possible to the village i call home have lived here all my life and have unfortunately had to bare witness to numerous housing developments that have not only increased the size of the village but have also been dramatically outside the value of most of the residents, which has brought about the moving out people who have spent there lives here and brought in new people who dont seem to embrace the comunity spirit of village life. I am not agaisnt progress or bringing in new people i understand the village needs to change to embrace the future and grow as looking at historic photographs of the village and surrounding areas prove has happend dramatically in the past but this proposal is too much an seems to be more of a money grab by housing companies in the light of the governments decision to increase housing and open up greenbelt land rather than the progressive growth of the village and the valley as a whole. I understand this is slighty long winded and more than likely wont get read but on the off hand it does i thank you for taking the time to read my views</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
144	Jackie	Heffernan	-		Object	The scale of this development is too much for Edenfield village. Not only will it totally alter the character of the village, more importantly the infrastructure/amenities cannot support so many additional houses. There would be traffic chaos. I would also like to add that the land behind Crow Woods leading down to the bypass has been regularly monitored for slippage over the past few years and there is some evidence of subsidence. How can it be safe to build here?		I understand that council has to generate additional funds and have no objection to development in principle but feel that this is far too much in one small area. I would also be interested to know what percentage of the proposed 489 houses would be dedicated low cost/social housing or would all be high price council tax bands?
145	Barbara	Lewtas	N/A		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. The volume of traffic on Bury Road is already way above what it should be on an unclassified road and the additional building will only make the situation much worse.		No
146	Jane	Guarino	-		Object	As long standing residents. We object to the scale of proposal for Edenfield. In view of the fact that parking is already difficult. School is small and even the teachers have problems parking. the roads are not adequate to house another number of cars. Even more danger for the pupils. - The main street in Edenfield residents have no garages and they all have to park on the roadside. - This school would not be large enough to enroll any more pupils. - The character of the village would also be completely changed there are no local services such as dentist GP all adding to a proposal of future chaos -		-
147	Simon	Crabtree	-		Object	The scale of this proposal will destroy the character of Edenfield as a village and a green space and the consequential traffic and demand on the infrastructure will be far too great. Moreover, although doing it over a period of years will lessen the immediate impact, it will nevertheless have such an impact. - - These plans must be scaled back considerably unless the local plan is to destroy one of the areas which makes Rossendale a place of choice by reason of the quality of life on offer. Some development in every area has to be acceptable if the country as a whole is to build the housing stock in needs but construction on this unprecedented scale is unacceptable. - - The plan is also inconsistent with the general principle of promoting Rossendale as a place to visit. - -		-
148	Mary	Carroll	-		Object	I am opposed to this because of the shear scale of what is proposed, in my view it will totally change the character of the village for the worst.		I do not have a computer but Mr Bradburn has kindly agreed to let me make my comments on his computer.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
156	Susan	Pitt			Object	<p>I am writing about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield, in particular. I understand you are planning to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt, so it can be built on.</p> <p>Below are the areas about which I am particularly concerned, and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan:-</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and, if carried out, would ruin the character of our village. The stress such development would place on the infrastructure would be enormous. An increase in the amount of vehicles on our roads. There is congestion now, so what it would be like with all this extra housing doesn't bear thinking about. Local schools would be unable to cope with a massive influx of pupils, and local doctors and dentists would be stretched beyond limit.</p> <p>I trust you will bear these points in mind when making your final decision</p>		
157	Barry	Pitt			Object	<p>I am writing about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield, in particular. I understand you are planning to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt, so it can be built on.</p> <p>Below are the areas about which I am particularly concerned, and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan:-</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and, if carried out, would ruin the character of our village. The stress such development would place on the infrastructure would be enormous. An increase in the amount of vehicles on our roads. There is congestion now, so what it would be like with all this extra housing doesn't bear thinking about. Local schools would be unable to cope with a massive influx of pupils, and local doctors and dentists would be stretched beyond limit.</p> <p>I trust you will bear these points in mind when making your final decision</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
158	Keith/Barbara	Kushner			Object	<p>We write with regard to the Council's Local Plan and its serious effect on Edenfield and the surrounding area. We understand you are proposing to ask the government to remove large areas of land around the village from Greenbelt so it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which we are particularly concerned and are covered by references HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan; Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>We strenuously object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale and extent of the new housing are far too extensive and would ruin the character and nature of our historic village.</p> <p>We trust common sense will prevail.</p>		
163	S	Gibson			Object	<p>Unfortunately I will be away when the planning and consultation meeting is held on the 12th September, on the proposal for the number of houses to be built in Edenfield.</p> <p>I understand the need for new properties, but I strongly object to the number proposed.</p> <p>The infrastructure ie amenities schools drainage and the amount of extra traffic will cause many problems.</p> <p>I live on Gincroft lane and know the problems of flooding during heavy rains. The drains cannot take the heavy water flow and silt washed down from the hills, leading to flooding onto Market Street.</p> <p>I moved to Edenfield 11 years ago, because of it reminding me of how Prestiwch used to be, but sadly no longer. It lost its character and identity, becoming too big.</p> <p>Please reconsider the number of houses you plan to build and let edenfield remain this unique village I move to.</p> <p>Full of character and warmth</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
169	Philip	Johnson			Object	<p>I write about the Council's plans and how it will affect the Edenfield Village. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas which I am particularly concerned and covered by ref HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan.</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street Edenfield Land off Market Street Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road Edenfield Land off Moorlands View Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large if carried out would ruin the character of the village</p> <p>Received via online survey 04/09/2017: Objection to the scale of this proposal for the Village of Edenfield which would change our beautiful Lancashire village. - - -</p>		<p>Below are a list of disadvantages to village if this proposal goes ahead.</p> <p>Traffic Overflow on Market Street and other main thoroughways - Traffic accidents - Damage to residents vehicles due to double parking - Neighbourhood tension as parking grows into a daily issue for residents - Lose of character to Edenfield village making it no longer a desirable place to live - Down grade of the village - Impact on house pricing due to over population of houses - Possible residents moving due to changing factors - Schooling both primary and secondary - Doctor/ dentist issues</p>
170	Julie	Hancox			Object	<p>I write regarding the Council's local plan and how it will dramatically affect Edenfield and the surrounding area.</p> <p>I understand you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt so it can be developed and built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by ref HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land West of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land West of Moorlands View, Edenfield.</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our already very busy village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
171	Paul D	Hancox			Object	<p>I write regarding the Council's local plan and how it will dramatically affect Edenfield and the surrounding area.</p> <p>I understand you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt so it can be developed and built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by ref HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land West of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land West of Moorlands View, Edenfield.</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our already very busy village.</p>		
173		Greenwood			Object	<p>We write about Council's local plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are areas about which we are particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>We object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
174	Alex	Marsh			Object	<p>I am writing about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. In marche this year, the Prime Minister declared that protecting the Green belt is 'paramount'</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particulary concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan: land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and, if carried out, would ruin the character of our village.</p> <p>Access to proposed developments: Market street is the single route through the village and is typically double parked for most if its length, because many of the houses are old terraces with no rear access or space for a garage. Providing access to the proposed developments would greatly increase the load on an already well used route. 489 extra houses, some with one car, many nowadays will have two = 750 extra cars.</p> <p>Traffic through the village: Edenfield currently has reasonable transport links to nearby towns. Buses and cars travel reasonably freely. Adding 750 cars to the morning and evening "rush" periods would result in gridlock. Even those that go to the nearest bypass or motorway access have to get there through the village. When the bypass is obstructed by accident, bad weather or sheer volume of traffic, drivers always seek alternative routes - typically through Edenfield.</p> <p>Access to the proposed building sites: The land to the west of Moorlands View is currently accessed via a narrow lane, by the farmer who rents/uses the land. It is difficult to see how building contractors with large vehicles and (subsequently) how the traffic from an estate of 45 houses would cope. There are similar concerns regarding access ti and from the other proposed sites.</p> <p>School capacity: 489 extra houses = approx. 1000 extra people, plus children, say 1 per house on average = 500 extra children both primary schools serving Edenfield are full, as are other local schools in Helmshore and Haslingden. 500 children translates to at least 2 full primary school with additional impact at secondary level. I see no plans to build the necessary school accomodation. If parents choose to place their children in more distant schools, the impact on transport and road use is obvious.</p>		<p>I have a prior commitment on September 12th Please ensure that my views are represented at the consultation meeting, thank you.</p> <p>The Council needs to give consideration to the houses in Edenfield that are already within 200 metres of the bypass. Residents are already affected by the traffic fumes and noise levels. These residents pay Council tax and are surely entitled to have the Council and Lancashire County Council make efforts to improve the environment. - Permitting the relaxation of the Green Belt is no way to improve the environment, for current or potential future residents. - You may find that smaller scale developments, e.g. 50 or 100 houses, which would have a smaller impact on local services and transport, would meet fewer objections.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

Amenities:

Local shops: no post office, one small convenience store, forcing increased use of local supermarkets which will contribute to traffic to and from Edenfield at all times of day.

There may be benefits for the butcher, the hairdressers, the bakery, the chip shop and Chinese takeaway - they may find they are over-loaded! We have small pharmacy, recently threatened with closure under government schemes to reduce costs.

Doctors' and dentists' practices are heavily used and probably have little spare capacity.

Air Quality:

I note that all of the proposed sites for development are close to the Edenfield bypass. They are in fact, mostly within around 200 metres of the bypass. The bypass is heavily used in morning and even peak periods, and has significant traffic throughout the day.

Recent studies have revealed approximately 40,000 excess deaths per year across the UK, and these are linked to living close to major roads.

Particulate matter (PM5 and PM10) from car exhaust plus tyre and brake wear are linked to asthma and other respiratory conditions. Nox gases in exhaust fumes also contribute. Children are likely to suffer more than adults as their lungs will be exposed during their development.

Noise is another factor, apparently linked to the development of dementia.

Our own house is approximately 110 metres from the bypass and most visitors comment on the traffic noise. Yes, we have double glazing, but nobody lives only inside their house, with all the windows closed. They enjoy gardening, sitting out in the sun, children are expected to play out their gardens. The section of the bypass that passes over the bridge over Blackburn Road is very poorly screened and is particularly noisy. This affects two of the proposed sites. Anyone who does venture outdoors on the sites of these proposed developments will be exposed to noise, traffic fumes and will be condemned to develop significant health issues as a result.

Please consider:

Your proposal is to remove these areas from Green belt status, with government backing, in the interests of allowing the construction of 489 homes. It is reasonable to suggest that, in a society increasingly fond of litigation, the authorities (local council, county council, government) could be sued for negligence because they saw fit to approve the construction of homes within areas known to cause health issues and excess premature deaths. This is borne out by studies in the USA and the UK. Is this a risk any competent, responsible authority should take?

Comment received via the online questionnaire (05/09/2017):

The scale of the proposal for Edenfield is unreasonable and prompts concerns

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>in several ways: - Access to and from the proposed sites would greatly increase traffic in and through the village, initially access for building contractors and subsequent traffic from 489 houses. - Amenities to support the extra families is not in place. The local schools are full, doctors' and dentists' practices are near capacity. Families who place their children in more distant schools will further increase traffic in the village. - ALL of the proposed sites are close to the Edenfield bypass, a busy commuter route, heavily used by goods vehicles throughout the day. There have been several studies showing that living within 200 metres of busy roads is detrimental to health, particularly for children. Exposure to exhaust fumes, PM5 and PM10 from exhausts, tyres and brakes, and high levels of NOx gases is known to contribute to asthma, respiratory failure and other conditions. - Noise is a further factor, NOT simply solved by double glazing. - The Council should bear in mind that their decision to relax the Green Belt and thereby allow construction of a large number of homes, brings with it a responsibility to families who purchase these homes. If the Councils decision is found to have increased the burden of ill-health within these families, which would fall on the local NHS, then those same families could consider litigation. - Apart from the practical matters outlined above, adding 489 houses to a village of 900 houses is no way to provide homes in a "desirable" location. The 489 extra house would destroy that same desirability.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
175	Sandra	Marsh			Object	<p>I am writing about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. In marche this year, the Prime Minister declared that protecting the Green belt is 'paramount'</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particulary concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan:</p> <p>land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and, if carried out, would ruin the character of our village.</p> <p>Access to proposed developments: Market street is the single route through the village and is typically double parked for most if its length, because many of the houses are old terraces with no rear access or space for a garage. Providing access to the proposed developments would greatly increase the load on an already well used route. 489 extra houses, some with one car, many nowadays will have two = 750 extra cars.</p> <p>Traffic through the village: Edenfield currently has reasonable transport links to nearby towns. Buses and cars travel reasonably freely. Adding 750 cars to the morning and evening "rush" periods would result in gridlock. Even those that go to the nearest bypass or motorway access have to get there through the village. When the bypass is obstructed by accident, bad weather or sheer volume of traffic, drivers always seek alternative routes - typically through Edenfield.</p> <p>Access to the proposed building sites: The land to the west of Moorlands View is currently accessed via a narrow lane, by the farmer who rents/uses the land. It is difficult to see how building contractors with large vehicles and (subsequently) how the traffic from an estate of 45 houses would cope. There are similar concerns regarding access ti and from the other proposed sites.</p> <p>School capacity: 489 extra houses = approx. 1000 extra people, plus children, say 1 per house on average = 500 extra children both primary schools serving Edenfield are full, as are other local schools in Helmshore and Haslingden. 500 children translates to at least 2 full primary school with additional impact at secondary level. I see no plans to build the necessary school accomodation. If parents choose to place their children in more distant schools, the impact on transport and road use is obvious.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Amenities:</p> <p>Local shops: no post office, one small convenience store, forcing increased use of local supermarkets which will contribute to traffic to and from Edenfield at all times of day.</p> <p>There may be benefits for the butcher, the hairdressers, the bakery, the chip shop and Chinese takeaway - they may find they are over-loaded! We have small pharmacy, recently threatened with closure under government schemes to reduce costs.</p> <p>Doctors' and dentists' practices are heavily used and probably have little spare capacity.</p> <p>Air Quality:</p> <p>I note that all of the proposed sites for development are close to the Edenfield bypass. They are in fact, mostly within around 200 metres of the bypass. The bypass is heavily used in morning and even peak periods, and has significant traffic throughout the day.</p> <p>Recent studies have revealed approximately 40,000 excess deaths per year across the UK, and these are linked to living close to major roads.</p> <p>Particulate matter (PM5 and PM10) from car exhaust plus tyre and brake wear are linked to asthma and other respiratory conditions. Nox gases in exhaust fumes also contribute. Children are likely to suffer more than adults as their lungs will be exposed during their development.</p> <p>Noise is another factor, apparently linked to the development of dementia. Our own house is approximately 110 metres from the bypass and most visitors comment on the traffic noise. Yes, we have double glazing, but nobody lives only inside their house, with all the windows closed. They enjoy gardening, sitting out in the sun, children are expected to play out their gardens. The section of the bypass that passes over the bridge over Blackburn Road is very poorly screened and is particularly noisy. This affects two of the proposed sites. Anyone who does venture outdoors on the sites of these proposed developments will be exposed to noise, traffic fumes and will be condemned to develop significant health issues as a result.</p> <p>Please consider:</p> <p>Your proposal is to remove these areas from Green belt status, with government backing, in the interests of allowing the construction of 489 homes. It is reasonable to suggest that, in a society increasingly fond of litigation, the authorities (local council, county council, government) could be sued for negligence because they saw fit to approve the construction of homes within areas known to cause health issues and excess premature deaths. This is borne out by studies in the USA and the UK. Is this a risk any competent, responsible authority should take?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
176	R	Paules			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>land off Exchange St. Edenfield land west of Market St. Edenfield land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
178	Liz	Stooke			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan:</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land West of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land West of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans is far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of the village</p> <p>Online comment received 07.09.2017:</p> <p>Edenfield has approx. 900 houses at the moment. The proposed development of 489 houses would increase the housing by over 50% and result in a total transformation of the village. - Edenfield is a rural village made up of predominantly stone built terraced houses lining the main roads with a small number of newer brick or stone built developments dotted around the village surrounded by hills and farmland. There is a balance here between two up two down starter homes and larger houses, between stone and brick, between old and new, between farmland and gardens, between buildings and green spaces. Unlike many villages in this valley it is open and exposed with long views...it has a unique character. - I am not opposed to development, it is inevitable. Thirty years ago as well as the church and schools Edenfield had many shops, a bank, a post office, a doctors surgery, a garage and petrol station and numerous pubs. Over the years facilities have closed and many have been turned into flats and other types of houses. With each new development comes the extra demand on school places and surgeries, more cars on the roads, an increase in demand for parking and so on. But at least when the housing development is relatively small the community has had a chance to absorb these new demands. To a large extent this is what has happened in Edenfield and why it continues to be a "desirable place to live". - I am opposed to the sheer scale of these proposals</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
180	Angela	Ashworth			Object	<p>I write about the Council's local plans and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land lanf around the village from the green belt to enable building. The areas below are the ones I am particulary concerned about and they are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan.</p> <p>Land off Exchange street, Edenfield Land west off market st, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land West of MoorLands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans would totally ruin the character of Edenfield and in particular the massive increase in traffic on the village roads would pose a threat to the safety of the residents, thinking particulary of the primary school which is located by the main rd.</p> <p>Please reconsider.</p>		
181	SW	Higginbottom			Object	<p>I write to object to the above plans in reports:</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market St, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>My objections are on the following grounds</p> <p>Traffic - The village is already a bottleneck, particularly market street. I have great difficulty exiting my drive onto market street. The congestion would be greatly accentuated if the proposed plan led to housing devleopment on the areas concerned, so I presume that the access to (i) and (ii) above would be onto market street.</p> <p>Parking - This is already a major problem. I often cannot get into/and off my drive. Further housing in the village, and the related traffic increase would only make the existing problem even worse.</p> <p>Character of Edenfield - If development proceeded as proposed, Edenfield would completely lose it's semi rural village character and would become an urban through flows (more in the nature of Brandlesholme)</p> <p>Schools, doctors etc - development on the proposed could not be adequately serviced by the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
182	Rebecca	Priestman			Object	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan:</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		
183	J	Davies			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I Understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered ny reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompaies the Plan:</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans is far too large and if carriedo ut would ruin the character of our village</p>		
184	Sarah	Williams			Object	<p>I am writing in regard to the proposed building of 500 houses in Edenfield which I am definitely not in favour of. The reasons being are that not only will it be taking away the natural beauty of the area and will almost double the population but also I feel the road systems, school, medical care and other essentials will be lacking. In the 40 years I have lived here I have seen the demise of many of the essential commodoties. The doctors surgery is no longer here or the post office. At one time there was a park, a greengrocers and a paper shop. No longer do these amenities exist. It is a nightmare driving down Market Street, now with cars parked on either side and at school time is even worse. With even more traffic and school children attending the only primary school in the village it will be difficult.</p> <p>My own children went to stubbins Primary Schoolmany years ago which now a days also has cars parked on both sides of the road.</p> <p>In recent years there has been building of houses which I feel have been accomodated very well. I realise there is a need for housing but 500 I feel will be far too many and will destroy the character of the village.</p>		P.S I cannot attend the meeting next week due to other commitments so I am writing my objection

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
185	Ron	Williams			Object	I am writing in protest at your proposal to build 500 houses in the centre of Edenfield, Market Street is a nightmare as it is without any additional extra traffic. The two schools cannot accommodate large numbers of extra children and the village facilities are not what they were. In the past few years we have lost the post office, the newsagents, the doctors and the methodist chapel, the bank closed a while ago, surely people want to live closer to these amenities not to be dumped where services don't exist. The whole character of our lovely village would be changed for the worst, and whilst I acknowledge that people have to live somewhere until roads are improved, car parking made available, and the provision of essential services restored, your plans appear to be ludicrous to say the least, unfortunately I cannot be at next weeks meeting but I'. Openly encouraging my friends & neighbours to be present and object forcefully.		
186	Innocenzo	Guarino	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village	-	
187	Mark	Johnson	-		Object	Edenfield does not have the infrastructure to support such a development. I object to the scale of what is proposed which would radically alter the character of the village. There is plenty of brown field sites in rossendale, these should be optimised.	-	
189	John	Entwistle	-		Object	I object to the size and scale of these proposals. The impact would be severe and radically alter the character of our village for the worse.	-	
190	Dorothy	Johnson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the plan which will radically alter the character of the village. - - No provision for extra medical treatment or schools. - - Parking would be impossible.	-	
191	John	Partington	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village	-	
192	Jennifer	Law	-		Object	This plan will affect the quality of life for the village which suffers now from parking problems, no doctors surgery or post office. The School is over subscribed. The scale of what is proposed is going to alter the village detrimentally and the infrastructure and traffic problems will be significant and not possible to manage. Smaller sites for improvement of the area should be used not valuable green space.	-	
193	Richard	Hesketh	-		Object	I object to the proposed removal of Greenfield land in the plans above as this would significantly alter the character of and benefits to the residents. - The size of the proposed development would impact hugely on local amenities, utilities and infrastructure. It is hard enough obtaining small improvements to local roads etc without suddenly introducing a massive physical, geographical, environmental and social change like this one.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
194	Paul	Garner	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposed developments in Edenfield which will radically alter the character of the village. To increase the size of the village by over 50% is irresponsible and will put pressure on roads, schools, parking.		-
196	Paul	Dugdale	-		Object	I object due to the huge size of the proposed development, the village of Edenfield could not cope with further traffic going through an already congested road. When the Bypass gets blocked how would you propose to keep traffic moving? Also ask your bus drivers from Rosso, what it is like trying to keep to a time-table going through Edenfield.		-
197	Di	Laycock	N/A		Object	I strongly object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield, which would radically alter the character of our village.		-
198	Lynda	Dugdale	-		Object	We have only been residents here for less than two years and have regularly observed the village to be a bottle-neck, especially at peak times and also an influx of vehicles when schools open and close. - Buses are also unreliable due to my above comments.		Build on your own doorstep - NOT OURS.
199	Julie	Fortune			Object	<p>I object to size and scale of this development project. This will completely change the character of Edenfield village. The village is currently at capacity with the amount of vehicles that park along Market Street. Adding more homes will increase the amount of traffic and bring this small village to a stand still. Parking is all ready a problem and that will be unbearable making residents begin to mark there homes with no parking signs and the like. - - Schools are a major concern too as all the surrounding primary and secondary schools in the area being full and appeals for places are constant. Are there plans for a new school too?</p> <p>Comments received by letter (06/09/2017): I writre about the Council's plans and how it will affect the Edenfield Village. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt so that it can be built on. These are the areas wich I am particular concerned and covered by ref HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan. Land off Exhance Street Edenfield Land off Market Street Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road Edenfield Land off Moorlands View Edenfield I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large if carried out would ruin the character of the village</p>		<p>Below are a list of disadvantages to village if this proposal goes ahead. - - Traffic Overflow on Market Street and other main throughways - Traffic accidents - Damage to residents vehicles due to double parking - - Neighbourhood tension as parking grows into a daily issue for residents - Lose of character to Edenfield village making it no longer a desirable place to live - Down grade of the village - - Impact on house pricing due to over population of houses - Possible residents moving due to changing factors - Schooling both primary and secondary - Doctor/ dentist issues -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
201	John	Crossley	-		Object	I object to the number of proposed dwellings that must be planned on a proposal of this size. There are about 1000 dwellings in the village at the moment and this proposal would mean an increase of roughly 50% thus radically changing the character of the village. - Have the following points been considered if so I would be delighted to know the answers - - The increase in children, with only one small primary school (already full) - The increase in car parking required on Market street for the extra traffic, at least 500 cars. Traffic on the main road is a problem now with cars parking on both sides. - The general state of the local roads without adding the extra traffic during and after the building of these extra properties. - The potential increase in crime within the area with no increase in local policing. - The current problem with the lack of any local medical and dental practice would only increase the pressure in Rawtenstall. - -		On the surface it looks like a badly thought out plan with no thought given to the infrastructure required. I think the bean counters have thought, 500 extra council tax incomes, wonderful, bugger the local community lets get the cash.
202	Barry	Padgett	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-
203	Stuart	Crompton	N/A		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. With the location of Merlewood in the Village, sandwiched between Rochdale Rd and Bury Rd we are constantly troubled by heavy traffic during the day, and when the Edenfield Bypass is blocked, very often with accidents and to a lesser degree road works, we are assaulted 24 hours a day with the amount of traffic noise and vibration that has no option but to pass through the village. - - Enough is enough, the village cannot take any more traffic, and neither can we! -		The village does not have the required facilities, in every sense, to cope with quantity of houses proposed, it is not just the cost of house building to consider. The council cannot cope with what exists now.
204	Kenneth Frank	Holden	-		Object	I object to the sheer volume of new proposed housing - The 2 schools in the village are already over subscribed. - All traffic from the proposed developments will have to be funneled on to the already very busy road through the village - The proposed development will radically alter the character of the village		None
205	Barbara	Holden	-		Object	I object to the sheer number of house that have been planned - The 2 schools in the village are already full - The road through the village is at peak times very congested - The sheer scale of the proposed developments will drastically alter the whole characture of the village - Land drainage and existing sewers will also be affected		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
207	Claire	Diack	Resident		Object	<p>I am objecting to the enormous number of houses to be built. There will be a huge strain on local services to the point of strangling the viable community that we have. - In recent years we have seen our GP Practice be taken away, the reason at the time was the community was not large enough to keep the one we had. - We have seen Edenfield Primary School enlarged numerous times to accommodate an increase of pupils, with this in mind, do you propose to halt access for those residing outside the village to ensure those children who do reside in the village have access to their local school, or have you got plans to build another school in what would become an overcrowded village. - If you build 489 houses, you can estimate that this could increase vehicles per residence to about 733, this calculation is made on an average of 1.5 vehicles per household, the affects of these vehicles moving around the village will cause traffic issues, we already have problems with parking, problems which are exacerbated when there are either, road works, the bypass is closed due to incidents. - The whole village main road has long rows of terraced houses, no where in the village are parking provisions made for these homes, in the row I live in there are five houses and eight cars. If there was yellow lines placed where do you think we will park? - If these houses are built, we will not be a village again, we will be a village of houses constantly for rent for people to take advantage of, we will see an increase in crime, we are a hop away from the motorway network, we don't have community police anymore, who will look after us and protect us, and investigate our crimes. - -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
210	Karen	Lester	-		Object	<p>The plans do not meet the needs of the existing village residents of Edenfield- - Maintaining rural villa character - The proposed developments will damage the special character and setting of the village. The urbanisation on such a scale will mean the village becomes a small town. To build houses on such a large scale will turn Edenfield into another suburb from which to commute. Helmshore is a good example of how local rural villages in Lancashire are being over developed - Housing - There is no demand locally for such large areas of housing development. The plans for Edenfield are completely disproportionate with the rest of Rossendale, yet there is no evidence that Edenfield has such a high need for housing. - Green Belt - Edenfield will loose a huge proportion of its green belt. There are no exceptional circumstances or special cases which warrant any release of such a large area of green belt for development.Green belt is there for a purpose and any reduction means fewer areas are safeguarded to prevent urban sprawl. Building on Green Belt land should not be considered, especially in an area so close to the Manchester conurbation. It is important that these areas are protected from development. For years people have lived in Edenfield in reliance of the existence of Green Belt land. They have had assurances from the Government that green Belt land will be protected. The decision to release Green belt is contrary to guidance by the NPPF. and any development on the Green Belt is wholly inappropriate. - Services - Developing areas of dense housing will impact on the life in the village.Infrastructure will be put under great strain, roads in particular, but also schools, health services and utilities. There is no access to the By pass (joining the M66) at Edenfield so traffic tends to go through the village rather than bypass it. Any housing development would potentially, lead to more road development, school expansions, and other road management controls such as traffic lights - Well being - Living in a semi rural area brings health and well being benefits. People benefit from the green open scenery and views, something they have lived with for years. To urbanise the village to such an extent will make living in the village more stressful and bring with it all the associated social problems of urban living. Access to open countryside will be reduced and the attraction of living in Edenfield will diminish - Property Value Property will be devalued as views of expansive hills and woods are blocked by urban sprawl and the village becomes a less desirable place in which to live - Costs - Local Tax - Costs to the general public will increase for more highway maintenance, refuse removal, sewers and water services- all met by the public, directly or indirectly, through higher demand for services. Rossendale Council will have to find more money for the services they provide through local taxes.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
212	Charles	Morrison	-		Object	<p>I have been a resident of Edenfield throughout most of my life - moving here aged 6. I now live here with my young family. - - It is a small and characterful village with modest facilities such as shops and services, but with the benefit of being surrounded by green space. - - The proposal for the wholesale removal of the protected greenbelt down the west side of the entire village, and the construction across this space that would inevitably follow is a great concern to me and I would like to object most strongly to the proposals named above, and state that the scale of change is far too large for the village. - - I understand the pressures on councils to support the building of new houses across the country, and I do not object to the building of new houses, but I believe passionately that it should be done with integrity, and with careful consideration given to existing infrastructure and residents, and not just on the basis of availability of land. - - I also understand that these changes could, and will most probably result in the building of up to 489 houses on large estates that will transform the very nature of where we live. I understand Peel Holdings and Taylor Wimpey have vested interests in much of the land in question, and I'm sure will be lobbying hard for these changes to go through. - - I believe that these changes to the greenbelt would change - negatively and irreparably - the character, attractiveness and rural nature of our small village. It would put strain on the roads - already congested, it would cause problems with the local schools - already oversubscribed. The village has also experienced cuts to services - post office, GP, and bus services have all gone / reduced massively over recent years. This is not a village geared up to support a 50% increase in its population and changes at this scale would be unfair, and affect negatively existing residents. . - - I write to ask you to please prevent this from proceeding on this scale. There is the potential for building in Edenfield without removing the greenbelt, and in a way that would be sympathetic to the surroundings. Removing the greenbelt will have so many negative impacts on Edenfield - please help its residents with your decision and stop this wholesale reconstruction of our village. - - Sincerely and with thanks</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
213	Grace	Barmak	-		Object	I absolutely object to all of this. - How can this lovely small village cope with such an invasion of houses and people? - The only benefit of this proposal is that it would put more money into the pockets of the greediest people who do not care about our land, our people or our country. You cannot destroy this area of greenbelt. - It would DESTROY further our: - ROADS - which are already under the strain of the trucks that hurtle through and the traffic that often comes off the motorway and bypass; - DOCTORS - as they are already full with patients from the area and it would be hard to cope with such an influx of people. - SCHOOL - which is already full to capacity and has around 30 children per class and so could not accommodate any more children. - AIR POLLUTION - which is already bad enough with the trucks coming through and the motorway being so close by. - FLOODED AREAS - which would just become worse! This is an area of great vulnerability and is prone to flooding - and Irwell Vale is proof of this, as is Chatterton, Stubbins and Nuttall Park it is crazy to think that we would dig further into this fragile hill and think that there would be no problems - are you mad? - TRAFFIC SITUATION - so approx. 500 more houses = 2 cars per house = 1000 more cars per day up and down the village. How could this benefit anyone????? It would be gridlock everyday. - NO - STOP THIS PROPOSAL NOW PLEASE.....PLEASE HAVE SENSEEDENFIELD VILLAGE SAYS NO.		This area is desirable for a reason - - If you did this to this beautiful area and the village of Edenfield then it would soon become undesirable and it would attract 'undesirables'. - Rossendale Council should start to make some good decisions instead of selfish and greedy ones - just look at the Asda and the McDonalds in Rawtenstall - they should never have been allowed - please be stronger, and better and think about your people and communities for once instead of always thinking about the dosh!
214	Paul	Hancox	-		Object	I object strongly to the scale to what is proposed for Edenbridge which would totally destroy the village and its surrounding area causing major traffic, parking and pollution issues which are already an issue for the local residents. - Traffic volumes, noise, speed, vibration and pollution caused by quarry and farming vehicles would be dramatically increased and only add to an existing major issue.		Traffic volume, speed and noise are of major concern to us locals in Edenfield. In our section of Bury road we must have at least one incident a month regarding damaged cars from quarry and other very large lorries. The volume of additional cars which would be generated by these plans would cause gridlock, frustration and above all, make the roads a major safety hazard!
215	Jeffrey	Yates	-		Object	I object to so many houses being built in such a small village when the roads around us are so busy already. the schools are already full and traffic comes to a standstill children are going to and from school .the village cannot tolerate any more traffic . we do not mind small developments eg 20 to 30 houses but come on 500 ridiculous		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
216	Paul	White	none		Object	I feel that the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield is far too much. It would considerably, in fact radically alter the whole character of Edenfield. It would be detrimental to Edenfield and it's residents. - Therefor I object most strongly to the council's proposals to allow 489 houses to be built in Edenfield. - I do not/cannot drive, I do not own a car therefor I am dependant upon public transport for all aspects of life...doctors, dentists, hospitals, groceries, social events, etc. - I feel sure that the bus services provided by the Rosso bus company for Edenfield will be greatly affected both during the proposed building of these houses and afterwards. - In this day and age my family and I (four adults in total) are somewhat in the minority...all being non-drivers. - Image the additional number of cars in Edenfield if 489 houses are built! - In fact the 482, 483, 484 bus services from Accrington, Haslingden, Rawtenstall and Bacup to and from Bury will be greatly affected as all these services run through Edenfield. - Market Street, the main thorough fare through Edenfield is a bootle neck now with parked cars on both sides of the street, running the full length of the street. - In respect to schools...Edenfield has one small Primary School. There is one more small Primary School located nearby Stubbins village which takes some Edenfield children. - Neither of these schools are for the sole use of Edenfield (or Stubbins) residents. - To repeat, I object most strongly to the council's proposals to allow 489 houses to be built in Edenfield.		None.
217	Paul	Clarke	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed in Edenfield. - This would radically alter the character of the village. - Traffic would increase dramatically in what is already extremely dangerous with all the lorries that travel through it		-
218	Bronwyn	Langley	-		Object	I object to the scale of the plan proposed as I feel it is too large and will adversely affect the character of the village		Parking and traffic on Market Street is already a problem and what plans are there car parks, schools, doctors etc.
220	Susan	Crossley	-		Object	I am objecting to the size of the building and the affect that this will have on the village of Edenfield. The massive scale of what is proposed for Edenfield would cause so many issues with parking, schools, doctors, and the amount of traffic especially when there are problems on the bypass through to Rawtenstall which causes huge problems through the village. - This would also have a knock on effect to Helmshore, Haslingden and Rawtenstall ! - - -		- - A very badly thought out plan ! - -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
221	Julia	Hancox	-		Object	I strongly object to the scale that is proposed for Edenbridge which would totally disrupt the village and the surrounding area creating major traffic, parking and pollution issues which are already an issue for the local residents and would make things much worse. - Traffic volumes, noise, speed, vibration and pollution caused by quarry and farming vehicles would be dramatically increased and only add to an existing major issue not to forget the health and safety aspect.		Traffic volume, speed and noise are of major concern to us locals in Edenfield. In our section of Bury road we must have at least one incident a month regarding damaged cars from quarry and other very large lorries. - The volume of additional cars which would be generated by these plans would cause - gridlock, frustration and above all, make the roads a major safety hazard! - Pollution again is an major issue in the area and to remove the greenfield restriction which will result in a huge increase in pollution would be insane and reckless to say the least.
223	Jennifer	Barnfield	-		Object	The scale of this development would radically alter the nature of the village . The infra structure in terms of road access,would be overloaded . There is one main road through the village which is already busy at peak times. If traffic is re routed through the village because of problems on the Edenfield by pass there is a constant stream of vehicles . - Cars are parked on each side of Market Street already . More houses on the scale suggested would make the traffic flow on Market Street horrendous . - Local schools would not support a large influx of pupils so that schools would inevitably have to be enlarged and it seems there are no plans to increase their size at present . - Local G. P. Services are already stretched and it is difficult to see how so many new residents could be served by existing services . - All the latest research suggests that living so near a major by pass causes increases in asthma and other health problems so that the quality of life offered to these new residents might leave a lot to be desired . Noise pollution from the by pass would undoubtably be a problem for them . - As resident of 45 years it is not that I object to the development of land per se but that the proposed scale of this development fundamentally alters the nature of this village .		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
224	William	Barnfield	-		Object	Whilst the government continues to pay lip service to maintaining the Green Belt it will give councils permission to erode it, so in effect they are inviting councils to do their dirty work for them. - In order to increase Council Tax revenue, and for whatever other inducements, Rossendale CC are prepared to 'sacrifice' Edenfield, downgrading it from a pleasant village to a teeming suburb. Is this a Council fit to represent us or should we be with Ramsbottom? - The present schools, roads, parking etc are only just sufficient for the existing population. The proposed housing is right next to the motorway, condemning the new residents to an unhealthy and noise-ridden existence. Current residents will be living in a less pleasant place. - The whole plan smacks of Council's desperation, developers' greed and Tory hypocrisy. -		Our village is already being blighted by the fortress the developers have erected around the Horse and Jockey car park. The pub itself has been left to rot for years. Just shows the sort of "people" we are dealing with!
225	Jill	Sutcliffe	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
226	Steven	Sutcliffe	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which could radically alter the character of the village		-
227	Fiona	Lewis	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. - The infrastructure cannot support further housing at this scale due to the following reasons: - - The floods we experienced in Irwell vale came from surface water coming down the hill, having inadequate drainage by having more housing and losing the green fields, shrubbery and trees etc will only make this much much worse. - - The transport infrastructure cannot support additional vehicles in the village, there is already parking problems. - The m66 at peak hours is a car park already. - - Schools are already full, traffic is bad on the small narrow roads. - - Edenfield's characteristic charm is of a small village with a small and strong community. This scale of housing will alter this drastically. -		-
228	Ashley	Lewis	-		Object	There are sufficient brownfield sites in Lancashire to develop before we begin desecrating the green belt. The green belt was hard won and it is more important than ever that it should be protected. Who really stands to gain from this development? Not the poor of the area who won't be able to afford these homes, nor the local residents who's environs will be irreparably diminished by having the village 's resources squeezed. Allowing this development is incredibly short sighted and driven purely by greed on the part of the developers and one wonders why any councillor would ever support it unless they stood to gain personally.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
229	Ryan	Chan	-		Object	This is a ridiculous plan to think that a small village like Edenfield can support this many proposed housing, it will be totally spoilt by the huge influx of cars moving in and out of the village. - - The development of larger housing with poor travel infrastructure can only mean larger cars (probably two per household) spoiling the air quality travelling to work and to schools in the next town because the smaller schools nearby are over subscribed. - - Added to this the flood risks to the houses further down the hill. - - There are many unused industrial units and older housing which can be developed and should be considered first before turning to green fields for development.	-	
230	Margaret	Entwistle	-		Object	I object to the huge scale of proposed housing for Edenfield, which would radically change the character of the village. - Stubbins and Edenfield Schools are almost full to capacity, and increased traffic along Market St. would be unable to cope at peak times. Parking in the village is already difficult and this would be greatly exacerbated. -		I am not against housing development in Edenfield but just the proposed number of dwellings.
231	Owen	Gregson	-		Object	I object to the large numbers of houses proposed for Edenfield which would render the village unrecognisable. - Moreover the main gripe here is it is on Greenbelt land. The whole idea of greenbelt land is the it is to stay GREEN and not be built upon! I have lived here for 10 years and spent a lot of money and effort improving my house within the village and it would not be the same place to live if these plans go ahead. It is very upsetting to think this may happen to our village. - There is not enough space for the cars we have now and the small school can certainly not accommodate more residents. - It is unbelievable to think that this is even being suggested when it is obvious the infrastructure is not there to cope with the plans		I can only re-iterate that Greenbelt land should not be built upon and our village will be ruined with the proposed plans. Whilst there is a need for more housing, more suitable sites need to found.
232	Sarah	Hardman	-		Object	Edenfield is a small village. We no longer have a Post Office. Most of the local pubs have closed down. The chemist is under threat. We have no doctor or dentist. - - The village school is already heavily oversubscribed (my five-year-old son attends) and should family housing be built on such a large scale, it will be unable to cope. Stubbins school is also very oversubscribed. - - Parking is an issue in the village and there is currently a very high volume of traffic passing through. Double-parked vehicles make access an issue; a potential extra 500-1000+ cars will create serious problems. - - In short: we lack the infrastructure to support such a massive potential development. I grew up in Helmshore and it is almost unrecognisable now due to huge overdevelopment. I understand that the council wants to develop the more 'appealing' areas of Rossendale as they can ultimately pocket more money in council tax. However, by effectively doubling the size of the village it will lose its character and sink under the extra demands made on it. - - It seems to me that the only ones set to benefit from such an over development are greedy landowners and the council coffers. Please leave our green spaces alone, look at more suitable sites and reconsider Edenfield becoming the next Helmshore.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
233	carol	hanson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield, not only can the infrastructure not sustain such growth, this will take a large amount of greenbelt land away. This will also alter the village so much, it will no longer really be a village. - There are already traffic problems in Edenfield, especially when there are problems or road works on the M66 or A56, how much more do you think these roads can take. Given the lack of public transport that services Edenfield the people who would be living in these new homes would need cars to get them anywhere.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
234	Lucy	Reynolds	-		Object	<p>I would like to strongly object against the release of Green Belt land in Edenfield for housing development in excess of 300 properties. - The development of this land would result in pressure on land and local infrastructure in A56/M66 corridor and have a significant impact both environmentally ? losing areas of ecological value ? and visually on the landscape and character of the local area. - The additional population would increase demands on already overstretched infrastructure such as schools. Families from the Edenfield area ? including ourselves ? already have to send our children to school in the Bury area as the schools in Edenfield do not have the capacity required. - The Council should not be unduly pressurised into releasing Green Belt as it is a preferred option for interested developers due to higher margins - they should consider using suitable brownfield sites and reviewing density policies to increase the number of dwellings achievable in existing land supply as a priority. The council should be able to demonstrate robust assessments of the capacity of brownfield and other land to accommodate growth across the whole of the Borough. - The Council should also demonstrate fully that it has consulted with neighbouring local authorities to understand if they could accommodate some of the new homes, particularly where it shares a housing market area ? for example on its borders with the Bury authority. - The National Planning Policy Framework states that Green Belt boundaries should not be changed except in exceptional circumstances. The loss of Green Belt is tremendously significant due to the negative impact on the environment with loss of natural habitats, agricultural land (of which Lancashire has some of the highest quality), rural landscapes etc. The aspiration for future growth does not constitutes an exceptional circumstance in itself, as economic growth is a perennial and constant desired outcome of public policy. - The NPPF states that ?The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of the Green belt are their openness and their permanence?. - However, the fundamental issue about the Green Belt is its integrity as a whole. It is important to identify the cumulative impact of any removal of areas from the Green Belt, both on the overall openness of the Green Belt and on the five purposes, which are: - 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; - 2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging together; - 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; - 4. To prevent the setting and special character of historic town. - 5. To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land - If a parcel performs well against ANY of the five purposes OR that it can clearly be considered to contribute to the openness of the Green Belt it should be eliminated from consideration for release. - The council?s own commissioned Green Belt Review of 2016 states that the parcels of land under consideration ALL</p>		No.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						perform strongly in some areas and will create at least a ?medium? degree of harm to the Green Belt if they were lost. - The report states that ?releasing the parcel is likely to have a substantial negative impact the integrity of the wider Green Belt? in all of the three parcels! - With direct reference to the draft local plan and policies: - ?Policy SD2: The Urban Boundary and Green Belt? states that ?except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area? ? the council should demonstrate how this development of over 300 houses could possible enhance the rural character?! - ?Policy HS3: Edenfield? also states that ?Any proposed development must make a positive contribution to the local environment?. I firmly believe this is impossible given that the development necessitates the destruction of 26ha. of Green Belt land by its very essence. - In summary, the councils own research and review demonstrate that the areas of Green Belt should not be released for development and other options within the urban and brownfield areas of the locality should be fully exhausted as a priority. -		
235	Faye	Weldon	-		Object	The proposals under HS2.71 will completely change the character of Edenfield village. This is a quaint village that Rossendale should be proud of! Not try to ruin!	-	
236	Sandra	Garner	-		Object	I object to the fact that Edenfield seems to be the main area for development despite it being so small. There is no support in the village for such a lot of houses. the road through the village is narrow and at some places you need to stop to let cars past due to all the parked cars. We have one tiny school, no doctor, no post office, very few shops. We have got a sex offenders unit nearby, I don't suppose that will be mentioned in the promotional material to potential buyers? I appreciate the need for well planned affordable housing in all areas but should such a large number all be put in one small village?	-	
237	Adrian	Maddocks	-		Object	Edenfield village struggles to cope with the current houses and cars in the village, the sheer scale of these proposed additions would cripple the village.	-	
238	Samantha	Rorke	-		Object	I feel that this many houses in Edenfield would make the village a very different place. Driving through Edenfield at the moment can be tricky with parked cars and school traffic. Better buses are needed at the moment without adding another 489 households. - I also feel that houses built on green belt will not be affordable to the majority of people needing a home, it feels like they are going to be built for the benefit of developers rather than the benefit of the local population.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
239	David	Fisher	-		Object	I should first say that I am not an out and out objector of development in Edenfield per se but what I do object to is the sheer scale of the development that could ensue from the removal of the above areas from the Green Belt. - Edenfield currently consists of approximately 900 houses and it is immediately apparent that to increase this number by anything like the 489 (54.3%) houses this proposal may result in will change the character of the village beyond recognition, a position that will never be recoverable. - I am not inclined to go into the detail this would have on facilities (traffic - parking- schools - medical) but save to say it is clear that all these will be severely impacted and indeed many are already under more pressure than they can sustain. - Over the 300 hundred or so years there has been an Edenfield Village the changes that have been made have by and large moved in a way that embodied new community requirements but not at pace that would devastate the village to the extent the above changes would, moving us us to position where the word "village" would no longer fit the description of what would result from such manifest changes. - I have been a resident of the village for over sixty years and have never had cause to air my views on matters of change in the past - perhaps this is some measure of how seriously I now view this current matter? - - -		-
240	A	Teague	-		Object	- - Further development in the Village is not desirable. Traffic congestion is at an unacceptable state now.		-
242	Sandra	Fisher	-		Object	The main thrust of my objection is the sheer scale of development that could take place if the areas mentioned were removed from the Green Belt and released as building land. - In my view this would radically and totally change the character of the village for ever to a point where it would not really be a village. - I have lived here over forty years and have never felt the need to put to print any objection in respect of the any of the various changes that have come to pass in that time but this really is too much.		-
243	Judith	Aquino	-		Object	I am objecting to the large scale of what is proposed for Edenfield for the following reasons: - 1) Traffic would be a huge problem, it only takes a small incident on the by-pass and there is a traffic jam through Edenfield. The village cannot cope with potentially 1000 extra cars. - 2) The two schools would not be able to cope with the massive influx of children. - 3) The character of the village will be completely transformed. It would no longer feel like a village.		-
244	Adrian	Finbow	N/A		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield as the planned development(s) would radically alter the character of the village. I am not opposed to reasonable, sustainable, sensible development provided that the appropriate supporting infrastructure (eg: roads, access, schools, local facilities etc) are fully implemented BEFORE any developments but a proposed 50% increase in the village housing over the period to 2034 is, in my opinion, excessive, inappropriate and wholly unwanted.		This proposed increase in the size of a small village is ridiculous and should be stopped as soon as possible.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
245	Helen	Finbow	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposed development in Edenfield. This would radically alter the character of our lovely village apart from the fact that Edenfield does not have the infrastructure to support such a huge development.		-
246	Gabriel	Dench	-		Object	I object to the scale of the plans as this would dramatically transform the village to something which would be unsustainable for the villagers.		-
247	Rebecca	Merrills	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the operation to build houses on the land that surrounds us as it would make living harder as there will be more traffic and the population of the added persons would increase too much for our village to cope with we do not have enough schools or other services to provide for more people		-
248	Mark	Welsh	-		Object	I have lived in Edenfield for 14 years. Moving here with my family was determined by many factors not least of which was the nature of the village, its scale and surrounding countryside whilst still being handily placed to access larger towns and cities via relatively good transportation links. - - During our time here we have seen massive disinvestment in the locality including a departing GP surgery, loss of the post office and an ever worsening local bus service. Council tax has increased year on year despite the loss of local services in the same time period. Roads continue to be in a general state of disrepair and on occasion the nature of traffic does bring the village to a halt. I see little evidence that if the proposed removal of greenbelt protection was to be made as per the locality plan there would be any improvement in the village infrastructure. Evidence of surrounding areas and their expansion over the last few decades would support this perspective. - - There are currently around 900 houses in the village. There are a considerable amount of properties for sale or for rent in the immediate area which doesn't appear to suggest a housing need for the village. - - Whilst my children are now of an age where school is not an issue for them directly I understand that both local schools are busy and any further development in the area would clearly impact on school provision. Seeing the daily chaos on the roads around the schools I suggest that housing increase on the scale suggested in the plan would only exacerbate this significant problem. - - Access to any of the proposed sites doesn't seem to be particularly straightforward without adding to the already busy times of the day in the village. Travel plans would no doubt be developed at some juncture but simple observation suggests that traffic chaos would ensue at key times in and around Edenfield. I do not think that this is easily resolvable or affordable to developers going forward. - - In conclusion I would like to register my objection to the proposals set out in the Council's Local Plan. Specifically my objection is based on the scale of the proposals (which are far too large) and on a simplistic level in that the character of the village and local area would be destroyed by the scale of the proposals outlined.		Local infrastructure is not sufficient to sustain the scale of development proposed in the Local Plan for Edenfield. - -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
251	M	Teague	-		Object	- The new development plan will add to the serious traffic congestion we have in Edenfield all ready. The village cannot cope with this amount of new housing / cars. - 1 Village School. No Doctors surgery. Plus its questionable to build family housing in close proximity to a Sex offenders unit at the Chatterton Hey House location.		
252	M J	Coyne	Chartered Architect		Object	I strongly object to the Site Allocation on the following grounds: - The character of Edenfield is that of a small linear village developed slowly over many years as a natural response to the requirements for trade and communication. - The size and scale of the proposals are totally unsympathetic and will destroy both the existing character and the setting of the village. - There are small sites within the village which would lend themselves to logical "infill" development, an example of which is the Horse and Jockey, and any further development should be limited to such sites in order to preserve the character. - The infrastructure cannot support the size of th proposals and there is no indication as to how this problem could be satisfactorily resolved. - As a matter of principle the Council should ensure that any development within the borough exhausts the available brownfield sites before consideration is given to greenfield development.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
253	Richard	Barrington	-		Object	Having grown up in Edenfield (my parents still reside there) I have massively benefited from the environment, both natural and social, that the village has created and is surrounded by. The greenbelt space surrounding the village is a fantastic reminder of the rural nature of the North West and the natural environment cannot be taken for granted. The sheer size of the proposed development will indefinitely impact the environment for those living within the village in such a negative way. - - The fact that the proposed development is earmarked for greenbelt land is a real worry for me personally (I work in Sustainable Development and so have an active interest in the environment) and and whilst I appreciate the country as a whole requires housing, greenbelt land was designed for specific reasons and the sheer size of this proposal would effectively remove the greenbelt from existence. The removal of such a large area of greenbelt would in my opinion be another example of the start of the end of greenbelts across the county. This would be a travesty and further highlight the reason why greenbelts were initially created. - - Further to the destruction of greenbelt the sheer scale of the proposed development will have indefinite impacts upon the village and its residents. The village already has issues with traffic and parking availability along Market Street due to the nature of the Victorian terrace houses, which is magnified when the bypass is closed and traffic comes through the village. To add in the proposed number of houses, and the associated cars, would make the village increasingly inaccessible and gridlocked with traffic. There simply is not another way round the village if the bypass is also gridlocked. The additional residents would also have a detrimental impact upon the amenities already in existence with education and health facilities already at full capacity, where are these additional children going to be educated? How will these residents have their health needs met? - - I very much object to the proposals being submitted for such a radical development. The well-being of the village, environmentally and socially, is in serious jeopardy by these proposals and believe the another approach is viable and more suitable.		
254	Ann	Rae			Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village - The roads will not cope with the amount of new traffic		
255	Ann-Marie	Coyne	-		Object	I strongly object to the proposals due to the scale and size which will conflict severely with the existing character and setting of the village. The infrastructure cannot support the size of the proposals and no indication is given as to how the matter would be resolved. Whilst I appreciate that there may be a need for additional housing within the borough I believe that priority should be given to the development of brownfield sites and that until such sites are exhausted no further development of greenfield sites should be permitted.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
256	Ian	Corless	-		Object	Housing in Edenfield currently comprises of approximately 900 properties. Your draft local plan details the land you wish to remove from the green belt to enable developers to build on these sites. These areas could have nearly 500 extra houses built which would be an increase of over 50% on the current number of homes. Developments of this size would ruin the character of Edenfield. What provisions are being made in your plan for the extra traffic, the extra school places that would be needed, the extra GP and dentistry services required ?? I object to this proposal in the strongest terms as the scale of these plans are far too large and as previously mentioned would totally change our local environment.....	-	
257	John	Davies	-		Object	I object on the grounds that so many properties would make Edenfield completely gridlocked - There are no facilities schools are more than full ,no doctors etc	-	
259	Karen	Hawkins	-		Object	I object to the number of houses that is proposed, half as much again for the whole of the village is ridiculous. It will no longer be a village. The village only has a few shops, a school, very little parking for the existing residents, through traffic from Rawtenstall, Haslingden to Ramsbottom and Bury. The pollution will be a problem. There are no new reservoirs. The drainage and power required would be too much to add to the existing utilities. More delivery vehicles, dustbin vehicles, visitors, people = just too much for this area. The number of houses should be spread out amongst the Rossendale Valley/Lancashire. The use of derelict factories and empty boarded up houses should be utilised as first priority. Builders prefer to new build than renovate - hard luck. Use existing stock first.		Edenfield is a village not a town. How many residents would still constitute a village?
260	David	Cowan	-		Object	I wish to register my comments about the large scale of proposed housing plans for Edenfield - which is not large enough to absorb the increases of housing that is being planned. -	-	
262	Claire	Mableson	-		Object	Edenfield is a village community the scale of the proposed housing on these sites would drastically change the village and its community. - The resources available to the local community e.g. Schools, doctors, transport links are not big enough to cope with the increase of cars and people you are proposing. - Parking in the village is already an issue and so is the amount of traffic passing through despite the bypass. Even the bypass cannot cope with the volume of traffic in the local community adding to this will only make transport issues worse. - The whole of the feel of this community would change, the proposed changes would also affect the tourists this area attracts. - There are also environmental impacts habitats will be destroyed something we should be protecting.		Please read previous comments
263	Ian	Summers	-		Object	This is a very large number of houses and the village already has problems with traffic and parking. schools, shops and could not cope with such an increase as it would SPOIL the village.		Please do not ruin our village with overcrowding.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
264	Jason	Straccia	-		Object	Without significant infrastructure improvements, the size and scale of the land being proposed for development within Edenfield would : - - ?Radically alter the character of the village due to the visual impact of the development - ?Have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours to the land in question, including noise, disturbance, - loss of privacy, etc - ?Put undue pressure on local services including schools, Health provision etc - ?Increase traffic and noise pollution within the whole village - ?Increase road congestion, and increase road safety concerns, particularly for the vulnerable young and elderly - ?Increase traffic and noise pollution within the whole village - - In short, the proposal involving taking so much land out of greenbelt within Edenfield village for potential development is over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity.		
265	Clare	Straccia	-		Object	Without significant infrastructure improvements, the size and scale of the land being proposed for development within Edenfield would : - - ?Radically alter the character of the village due to the visual impact of the development - ?Have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours to the land in question, including noise, disturbance, - loss of privacy, etc - ?Put undue pressure on local services including schools, Health provision etc - ?Increase traffic and noise pollution within the whole village - ?Increase road congestion, and increase road safety concerns, particularly for the vulnerable young and elderly - ?Increase traffic and noise pollution within the whole village - - In short, the proposal involving taking so much land out of greenbelt within Edenfield village for potential development is over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
266	Joanne	Ash			Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - I fail to see how the village can cope with the influx of vehicles with the proposed number of houses. There are already problems with vehicles being parked on bends and at junctions, within the village, which clearly causes current problems with traffic and this will be exacerbated. Edenfield is a sought after area? as it is a village with an impeccable and enviable traffic safety history but the increase of traffic will change this and put the elderly and young children at risk. - There have been numerous times when the traffic on the by-pass has been forced to use the village due to incidents; this has caused the village to become gridlocked. Based on this, the evidence is that the proposed number of houses will increase the traffic to result in daily gridlock within the village roads and will force vehicles to take shortcuts through the smaller streets which will increase the accident rate within the village. - The houses on Bolton Road North currently shake when heavy goods vehicles and quarry vehicles pass. This problem can only increase and worsen when the number of heavy vehicles increases within our village for the construction work which, in turn, is likely to cause structural problems to the houses. The Local Council must then accept responsibility for same. The roads in the village are not designed for continual and extensive use by heavy vehicles. The state of repair for these roads is not without issue and, with the proposed additional vehicles in the village, will also become costly to the Local Council in repair bills and claims for damage caused to resident's vehicles. - The air quality in the village [with increased traffic and fossil fuels being burnt in the village] will also change and will be detrimental to the health of the elderly and the young in particular. - The scale of the proposed Council Local Plan is extensive and is not sustainable within such a small area. -</p>		No further comments - please see previous comment box.
267	Peter	Dawson	-		Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - There is not the infrastructure in place to allow for additional houses to this large scale. The increase in traffic and air pollution would be detrimental to health and environment.</p>		Comments in previous comments box.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
269	Jean	Davies	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the Village. - - At present the traffic parked on Market Street is now already double parked with buses struggling to get through. Any increase in the volume of traffic would only exacerbate this current problem. - - Presumably there will be a substantial amount of children involved with the building of these houses. Has anyone considered the schooling situation in Edenfield and Stubbins already. Where are these children going to be accommodated for schooling purposes with Edenfield's tiny school already at full capacity and Stubbins is the same. - Has enough consideration been put to all this and would the intention be to build a new primary school or double the size of Edenfield Village primary school? - - Furthermore, has consideration also been given to doctor and dental facilities that would need to be available? - - In conclusion, not enough thought has been given to the above facts mentioned that is why this proposed development as it stands is totally out of the question for our small Village. -		I think I have already made my views known on previous question.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
270	Stephen	Terry	-		Object	This whole plan is unacceptable as the scale of the development and the number of houses proposed would radically change the character of Edenfield village		Hi, I am a resident of Edenfield and have been horrified to find out about the development proposals to add around 500 new 'units' or homes to our village, as it will destroy the village as we know it and much of the Greenbelt land that generations of residents to Edenfield and surrounding communities have enjoyed. I also do not see any proposals to help the local schools cope with the extra influx of pupils or any plans to deal with the extra traffic this will inevitably cause. Also the ecological impact will be devastating and irreversible! With the land in question being used by Dear that I see on a regular basis as well as other wildlife such as birds of prey As well as the destruction of plants and trees that provide the community with a much need link to nature. The only reason I can see that this development is even being considered is so the council can make money off selling the land and then continue to reap the extra revenue of extra council tax payments with no consideration to the current residents of the village or the future of the community this development will destroy. Regards,
271	susan	harrison	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. I also feel it will cause problems for roads, schools and other basic facilities.		-
272	Karen	Corless	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. Edenfield is a village and the proposed plan would radically alter the character of the village. There is no provision for additional services ie schools, doctors, dentists. Traffic congestion would also be an issue.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
274	Elizabeth	Danks	-		Object	Edenfield is a lovely village but it is fast becoming a difficult place to travel through. There is already much heavy traffic and local traffic polluting our streets.. The building of 400 more houses will only add to the traffic chaos. During the consultation, time must be spent considering the effect of 400+ new houses (potentially 1,600 persons,800 cars) on the infrastructure. Edenfield cannot support the parking, school places, bus routes (goodness - the village cannot even support a bus to Manchester!!!) that such a venture would involve.And the term "village" as applied to Edenfield would be erroneous. The sheer scale of your plans is ridiculous and not 'thought through'. Please consider carefully the effect of such plans before progressing further Thank you.		-
275	Sue	Bellass	-		Object	My husband and I have been residents of Edenfield for over thirteen years and feel that our three children have grown up in a perfect location, with minimal traffic, good schools and beautiful countryside on the doorstep. Our children are now heading for young adulthood, and we would like them to have the option to buy affordable housing in the village if they wish, and, therefore we support SMALL scale, tasteful housing development. However, it is NOT possible to build 489 houses in Edenfield, increasing its size by over 50%, without radically changing the nature of the village we call home. The infrastructure could not cope with an influx of people of that magnitude, and the proposed development would cause utter chaos on the roads and in our schools. People in the village already have difficulties with parking, and in the time we have lived on Eden Court, it has become harder and harder to exit the court turning right because of traffic congestion. - - The proposed development would absolutely destroy the wonderful character of our quiet village. Edenfield would no longer have its green spaces; it would become congested, noisy, polluted and be bereft of the charm that makes it such a desirable place to live. I object to the proposed developments in the strongest terms.		-
276	Alison	Heaton	-		Object	my objection is the sheer scale of proposed development. The roads around the Village are already congested in peak times and very busy at other times. On average it already takes me 15 / 20 mins to travel from Edenfield to the motorway slip road onto the M66 south in the rush hour. This distance is only two miles. The M66 north sliproad and stretch of motorway are often at a standstill as it stands now. Another 500 if not more car users will affect this adversely if no additional infrastructure is to be provided. - I am concerned about the loss of the greenbelt on environmental grounds also - greenbelt was originally established for very good reasons. - As a local Governor our local primary schools are already oversubscribed every year and this would add pressure to get places and frustrate families trying to get their children at a local school. If they cannot get in - once again families will be forced to take to the roads to travel to schools further afield.		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
277	James	Martin	-		Object	This development will completely change the small village of Edenfield and devalue the lifestyle of the community.		There are many public footpaths and walks for families and dogs that would be lost if this plan were implemented. We must protect this green belt site for the appreciation of its history and for future generations to appreciate.
278	Kathleen	Martin	-		Object	The plan is to increase the housing in our small village by 100 per cent which will completely destroy the character of this historic area.		The village of Edenfield has long been established as a small quaint area of historic interest. This description would be obliterated by increasing its size with modern housing.
279	Jodie	Rowbottom	-		Object	Having recently moved to the local area and paying for this area for the quiet nature and village atmosphere, I object to the sheer scale of the proposed plan for Edenfield which would radically change the character of the village and the environment I'm bringing my young family up in.		The proposed plan will double the traffic and routes from edenfield. Parking will be an issue for residents and you will be adding to already busy roads that the speed limits are not enforced on. This alongside waggon and lorry traffic which could daily goes through the village will be a nightmare
280	Ian	Rowbottom	-		Object	The scale of the proposed plan to more than double the current housing is extreme and is not taking current local people into consideration. People including myself moved and live in the village for the character and village feel to the area. Bringing up a young family we want to keep the character of the village and buildings in the area which will be radically changed with the pure scale of proposed plans		We already have passing traffic in the village and gridlock on roads due to bigger vechiles lorries etc coming through up to the quarries. Add double the car traffic the roads will be terrible not to mention parking, safety and road crossings

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
281	John and Sylvia	Gibson	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of this proposal as it would radically alter the character of the village. Also the traffic and parking would be more chaotic than it is at the moment.		We have lived in Edenfield since 1971. We didn't know anything about the area as one of us is from Surrey and the other from Yorkshire. However, we drove around the area and also did a lot of research. There were so many pluses - a beautiful rural village with wonderful views and most importantly - lots of greenbelt areas. - - Over the years there have been several developments which have not spoilt the village. We have a great community spirit with so many activities throughout the year for all ages. If these plans are approved village life will change for ever and not for the better. - - We already have traffic problems through the main street and parking is difficult. It is not easy to get children into the village school now so goodness knows what would happen if we had all these extra homes. - Edenfield is a desirable place to live because of the size, views, amenities (school, church, shops - places to eat, community centre etc) It really would be sad if the council approve all these plans by removing greenbelt in our village when there are other areas within Rossendale where homes could be built without removal of greenbelt.
282	deborah	farrow	-		Object	I have lived on Moorlands View all my life with my parents and now with my own family - most of the residents of moorlands view have been here over 25 years and are now friends and we are a small community of friends - this developemnet will change the feel of the village and the roads and schools would not be able to cope with a large increase of homes and people all with cars		if this goes ahead we will no longer be a nice village where people look out for each other but just another housing estate

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
283	Paul	Farrow	-		Object	I have been a resident of Moorlands View for 30 years and have enjoyed the peace and quite this part of the village offers. Allowing a major housing development to be built at the front of our house will impact on the feeling of living in a rural setting not to mention the amount of traffic in what is already a small main road running through the centre of our village. - - Our house price will be affected as the houses proposed are going to effect our views of the countryside and increase both pollution from light and noise. - - The access roads to this new development will increase road congestion and make local travel longer to accomplish. - - Developing our village is going to destroy our quality of life and lead to many locals moving away to find the peace and quite we currently have in what is a small but happy community. - -	-	
284	Carl	Robinson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of this proposed development.	-	
285	William	Robinson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of this proposed development.	-	
287	Philip	Pye	-		Object	The objection is to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.	-	
288	Margaret Valerie	Pyett	-		Object	I object to the size of what is proposed for Edenfield on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would alter the character of the village.	-	
289	Dorothy	Downey	-		Object	These areas are too vast and would completely spoil the open aspects now enjoyed in this village. The numbers of houses proposed to be built are far more than the village can cope with. The roads would not cope with the extra traffic and parking is now at a premium on all the main roads. There is no room in the two local schools, we have no doctor's surgery and the surgeries in Rawtenstall and Ramsbottom are fully subscribed. -		I think the planners should think again about this scheme and distribute the housing needs more evenly over the Valley.
290	Hazel	Hardie	-		Object	The proposal is far too large for the size of the village and the infrastructure cannot support this. For instance, schools, roads, parking, shops etc. The sheer scale of this proposal would radically alter the village.	-	
291	J	Scholes	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposal for Edenfield which will radically alter the character of the village.	-	
292	P	Scholes	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposal for Edenfield which will radically alter the character of the village.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
293	M.	Duckworth			Object	<p>I write with reference to the Council's Local Plan on the proposed development of Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land from the village which is considered a "greenbelt" area.</p> <p>These areas which I am particularly concerned about are covered in by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompaies the said plan.</p> <p>Land off exchange street - Edenfield Land - west of Market street - Edenfield land off Blackburn Road - Edenfield land - west of Moorlands View - Edenfield</p> <p>Not only do I object to the building on these areas of outstanding beauty I would like you to consider the effects of traffic pollution to the inded residents of these properties - as the main A56 Bypass is getting considerably busier by the day. Need I say more about the poolution this will bring our lovely village. Not to mention the chaos this will cause to traffic going through the Village - At peak times it is difficult to manoeuvre at the best of times. Also have you thought about the schools in the area.... Two village schools that would not be able to cope with the admissions - from residents throughout the valley. The nearest health centres are located in either Rawtenstall of Ramsbottom, The nearest hospital(s) are eutger Royal Blackburn Hospital or fairfield in Bury, do you think this is really acceptable for people living in Edenfield.</p> <p>Also Edenfield has a great bird and wildlife inhabitants -do you think that wrecking the "greenbelt" is going to help them - No - where are the wilflife and birds going to inhabit then? Or are you jjust going to hope that this will go away ???</p> <p>So are you going to turn our lovely village in to a polluted Town - I object to these proposals as it would damage the environment and character of our village.</p>	HS2.071

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
294	M	Bennett			Object	<p>I am writing in relation to the draft local plan and the impact it will have on the quality of life and human health for my family and the residents of Edenfield. This letter is to protest against any proposal to remove areas of land from the Greenbelt.</p> <p>I have attached a plan that demonstrates that parts of Edenfield are currently within an Air Quality Management Area - meaning the air quality within this zones does not meet national Air Quality Objectives. By definition this means that the air quality in these areas is likely to affect Human Health.</p> <p>The areas that concern me are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>By building houses on these Areas, there will be additional pulltants emitted into the environment from boilers and cars. On average, each house will have two cars, and I understand that upto 450 houses could be built. This will not only change the character of the village, but will significantly affect the air quality in the village.</p> <p>The air quality will significantly decline in the existing Air Quality Management Area, and the Air Quality Management Area will then expand into the village affecting many more people's air quality and human health.</p> <p>Is this what the local authority wants for Edenfield? A decline in air quality and an expansion of areas where emissions affect human health. If these plans go ahead then the future of Edenfield will be a village where air quality targets failed to be met.</p> <p>I hope that you appreciate te strength of feeling in the village and that you refuse to accept the destruction of the greenbelt in Edenfield.</p>		
296	Joyce	Stopford			Object	<p>I am most concerned with regard to the possible building of 72 houses on land which surrounds Chatterton Hey.</p> <p>I have lived in Exchange Street for over 18 years and have experienced the increase in traffic and problems with parking. How exchange streeet could deal with the increase of more traffic I can't imagine. We have a park and large field for children to use relatively safely at the moment but this would not be so should this development go ahead. I appreciate we need more houses but not on this scale in a village that can't provide the services of more schools etc.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
299	Renee	Wilson			Object	<p>I write in regard to the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to request the government to remove large amounts of land around the village from the Greenbelt so that it can be used for housing.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land West of Moorlands View, Edenfield.</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far to large and if carried out will irrevocably destroy the character of our village, which has been described as a picture postcard village.</p>		
300	B	Garvey			Object	<p>I have lived in the delightful village of Edenfield for over thirty years in that time some houses have been added so I am not against change. But the proposed addition of over 400 houses taking greenland and changing the character of the village is not acceptable.</p> <p>We have lost the post office and the news agent, our two schools are full but it is the though of at least 400 more cars on the road that is not acceptable.</p> <p>I look forward to the meeting on Tuesday September 12th to show my opposition</p>		
301	B	Whittaker			Object	<p>I write in protest at the draft local plan removing large amounts of land around the village, so that the greenbelt can be built on. I am an elderly villager who enjoys walking around these areas namely land off Exchange Street, West of Market Street, Blackburn Road, Moorlands View. The proposed building of all these houses will totally change the character of this village - and I do wonder how the schools, large increase in traffic will be accommodated for future families this very pleasant area would become virtually an urban sprawl</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
302	A	Rich			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan & how it will affect Edenfield, I understand that you are planning to ask government to remove large amounts & land around our village from the greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>The areas I am particularly concerned, are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>Land off exchange street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large (an increase of 50% in the housing & the impact on the infrastructure etc). If these proposals are carried out, it would ruin the character of Edenfield from every aspect.</p>		
303	S E	Wallwork			Object	<p>I wish to show an objection to the plan that a considerable amount of land around the village could be built on.</p> <p>It does seem that parking and congestion has gradually increased and the building of a large amount of houses would alter the character of our village to an unacceptable degree.</p> <p>My main concerns are covered by Ref HS2.71 on the site map.</p>		
304	Eric	Wallwork			Object	<p>I write about the council's local plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan:</p> <p>land off Exchange Street, Edenfield. Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p> <p>Traffic/parking would become huge concerns with potentially 1000 extra vehicles on village roads and parking space already at a premium.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
305	J	Ash			Object	<p>I write about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p> <p>As a serving police officer who has previously worked on the specialist traffic department, I fail to see how the village can cope with the influx of vehicles with the proposed number of houses. There are already problems with vehicles being parked on bends and at junctions within the village, which clearly causes current problems with traffic and this will be exacerbated. Edenfield is a 'sought after area' as it is a village with an impeccable and enviable traffic safety history but the increase of traffic will change this and put the elderly and young children at risk.</p> <p>There have been numerous times when the traffic on the by-pass has been forced to use the village due to incidents; this has caused the village to become gridlocked. Based on this, the evidence is that the proposed number of houses will increase the traffic to result in daily gridlock within the village roads and will force vehicles to take shortcuts through the smaller streets which will increase the accident rate within the village.</p> <p>The houses on Bolton Road North currently shake when heavy goods vehicles and quarry vehicles increase within our village for the construction work which, in turn, is likely to cause structural problems to the houses. The local council must then accept responsibility for the same. The roads in the village are not designed for continual and extensive use by heavy vehicles. The state of repair for these roads is not without issue and, with the proposed additional vehicles in the village, will also become costly to the local Council in repair bills and claims for damage caused to residents' vehicles.</p> <p>The air quality in the village [with increased traffic and fossil fuels being burnt in the village] will also change and will be detrimental to the health of the elderly and the young in particular.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed Council Local Plan is extensive and is not sustainable within such a small area</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
307	Gillian	Heywood	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed. This would radically alter the character of the village and there is already an issue with traffic through the village not to mention the problems with parking. There are many people in the village who would like to see smaller dwellings in the village to help the younger generation to afford to live in the village or for those retiring to down size.		-
308	Elizabeth	Summers	-		Object	I object to the size of the proposed development for Edenfield which will add to the present traffic problems, both the number of cars driving along Market St. and Bury Rd, and the number parking on these roads. At present they are often reduced to single track by double parking, leading to hold ups by tractor, buses and difficulty for ambulances and other emergency vehicles. At present driving onto Market St. from the side roads is very dangerous because approaching traffic is hidden by parked vehicles, this can only become worse if more cars are based in the village. - I also feel there is not an adequate infrastructure (schools, medical surgeries etc) to support this number of houses which will completely change the nature of the village.		-
309	Ken	Parkes	-		Object	As a resident of the village for the past ten years one of the things that attracted us most to Edenfield was the sense of community and history clearly in evidence through its buildings and its people. The proposal to build 489 additional houses would drastically alter the essence of the village and completely destroy the very thing that makes Edenfield such a unique place to live. The proposed expansion of housing stock on what are limited sites would put intolerable pressure on the existing roads and access points resulting in regular incidents of gridlock, especially in times when the M66 is blocked or closed. In addition with the proposed increase in population there would need to be available places at local schools neither of which could immediately accommodate an influx of extra pupils. - Notwithstanding, I fully appreciate the need, nationally, to expand housing stock and most importantly to provide affordable housing to allow first time buyers to get a foot on the housing ladder, and I would welcome a planned, incremental building plan that created a limited number of additional homes which allowed the village to adapt and adjust to an increased population. The current plans are far too drastic and seem to place an undue emphasis on Edenfield as a target for planned development in Rossendale. - I would urge the council to reconsider the extent of this plan allowing the village to retain some of its green belt and ensure it remains a popular and desirable place to live.		I understand the pressure that all local councils must be under from central government in their quest to build more houses but the fact that successive administrations have failed to meet even modest house building targets does not mean we should attempt to somehow make up for this failure by destroying local communities with unrealistic expectations of what they can cope with. - Please stand firm in the face of external pressures and respect the integrity of the communities that make up the Rossendale Borough and make this area of East Lancashire such a special place.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
310	Carole	Higginbotham			Object	I wish to object to the sheer scale of what is being proposed for Edenfield. Edenfield is a village and would no longer be one if the number of houses proposed are built. There is one primary school in Edenfield which is - oversubscribed always, there are no Doctors surgery to accommodate the vast influx of people. Parking at the moment is a massive problem, Market Street becomes gridlocked when there is a problem on the bypass so goodness knows what will happen when there are new access roads to accommodate the new properties!!		I think Rossendale Council need to strongly look again into what is being proposed for the village of Edenfield. There are many other areas in Rossendale that could be used for the building of new homes that would enhance rather than ruin a village that is already full to capacity!
311	Margaret	Filkins	-		Object	My objection is the sheer scale of the proposed development. The character of the rural village would be lost and the current infrastructure would not support the proposed increase in people numbers. My main concern is flooding. At present a heavy downfall of rain turns Market St into a stream. The drainage system cannot cope and our garden is often under standing water which seeps under the back door. I am concerned that the proposed development would result in the surface water being greater than at present as the fields would no longer be there to soak up excess water.		Whilst I appreciate there needs to be an increase in housing stock for future generations, consideration of existing roads and amenities should be a priority to determine how many more people could comfortably be accommodated in this area in order to maintain an equilibrium of lifestyle currently enjoyed by existing residents.
312	Julian	Butterworth	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the Village		-
313	rebecca	gillett	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. I feel that it would have a major impact on the traffic within the village and therefore majorly disadvantage the residents. In respect to the land off exchange street that surrounds chatterton hey; this land has been used by the community for many years and I enjoying this land myself. Building on this land would take away a piece of land utilised by the community and would be a great shame		-
314	Julie	Butterworth	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
315	Chris	Barlow	-		Object	I object to the shear scale of edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. I feel that the increase of traffic would cause major disruption to the narrow streets of edenfield which would also increase pollution to what is a clean and healthy environment. With increase of 489 houses, the local primary schools would suffer with the influx of children wanting to attend by parents. children wouldn't be educated to the high standard which already exists at the moment.		-
316	Phillip	Dawber	-		Object	The size of development would change the village of Edenfield beyond recognition. - The proposed building works would not sit well within the infrastructure of the village. - Traffic and parking are already problems in Edenfield. - There is no space in primary schools in the village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
317	Susan	Scott			Object	I object to the sheer scale of proposed development, and feel the infrastructure of the village, already overstretched, will never cope, and would radically alter the character of the village.		-
318	Tony	Garner	-		Object	Development on this scale would DESTROY the character of the village. An increase in housing of more than 50 per cent threatens the very nature of village life and is completely unsustainable in terms of highways, public services (schools, doctors, dentists), amenities and parking. - - Edenfield appears to have been singled out for development unjustly compared to the restive Rossendale		-
320	CHRISTINE JOAN	Blow			Object	I object to the above developments for a number of reasons. There appears to be no provision for extra infrastructure and access to these developments. traffic and parking will become a huge concern with the expected extra vehicles using the now, already congested roads, especially Market Street. - The two, oversubscribed, primary schools could not cope with the added numbers. - An added 400 or so houses would alter the nature of the village beyond all recognition, making it a much less pleasant place to live for all concerned. - I believe that there is more suitable land, with better infrastructure further up the valley. - A smaller development would be acceptable, it is the sheer scale of the proposal which is deeply worrying.		No
321	Frank	Quigley	-		Object	I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Ednefield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. - - These are the ares about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map. - - I am not against small development, but the sheer scale of these proposals would ruin the village. If these proposals were to go ahead, Edendfield would go from a desirable place to live, to a very undesirable place. Due to the lack of school places, the fact there are no shops, doctors and the roads being continuously blocked with the amount of traffic, these houses would add to the amount of traffic which goes through the village alongside the wagons which pass through to Scout Moor Quarry, leading to people on foot being unable to cross the roads safely. - - Edenfield Parish School is settled in the middle of the proposed development sight which would endanger the young people who walk to school everyday.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
322	Jacqueline	Quigley	-		Object	I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Ednefield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. - - These are the ares about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map. - - I am not against small development, but the sheer scale of these proposals would ruin the village. If these proposals were to go ahead, Edendfield would go from a desirable place to live, to a very undesirable place. Due to the lack of school places, the fact there are no shops, doctors and the roads being continuously blocked with the amount of traffic, these houses would add to the amount of traffic which goes through the village alongside the wagons which pass through to Scout Moor Quarry, leading to people on foot being unable to cross the roads safely. - - Edenfield Parish School is settled in the middle of the proposed development sight which would endanger the young people who walk to school everyday.		-
324	Tracy	Finney	-		Object	The council plans for Edenfield are ridiculous given the sheer scale of the plans. Basically you want to develop and take away all the green belt land that makes Edenfield what it is and what attracts people to live within the borough. - If we wanted to live in heavily built up areas then we would live in Ramsbottom and have cheaper council tax under Bury Council. The village and its roads and facilities are not equipped to be able to cope with the proposals and Rossendale council have little interest in the village that is at the extreme of the borough boundaries. Edenfield is a forgotten village unless of course the council can make more money by allowing an excessive amount of houses to be built on the greenbelt that it doesn't care about. - - The proposals will, if agreed, would radically alter the character of the village and would most certainly be to the detriment of the village and it's current population that have in fact already paid for the privilege of living in an area surrounded by greenbelt.		-
325	William	Finney	-		Object	This proposal would have serious detriment to the village and would radically alter the character. - - We do not need more houses and we want to keep our green belt land.		-
326	Kieron	Finney	-		Object	This land should not be built on and should remain as green belt. The plans would cause serious detriment to our village and would radically alter it's character		-
327	Kristofer	Finney	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-
328	Clifford	Kenyon	-		Object	The plans for Edenfield village are preposterous and should not be allowed to proceed. The sheer scale of the plans will drastically affect the village and radically alter it's character.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
329	Madge	Kenyon	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield Village. - The village does not have the infrastructure to support these plans and the roads around the village and in particular the schools are terrible without adding more problems. - - The village is just not equipped to cope and these plans would significantly alter the character of village.		-
330	Corinne	Littlewood	-		Object	<p>I appreciate new houses are required but feel strongly these developments should happen on brownfield sites. I choose to live in Edenfield because of its rural surroundings and believed it was protected by green belt.</p> <p>##### Letter comments #####</p> <p>I am writing to the councils Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. The areas I am particularly concerned about are covered by reference HS2.71:</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. The local infrastructure will not cope with such an increase in population, the roads are all ready congested, the school is full and it is extremely difficult to register with a doctor as Rawtenstall's GPs claim they do not cover the Edenfield postcode</p>		-
331	Alan and Carole	Riley	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of the proposed house building for Edenfield, which would radically alter the feel and character of the village.		-
332	Heather	Hayden	-		Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. It would no longer be a village.</p> <p>##### LETTER COMMENT ###</p> <p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan:</p> <p>Land of Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land of Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of the village</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
333	JULIE	MUNRO	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of this proposal. Not only would it radically alter the character of the village, but add immensely to the numbers of vehicles (both during completion and afterward by new residents). - The sheer numbers of properties that have been proposed throughout the whole village would without doubt have a significant detrimental effect on the natural landscape, peace and beauty of the area. Not withstanding the absolute necessity for larger schools, GP's and other healthcare providers.		I also believe that the proposals will have a significant detrimental effect on the value of my property as a large number of properties being proposed are to the rear of my house. I purchased just under 4 years ago with the understanding that nothing that would ever be built on the land to the rear because it is protected by greenbelt. -
334	Joe	Littlewood	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the Village. - Also the Infrastructure is hardly adequate at present. Too many vehicles blocking the main road (A56)?, how will it cope with another 100, never mind potentially 1000 plus ?. - Lack of Medical/Dental provision. Also Bus service is already drastically reduced. - I am informed that the Schools are already full.		Not at the moment.
336	Sharon	Canavan	-		Object	Edenfield doesn't have the capacity nor the infrastructure to support this many houses. - Increase traffic would add to the burden already endured by villagers. - Green Belt land should not be used for such a scheme.		-
337	Margaret	Bispham	-		Object	The infrastructure in the village would not be able to cope with all of this extra housing development. The roads are already grid-locked; the two local schools are full; we have no G.P. surgery or bank/post office. - The lovely open aspect would be completely lost if the green-belt land were to be swallowed up by housing which would be detrimental to the lives of the people who already reside here.		Why have the planners decided to put most of the development in Edenfield? - Surely other areas in Rossendale should be considered. Maybe the developers could sell property better in this area but other areas should be sought and encouraged to bring their areas up to somewhere that people might want to live and that developers might want to build. - Is this the easy option to centre such a large development in Edenfield?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
338	Janine	Hartley	-		Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of development proposed for Edenfield, particularly the sites mentioned above. - I understand that Edenfield has been chosen as the main site for new housing in Rossendale, due to its perceived desirability. However, this desirability is largely due to the fact that the area is not overcrowded or dominated by housing. Should these plans go ahead, this will no longer be the case. - I firmly believe that these proposed plans would have a radical, detrimental effect upon the character of Edenfield. It is a small village and simply will not cope with such a vast amount of new housing.</p> <p>Letter received 18/09/2017: I write about the Council's Local Plan. It is my understanding that you plan to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around Edenfield from the Greenbelt, so that it can be built on. I am particularly concerned about the following areas: Land south of Wood Lane Land west of Market Street Land off Exchange Street Land off Blackburn Road Land west of Moorlands View These are covered by references HS2.73 and HS2.71 in the local plan I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans is too large. If carried out, these plans would ruin the character of our village and put unmanageable pressure upon schools and health services in the area. While I understand that there is a need for additional housing in Rossendale, I feel it is unfair that Edenfield should be singled out as the primary area for this, particularly as it is such a small village, which would suffer significantly under such wide-scale change</p>		
339	April	Barker	-		Object	<p>I object to this proposal of a build of nearly 500 houses. The village can not sustain this amount of houses. The school could not handle to influx of extra children as it struggles now with the amount of children attending. The traffic flow and build up would be terrible, our roads can't cope with the heavy traffic as it is. Resurfaced regularly due to high influx of traffic. This is a village, not a town. It is a beautiful place and you are going to destroy our beautiful countryside.</p>		
340	William	Barker	-		Object	<p>I object to the proposal of building an extra 500 houses. I have lived in edenfield all my life and have seen many changes to the village. This proposal will not enhance the village it will destroy it. We are a small village and cannot cope with the extra influx if people and traffic. The school can't cope with more children, the roads can't cope with more traffic. We are a small village and not some big town, you will destroy this community by building these house so I strongly object to this proposal</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
341	Peter	Ash	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. There are already on-going problems with traffic in the village when the Edenfield by-pass and M66 have traffic problems. Living on the main road the smell of diesel fumes is sometimes overwhelming (can smell it in the house) and this will become a daily occurrence with the planned number of houses (huge increase in traffic). The air quality will decrease and the village will become gridlocked affecting the quality of life for those living here.		No - as per previous comments box.
342	Christine	Ash	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. I moved here as I am in ill health and the fresh air is far better for me than the town where I used to live. The scale of the proposed build will mean that the village will be inundated with vehicles. The green land that I walk to assist with my health will be gone (I cannot walk hills and rely on the flat areas around the fields). A pleasant village atmosphere will change and it will no longer be a sought after area, likely to become gridlocked with traffic.		No - as per previous comments box.
343	Alan	Heywood	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for edenfield which will radically alter the character of the village		The plans would totally change and ruin the character of the village. Traffic/ parking would be a huge concern it is difficult now to park near the shops in the village and the volume of traffic already causes question at peak times.
344	Gordon	Worth	-		Object	It is accepted that new affordable houses have to be built to meet Government targets and to meet the needs of future generations. - I am supportive of this concept but object to the massive scale of the proposed development as outlined in the current plan. - The building of 489 properties in Edenfield if implemented would destroy and radically alter the character of the village. - An alternative plan needs to be formulated with less houses thereby protecting the village amenities and the value of its current housing stock. - Should the current plan be implemented then there is the potential for a significant increase in the population of say 900 people minimum plus their children. - Without vast improvements to the village infrastructure then the pressure on schools, doctors, traffic, roads, parking and public amenities would be unsustainable. Presumably even more green belt land would have to be released resulting in a further adverse affect on the character of the village. If this was to happen then it would added weight to my objections.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
345	Denise	Langrish	-		Object	I strongly object to this huge amount of land to be used for building it will ruin a village community for ever. The traffic will be horrendous, we have too much traffic already trying to get through a narrow village. The few shops need car parking as it is. Edenfield will no longer be a village. We have local horse riders regular going through the village it is risky as it is, more traffic will enhance the problem. With a huge estate coming out onto Market Street it will create huge problems. We need more trees on the land in Rossendale for the environment not buildings.		Only that so many houses will absolutely ruin an old village & spoil the environment for the wild animals around. Sheep have grazed on the land around here kept it so green for far longer than I have lived here & I have been here 31yrs. The reason people live in Edenfield is to be in small populated places if we wanted to live in populated areas we would move to the city. Why does councils not care about pre existing public that have paid into the place for years. Just want to ruin the surroundings by getting too big.
347	Peter	Entwistle	-		Object	I would like to object to the proposed plan which would radically alter the character of the village, increase congestion and be destructive to village way of life.		-
348	Jill	Entwistle	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield that will radically change our Village increasing traffic which is already heavy through Edenfield x spoil our green belt area and wildlife.		Residents views should be taken into account as we live in this village

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
349	Jonathan	Casey	-		Object	<p>My objection is to the scale of development proposed for Edenfield. - I understand that the area has been singled out as the main site for new housing in Rossendale, because of the desirability of housing in Edenfield. - In my opinion, this desirability is largely due to the fact that the area is not overpopulated and has a significant amount of green belt land, which comprises unspoilt scenery. Should the proposed plans go ahead, this would be ruined. This would destroy the character of Edenfield (as it is only a small village to begin with) and would reduce the value and desirability of housing in the area. - There would also be a detrimental impact upon schools, dentists and GP services in the area, as the village simply isn't large enough to cope with such a sudden increase in its population.</p> <p>##### LETTER COMMENTS #####</p> <p>I write about the Council's Local Plan. It is my understanding that you plan to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around Edenfield from the Greenbelt, so that it can be built on.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the following areas: Land south of Wood Lane Land west of Market Street Land off Exchange Street Land off Blackburn Road Land west of Moorlands View</p> <p>These are covered by references HS2.73 and HS2.71 in the local plan</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans is too large. If carried out, these plans would ruin the character of our village and put unmanageable pressure upon schools and health services in the area. While I understand that there is a need for additional housing in Rossendale, I feel it is unfair that Edenfield should be singled out as the primary area for this, particularly as it is such a small village, which would suffer significantly under such wide-scale change</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
350	Carl	Hayden	-		Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of what is prosed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - -</p> <p>##### LETTER COMMENTS #####</p> <p>I write about councils local plan and how it will affect edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan: Land of Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market street, Edenfield Land of Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of the village.</p>		I am concerned that we have not got the amenities to support this amount of people also we have problems when the bypass closes the village gets gridlocked. This development would add to the problem.
352	Margaret	Gastall	-		Object	As a weekly visitor to Edenfield. I feel that this proposal will alter the entire village and it wouldn't be a village anymore. - The traffic will be dreadful.		-
353	Victoria	Giles	-		Object	I object to the scale of the development which will radically alter the existing character of the village and destroy its setting. - The infrastructure cannot support the sheer size of the proposals and I do not believe that the shortfall can be satisfactorily resolved. Local schools are oversubscribed and health facilities are at stretching point with no future prospect of improvement on the scale necessary to cope with the demand that would be generated. - Priority should be given to the redevelopment of brownfield sites before greenfield development and the borough should ensure that all unoccupied dwellings are fully utilised. -		-
354	Susan	Heyes	-		Object	With the volume of new housing proposed, traffic, schooling, medical establishments would all be a problem and the character of Edenfield would be would be radically changed.		-
355	Bonnie	Littlewood	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village, not being able to cope with the traffic and parking of 1000 more cars as its already at a premium and the amenities to cope in terms of the schools, GP services and dentists with the influx of children and adults.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
356	Robert	Dunne	-		Object	I have lived in Edenfield for about 10 years on bury road, the amount of traffic is already fairly untenable and dangerous. - There is nowhere enough parking in the village and outside houses. - There is very little infrastructure in Edenfield, our post office closed, the schools are full etc, so nearly doubling the amount of people seems ridiculous. - Overall the sheer scale of expansion would radically alter the complexion and feel of the village. - I feel I should point out I don't object to all of the plans just the ones listed and I do appreciate change will cause upheavals.		-
357	Sheila	McIntosh	-		Object	I wish to object to the sheer scale of the proposed development for Edenfield village, which will radically alter the character of the village. It appears that because of the desirability of living in a village has singled Edenfield out as the main development area for Rossendale. - Traffic volume would increase with the prospect of up to 1000 extra cars on the village roads. Trying to get to Manchester at rush hour is difficult now but without improvement in the road network it will be a nightmare. Any problems on the Edenfield Bypass/M66 can and does cause serious congestion on the village roads. - I am concerned that the local schools would not be able to cope with a massive influx of school age children. Catholic families who live in Edenfield are in the parish of St. Josephs' Ramsbottom and there have been problems in the past for families in Edenfield to get places at the parish school. There is no GP surgery in Edenfield or Dentist and it appears there are no plans to increase those services in the surrounding areas or introducing new services to the village.		I accept that there is a need to build more houses especially affordable ones but it is not acceptable to almost double the size of our village. I sincerely hope that the proposals will be reevaluated.
358	Gill	Hillel	-		Object	I wish to object as the size of the village will not support such an influx of new homes. As it is, there is a shortage of parking within the village and the residents on Boundary Edge have to put up with other residents parking on our small development as it is. We have no dentists, doctors, post office and other services in the village. Traffic can also be a problem on Market Street. The proposed developments would massively increase the size of the village which would be catastrophic and would change the dynamic and character of the village.		-
359	joseph	Bowden			Object	we object to the extent of what is proposed for Edenfield as it will radically alter the character of the village.		The sheer scale of what is proposed would cause immense disruption to the village for an extended period of time making the lives of we residents unbearable.
360	Richard	Hillel	-		Object	The size of the proposed development will completely destroy the character of the village of Edenfield. It will be a continuance of the urban sprawl linking Bury and Ramsbottom without a break until Rawtenstall. Consequently it will detrimentally impact the character of the Valley.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
361	paula	Bowden			Object	we object to the sheet scale of what is proposed for Edenfield as it would destroy village life.		The volume of traffic would utterly change the nature of Edenfield and would be dangerous in what is already a very tight area for road traffic.
362	alan	smith	-		Object	I came to live in Edenfield some 26 years ago for a number of reasons but the main one was it's village nature and size.. The proposed scheme to increase the number of houses by more than 50% would simply destroy the whole character of the village.Parking is already difficult and often dangerous in Market St. I am lucky to live in such a beautiful place and am quite happy for some new limited expansion so others can enjoy this lovely environment. However the proposed scale of the expansion is outrageous. I thought Green Belt was protected and could not be destroyed at the whim of the Council. We need a plan to enhance the village not destroy its character.		The Council should be working on improving the environment not destroying it. - Some examples. - The new street Lights in Moorcroft which are dangerous and ineffective along with the pavement surfaces. No money I suppose. - Withdrawal of direct bus to manchester - No Post Office
363	Sidney	Aston			Object	I am objecting about the scale of the proposed housing increases for the Edenfield area; the size of your proposal would completely alter the character of this lovely village, one of the reasons I originally moved here.		-
365	John	Pilsworth	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which is far too many properties for this area.		-
366	Ann-Marie	Fare	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield because it would drastically change the character of the village. Roads would not cope with the volume of traffic and we do not have the amenities to cope.		-
367	Pauline	Littlewood	-		Object	Having been to the meeting to view the plans I am horrified by the scale of the proposed development of this tiny village compared to the plans for the rest of the borough. - I cant imagine where the children will go to school, which doctors they will attend or how they'll drive or park in this already congested VILLAGE.		To top it all its supposed to be greenbelt, or does this not matter any more in this day and age.
368	Susan	Popland			Object	It's ridiculous at the volume of houses you want to build! Alter the village completely. The traffic this would cause is utter madness! The bypass easily gets backed up now & parking is already bad. Schools, dentists & doctors aren't being increased, so again another chaos in the making! - I hate the fact you wish to change the character of the village, the scale of the plans are far too large for our little village to cope!		I want our child to grow up around countryside, not a built up village with no fields & walks to go on.
369	Dominic	Popland	-		Object	I object to sheer size of the proposal. It would nearly double the village of Edenfield in size. The bypass can't currently cope with volume of traffic at rush hour. The road in and out of Edenfield gets backed up now too. Doctors and dentists are already pushed, it takes days to get an appointment! What about schools? I don't see any plans to build anymore? How will they cope with the massive influx of children? Simple answer they wouldn't. I don't see how this could possibly be entertained!		There are enough old mill sites littered around the Valley that could be redeveloped first! Why take the cheaper option and ruin the place we live in? The reason most people live in a valley is that its surrounded by countryside if i want to live in a big town or a city I'd move to one!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
370	Ruth	Lord	-		Object	The scale of the proposed developments is far too great for what is basically a small village (Edenfield) and its delightful and unique character would be lost. The infrastructure of Edenfield is barely sufficient for existing traffic, schools are full, there is no doctor, dentist or vet. Flooding of Market Street at the bottom of Fish Rake Lane is becoming depressingly frequent. More building increases run off as you will be aware. Loss of green spaces runs counter to current opinions about physical and mental health. If this housing is built, even if it is 'social' or 'affordable', I am doubtful that people from the Rossendale valley will be able to afford to buy. I suspect Edenfield would become commuter belt for Manchester and the M66 will be gridlocked 24/7 - I accept that some new housing may be required, and encourage you to make sure it goes to locals. However, it must surely be the highest priority to redevelop brownfield sites before greenbelt. Thank you for your attention.		-
371	Kathleen	Davey	-		Object	I object to this proposed development due to its sheer size and the detrimental way it would alter the character of this village. I have serious concerns for the increased vehicle traffic through the village, the lack of infrastructure to provide school places, doctors facilities as these are currently oversubscribed.		my major concerns are the sheer size of the proposed plan in what is a small village, and using precious green belt land. the number of houses proposed would result in a enormous an increase in traffic on an already congested road through the village.
372	Paul	Kelly	-		Object	I am not a NIMBY and I can see the need for some controlled housing development. However it is the sheer scale of the proposed development that is of the utmost concern. It will change the character of the village enormously and not for the good. The number of houses proposed would put an enormous strain on local services and the extra vehicles and traffic that is bound to follow would lead to traffic congestion and chaos. I am also concerned that should outline planning permission be given the number of housing units would be increased from the proposed number of 489 in order to maximise profitability. These proposed figures would lead to a 50% increase in the housing stock in Edenfield. No place can withstand such a huge and rapid development.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
373	Ann and Linda	Stephenson	-		Object	size of proposed development and lack of infrastructure to support same.		Yes - before any decision is made about this plan I suggest that councillors and relevant council officials visit Edenfield in the evening - and try to park on Market Street and when they've managed that look at the accesses to the land in question. My own suggestion is that all estate roads should lead directly onto the bypass - McDonalds have already set the precedent.
374	Lisa	Sanderson	-		Object	I have attended your planning information event at Edenfield Community Centre- located in the heart of the land that I am objecting to the transfer of green belt land for the purpose of building new homes. I have several concerns and objections that after speaking to the forward planning team has not been allayed. 1) The area is green belt and should be protected. The land is part of the heritage of the village, it is a community assets that has been enjoyed by countless generations. 2) I find the sheer volume of houses proposed to be preposterous. Looking at the plans the proposed widening of the belt will increase the village by over 50% 3) I can't see how exhausting infrastructure could support the number of proposed houses- particularly GP, local Highways and primary schools. 4) the potential disruption to the village which as I understand at a building rate of 30 homes a year could last 10 yrs + 4)		-
375	Abbie	Suthers	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. -		-
376	Philip	Suthers	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
377	Marie	Suthers	-		Object	<p>We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.</p> <p>Comments received by letter (04/09/2017): Draft Local Plan - Edenfield I write regarding the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect the small village of Edenfield. I am aware that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of Greenbelt land from around our village for development. These are the areas which I am very concerned about and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan. Land off Exchange Street Edenfield Land West of Market Street Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road Edenfield Land off West Moorlands View Edenfield I am writing to object strongly that on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. There are also a number of other objections that I would like to make. Firstly the extra traffic a potential 489 new houses would bring to the area with average household having a least 1 car but in most cases 2 -this could see an increase in traffic in the area by approximately 978 cars. There is literally no room either in the village or on "the bY'pass for this many additional cars. When the by-pass is closed due to an accident which is getting a far too a regular concurrence, all of the traffic diverts through our little village, causing traffic chaos, damage to our roads and increased air pollution. Secondly again with potentially another 489 houses being built and the average family having 2.4 children this would mean that an additional 490 places would be required within the schools surrounding Edenfield. The schools in Edenfield are already oversubscribed and this includes the local High School which again is full with a waiting list. Where are these additional children meant to be educated?? This is the same for the local Doctors and Dentists which again are already full. I have to queue at 7.30am outside my doctors to have any chance to get an appointment. The idea that this small village could increase by 50% without firstly improving the local services and infrastructure is absolutely ludicrous. We do not even have a bus link to any major city now in Edenfield. Furthermore the property value in Edenfield is at a premium because we have greenbelt land and it is a small village. Will the Council compensate any sellers who could potentially loose a property sale or have to drastically reduce their house value due to this black cloud which is having over our village? There are many more issues/concerns which could be made against your Draft</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Local Plan which I am sure will be raised at the meeting on 12th September 2107. I just hope the Council Leaders who attend and probably don't live in Edenfield will listen.</p> <p>The whole village is against the Plan which would potentially see our village increase by 50%.</p> <p>I have never had reason to write to my MP but I feel so strongly about this matter that I will be sending a copy of this letter to him.</p> <p>I hope that you will take all of the objections raised by local residents in Edenfield into consideration before you ruin the local countryside forever.</p>		
378	Patricia	Turck	-		Object	<p>Edenfield is a mainly through village The scale of development will drastically change the whole character of the village. We have already had our views and neighbourhood destroyed by the ugly Turbines that sit high above us. The villages around Bury and Rawtenstall are there for everyone to enjoy and allow a bit of escapism for those wishing to visit who may wish to otherwise live near work. We have cyclists motorists and walkers that all flock here to enjoy the views and peace and quiet. Where are they to go otherwise. There are always properties for sale of varying prices if people want to come and live here. So please don't destroy this village that everyone can enjoy there are plenty of run down areas in this region that can be redeveloped to improve and increase available housing. Careful planning and implementation of projects can help to preserve beautiful environments for all and not just be so to line the pockets of FatCat developers who will be here and gone and not have to live with Edenfields destruction.</p>		I feel happy to have the horse and jockey site in Edenfield to be sympathetically developed as it is an eyesore at present. But please reserve the natural beauty of the rest of the village for everyone. Thankyou
379	Jordan	Gotts	-		Object	<p>We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
380	Jennifer	Durham	-		Object	<p>I have been a resident of Edenfield for over 15 years. I believe the local plan will change Edenfield dramatically for the worse. It will affect the lives of all residents and negatively impact the life of the community. - I understand you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land from the Greenbelt so large housing estates can be built. I am concerned about- - Land off Exchange Street, Land west of Market Street, Land off Blackburn Rd, Land west of Moorlands Road. - I object to these proposals. Edenfield will change from a village into a small dormitory town. The country outlook will change dramatically. The infra structure and services will not support the growth in population which will be more than 50%. Having gone to the consultation tonight, it was clear that there were no plans for new schools, GP surgeries, dentists, car parks, road widening etc. - Edenfield is already a busy village with traffic using the main road through the village as a "rat run" - an alternative to the M66. Cars and heavy goods vehicles speed through the village well over the 30mph limit. Drivers are impatient if residents attempt to park, get out of their car etc. I am amazed that there has not been a fata accident yet. Imagine these already crowded roads with 1,000 more local cars (average 2 cars for each of the new 489 households).In addition it is bound to put even more pressure on the current difficult parking situation. It is already very difficult to park anywhere near our houses. - I am concerned that so many houses are planned in one small village. I understand that Edenfield is the only town/village in Rossendale where the plan is to enlarge it by 50%. I imagine this is because this is where the housing developers expect to make most profit. Once again it seems profit comes before people. - I hope the council will review it's plans and scale back the planned developments considerably. - -</p>		Please please reconsider for the sake of local residents
381	Nigel	Cartmell	-		Object	<p>I object to the excessive number of houses being proposed in the village of Edenfield which if built would completely change its 'sleepy' character that drew us here.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
382	Alistair	Green	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - The village already suffers from parking and traffic problems with the current volume of vehicles, with fairly frequent minor accidents on market street involving parked vehicles. An increase in vehicles in the area will only make things worse and the plan does not appear to address the current problems, let alone improvements for the increase. - There appears to be an assumption that a lot of the housing will work locally, however the good motorway links make this a good commuter location for Manchester, and I doubt this will change. We are not well served for public transport to Manchester so this will clearly increase road traffic. - The schools in the area are at capacity and with little scope for further growth, similarly doctors and dentists. Such a significant increase in this area would require an increase to the services available, and again I see no evidence of this in the plan. There was a comment about possible use of services in Bury, but I don't believe services there are any better. -		-
383	Michael	Jones	-		Object	I strongly object to what is proposed for the village of Edenfield, the proposal would completely alter the character of the village. There is not an infrastructure to support development on this scale, there are no doctor's, dentist, parking or roads equipped to handle a double in volume of traffic. The schools are already over subscribed and the area is already being targeted by people wishing to commit crime such as burglaries.		-
384	Helen	Jones	-		Object	I strongly object to the proposed changes to the Edenfield village and its surrounding countryside, this would double the size of an already heavily populated under resourced village. The plans would damage the character of the village and put immense pressure of already strained schools and other local services.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
385	Rebecca	Green	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - The village already suffers from parking and traffic problems with the current volume of vehicles, with fairly frequent minor accidents on market street involving parked vehicles. An increase in vehicles in the area will only make things worse and the plan does not appear to address the current problems, let alone improvements for the increase. - There appears to be an assumption that a lot of the housing will work locally, however the good motorway links make this a good commuter location for Manchester, and I doubt this will change. We are not well served for public transport to Manchester so this will clearly increase road traffic. - The schools in the area are at capacity and with little scope for further growth, similarly doctors and dentists. Such a significant increase in this area would require an increase to the services available, and again I see no evidence of this in the plan. There was a comment about possible use of services in Bury, but I don't believe services there are any better. - I also object to the reduction in green space and increase in air pollution resulting from such an increase in houses. I am also concerned about the potential for flooding due to the reduction in fields to drain away the water which flows down from the moorlands substantially in heavy rain		-
386	Samantha	Seeley	-		Object	I am completing this survey to object to the proposed housing plan in Edenfield village.		-
387	Carys	Boyle	-		Object	I strongly object to these proposals. The scale of the plans is too large for such a small village. It would dramatically alter the character of Edenfield. I have great concerns regarding the environmental impact of potentially a further 1000 extra vehicles on the village roads, including both noise and air pollution. Access and parking would also be of concern.		I am not against the development of new houses, only the numbers proposed is far too excessive for the size of the village.
388	Liam	Pickering	-		Object	The scale of the proposal is far too great, and would potentially ruin the character of the village. It would significantly increase the number of vehicles passing and parking in the village, resulting in further congestion and difficulties in parking. I live on the main road through Edenfield, and this would only add to the level of noise and air pollution generated by the extra traffic.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
390	GEORGINA	UNSWORTH	-		Object	THE SCALE OF THE BUILD EDENFIELD IS A VILLAGE THIS WOULD TURN IT INTO A TOWN. - THE ROADS ARE NOT LARGE ENOUGH TO SUSTAIN THE BUILD, WE HAVE NO DOCTORS, SCHOOLS PLACES AVAILABLE TO ACCOMODATE THE POPULATION , THE HOUSES THAT WOULD BE BUILT ARE NOT BE AFFORDABLE FOR LOCAL PEOPLE, BUT FOR PROFFESIONAL. PEOPLE WANTING EASY COMMUTE TO MANCHESTER VIA THE MOTORWAY NETWORKS		WE NEED TO KEEP OUR GREEN AREAS AND NOT BUILD ON THEM, THERE ARE ENOUGH BROWN AREAS THAT COULD BE BUILT ON AND DELAPIDATED BUILDINGS THAT COULD BE REDEVELOPED THESE OPTIONS SHOULD BE LOOKED INTO FIRST - GREEN AREAS ARE THERE FOR PEOPLE TO ENJOY !!!!! - THERE ARE NO AMENATIES IN THE AREA TO ACCOMODATE THE AMOUNT OF PEOPLE, LOCAL PEOPLE CANT GET APPOINTMENTS AT DOCTORS AND DENTISTS AS IT IS, SCHOOL PLACES ARE FULL AND THE ROADS ARE SHOCKING
392	Susan	Hayden	-		Object	We object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village,and which would not be able to support the volume of traffic or the vital services		-
393	Doreen	Clark	-		Object	The main reasons I wish to object to the proposals are that Edenfield roads are not equipped to deal with all the extra traffic which will be generated if this scheme is approved. Also, the two schools are already at maximum capacity and the quality of life for the residents already living here would be impacted in a detrimental way.		The scale of proposed development is far too large for the village infrastructure to cope with. - I agree that extra housing is required but definately not on this scale.
394	June	Kenyon	-		Object	I am objecting to these proposals mainly because of the increase in traffic this proposed development will cause. The roads are already in a bad state of repair and quite often the main road is at a standstill, particularly if the by-pass is closed. Another maybe up to 1,000 cars will cause grid-lock. Letter received 05/10/2017: I am writing about the Local Plan to build approximately 261 houses behind Market Street towards the by-pass. As you can see, I live on Market Street and am concerned about the volume of traffic such a development would bring. Not only the volume of traffic, but where are the points of access going to be to such a large development? Market Street is the main North/South road through Edenfield, and is already a bottleneck on busy mornings, Friday evenings and especially when the by-pass is closed through accidents. It is not wide enough now and at all times can barely cope, an extra couple of hundred cars does not bear thinking about. I object to the proposals on the ground that the scale of the plans are not too large but downright impossible.		I would also like to point out that the two local schools are full to capacity; the village does not have a bank/post office or doctor's surgery. - The scale of development is far too large for the village of Edenfield to cope with, perhaps if the numbers were scaled down considerably then a much smaller development may be viable.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
395	Daniel	Giles	-		Object	I strongly object to the Site Allocation. - The scale of the proposals is grossly excessive and will destroy the existing character and setting of the village. - The proposals will result in a dormitory development for commuters and consequently will bring no "added value" to the community and cannot therefore be justified. Development should be sited within reasonable distance of areas of employment. - The existing infrastructure is already overstretched, cannot support the size of the proposals and no solution to the problem is indicated. - All available brownfield sites must be exhausted before greenfield development is permitted.	-	
396	Anne	Farmer	-		Object	I object to the size of proposed development of Edenfield Which would radically alter the character of the village.		Edenfields roads are extremely busy currently - and could not cope with the increased traffic the proposed development would - create . - .The two schools which serve Edenfield could not cope with a large influx of children.
397	Elaine	Engel	-		Object	The scale of the proposed development is far too large for the village to cope with. - The roads would not take the extra traffic which would be generated. - The two local schools are already full to capacity and we do not have a doctor's surgery or bank or post office.		The area would become like Helmshore which has been over-developed by the planners and also the site at Rossendale General Hospital. - I accept that we have to have some new housing development in Edenfield but not on the scale proposed at present.
398	Andrew	Nicholls	-		Object	The proposed development is for far too many properties. I am not against small, gradual development but 489 houses is far too many for the roads and facilities to cope with. I live on Market Street and traffic can be very bad, especially around the bottle neck near the mini roundabout opposite Gincroft Lane. Adding up to 1000 extra cars using this route daily would cause chaos and gridlock. It simply won't work. - - We also lost the post office a couple of years ago, have only a small, massively over subscribed school, no doctor, no dentist etc.. It is already almost impossible to get an appointment at the local doctor, almost 500 new households will make it even harder and could impact on the health of people who can't access much needed care. - - There are hundreds of quarry wagons already going up and down Market Street at all hours, each one making the house shake. The extra construction traffic during building would cause dirt, pollution, damaged and traffic issues possibly for two decades. It would be hellish to live here during this, never mind after. This is all without even getting to what would happen to the character of the village. The location has been selected as it is a nice place to live with plenty of green space and countryside. It goes without saying what would happen to all of this if 489 new houses were added to the 900 already here.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
399	Keith	Butterworth	-		Object	<p>I strongly object to Edenfield being singled out for such a massive increase in housing .It would be entirely disproportionate and constitute by far the largest impacted area in the whole of Rossendale.The area of greenbelt lost in one allocation would completely destroy the essential character of the village, which has managed to retain a rural feel for 500 years, or more. In this respect, the shape and position of this area of greenbelt could hardly be worse, in terms of the impact on the village character. It stretches almost the entire length of the village, running parallel to existing housing lines, rather than extending radially (which would at least preserve some of the adjacent landscape. - - The plan proposes virtually 50% more housing in a village with a current infrastructure supporting only about 900 houses. There is talk of a new primary school and the fact that Exchange St would (ludicrously) become the only access road for a huge, elongated swathe of new housing. Beyond these plans, what others are there, to alleviate the impact factors such as increased demand for education, healthcare, utilities, road usage, loss of on-street parking etc?</p>		<p>It seems that RBC is interested only in taking the line of least resistance to getting greenbelt removed by government. Planning officers at the consultation event were talking about 'saleability' of proposed housing and 'proximity to existing villages' to justify these site allocations. Is the housing stock needed or is it not? Assuming it is, I would like to see more emphasis on reduced impact on village residents, more recovery of brownfield sites, more respect for Rossendale's rural character and less attention to planning for the largest, quickest financial return for the Council. In some areas of the borough, some creditworthy considerations seem to have been applied in the Local Plan. Edenfield, however, appears to be being massively and thoughtlessly 'dumped on' for convenience and profit. COME OFF IT! Are we still not past the 20th Century era of destroying small villages? Incremental growth of already urbanised centres must be a far less disruptive process for the population, contiguous greenbelt areas and wildlife habitat.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
400	Jill	Giles	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposals for Edenfield which would radically alter the character and setting of the village. - There are small sites within the village which provide opportunities for infill development - the development of which would be in keeping with the existing character and not impose unreasonable pressure on the existing overstretched infrastructure. - The proposals will result in a dormitory development for commuters to Manchester and surrounding areas instead of supporting the economy of the local area. A no win situation for the borough. - All existing unoccupied residential accommodation, and structures suitable for conversion to residential use, must be brought back into use before further new build is permitted. - All brownfield sites must be developed as a priority before consideration is given to greenfield development.		-
401	Edith	Barker	-		Object	This will become a problem with parking issues, the village will become a commuter network whereby the village will turn into an unsocial area to live, family life will be destroyed. We will see the area decline in the way of distruction to the local area not only with the increased housing but the sheer number of houses and the number of people and vehicles that will cause a lifestyle being destroyed.		There will be issues with housing allocation, the homes will be sold to town/city people after a 'quick buck', the houses will be purchased to be used as 'to let' homes where we will see a decline in who resides in them causing anti-social behaviour and other criminal activity. There will also be an increase in vehicles, turning a busy road into caos.
402	Margaret	Wilson	-		Object	I am objecting to the scale of the proposed development. The village of Edenfield could not cope with the proposed number of houses. The roads are already extremely busy with the existing traffic using them and if the by-pass is closed the traffic grinds to a halt.		I accept that some houses will have to be built in the village but not on this scale. - The two schools are full to capacity and we do not have a doctor's surgery, bank or post office. - The whose area would be changed and the village would loose the lovely open green-belt spaces which now exist.
403	Paul	Fitton	-		Object	The scale of the development is out of proportion to the existing size of the village, and would destroy its character.		I am a regular visitor to the village and have a number of friends and associates living there.
404	Kay	Akpinarlioglu	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposed development in Edenfield which would radically alter the character of this village		-
406	Robin	Platt	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-
407	Greg	Webster	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
408	Julie	Horsfall	-		Object	Objections to the sheer scale of the proposed development in Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the Village. Edenfield would cease to exist as a village and the infrastructure is not suitable for development.		No development on green belt sites in Edenfield Village there is plenty brown belt sites to develop.
409	Sandra	Lang	-		Object	I am objecting to the scale of what is proposed, 489 more houses on an existing stock pf about 900 will adversely affect the character of the village.		I do not have a computer myself but Mr Bradburn has kindly agreed to let me use his to make my comments.
410	Barry	Lang	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. This will completely change the Character of the village for the worse.		I do not have a computer but Mr Bradburn has kindly agreed to allow me to use his to make my comments.
411	Brenda	Henderson	-		Object	I object to the scale of the proposal which will increase the number of houses in the village by over 50% and increase the size of the built up area by almost 100%. in my view this is wrong.		I do not have a computer and Mr Bradburn has kindly agreed to let me use his to make my comments
412	Christine	Bishop			Object	The scale of this proposed development in Edenfield is far too big. It would totally transform the village, as it will increase the number of houses by over 50%, and there is no infrastructure in place to deal with this massive expansion. - Market St cannot cope with the volume of traffic at present, so it would become totally gridlocked once the proposed expansion has taken place. When the M66 is closed due to an accident, all the traffic is automatically diverted through Edenfield - nothing would be able to move if this occurred. - Edenfield has only 2 schools, and I'm not aware of any plans to increase this number - where will all the extra children get their education? - There is no doctor or dentist working in the village, so will all the new residents be able to register with other local GPs and dentists? I doubt it, as it is already very difficult for people to register with these medical services. - Parking in Edenfield is a nightmare at present. Market St has parking on both sides of the road, which means that 2 lanes of traffic cannot pass, where the road is narrow. Where will all the extra cars park if the proposed expansion goes ahead? On the streets causing even more chaos? - I have lived in Edenfield for 28 years, and I appreciate that there must be new development throughout Rossendale, and Edenfield must have it's fair share. Having seen the maps and diagrams at The Consultation last night, it became apparent that Edenfield has been singled out as the main development area, which I think is totally unacceptable. -		-
413	Robert	Henderson	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which will completely alter the character of the village. What might become 500 more houses in our small community will chang it beyond recognition.		I do not have a computer but Mr Bradburn has kindly allowed me to use his to make my comments.
414	Peter	Bretherton			Object	WE UNDERSTAND THE PROPOSAL TO REMOVE GREEN BELT STATUS WILL ENABLE THE BUILDING OF MANY (400 PLUS) HOUSES IN THE VILLAGE WHICH WOULD CREATE HUGE PROBLEMS WITH ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC, PARKING ON MARKET STREET IN THE VILLAGE, AND EFFECTIVELY SPOIL THE VILLAGE LIFE WE ENJOY AT PRESENT.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
415	Alan	Ashworth	-		Object	The number of houses in the Borough is approx 34000 with 4000 being proposed in the new fifteen Year Plan. (This equates to an increase of 11.76%.) In Edenfield the Plan proposes 489 extra houses to be built against the 900 that currently exist, this equates to 54.3%. This is disproportionate and totally unacceptable. - I am not against growth in the Village we have to provide housing for our Younger people and for people who are employed locally. However this growth needs to be in line with the growth predicted for the Borough as a whole. - I believe we can find sites in our Village to cope with a sensible level of growth without destroying our Green Belt. - The proposed plan will destroy the Village in the way that Helmsore has been destroyed and devastate our Green Belt. There is no demand for this number of Houses in the Village and the infrastructure could in no way cope with what is being proposed. - The road is already congested and under the proposed plan a further 1000 cars will be added to the current numbers. Additionally, there will be several hundred more cars from the Plans proposed for the expansion in Irwell Vale, Ewood Bridge and Townsend Fold, we will come to a total standstill. - We have been advised that the Sewers are operating at a maximum level, the two local Schools are already full and the local NHS Doctors and Dentists are struggling to provide an acceptable service.		We would be able to cope with the growth predicted for the Borough but anything in excess of this would destroy our Village
416	Carol	Ashworth	-		Object	I attended the consultation yesterday and it confirmed my worst fears that our village is being destroyed. We have a lovely village of approx. 900 houses and the plan proposes to build close to 500 houses. This is an increase well in excess of 50 % and totally disproportionate in terms of the Borough itself which is only 11.76% as a whole. - We cannot cope with an expansion of this size, it will decimate our green belt and bring our roadways to a standstill as well as putting our children and elderly people at risk when crossing the road. - The rest of our infrastructure, particularly the sewers are operating at maximum capacity, our doctors and dentists are struggling to cope with life expectancy in the valley being very poor. - We need the Council to rethink the plan, to allocate the growth equally throughout the area and look to utilise existing brown field sites and only small pockets of our precious green belt land.		I believe the Council should look to utilise this opportunity to improve the deprived areas in the Borough, making them a more desirable place to live instead of taking the easy way out and spoiling the jewels of the Borough.
417	PHILIP	JOHNSON	NONE		Object	THIS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, IRRESPECTIVE OF GREENBELT, IS JUST TOO LARGE FOR A SMALL VILLAGE LIKE EDENFIELD. A POTENTIAL INCREASE OF 50% WOULD ALTER THE CHARACTER OF THE PLACE AND OVERWHELM LOCAL SCHOOLS AND SERVICES.		INEVITABLY THERE WILL BE HOUSES BUILT HERE, PEOPLE, INDEED THE COUNTRY NEEDS MORE HOUSES. I HOPE WHEN THIS HAPPENS WE WILL HAVE A MIX OF HOUSES AS WE HAVE NOW. THAT IS DETACHED, SEMIS, TERRACED, SOCIAL AND HOMES FOR THE ELDERLY.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
418	Eric	Whittle	-		Object	The scale of this development is massive and the infrastructure could not cope with this influx of properties. The roads are in a bad state of repair and parking on Market Street and around the village is at a premium. The road is grid-locked if the traffic off the by-pass is diverted through the village. - The schools are already fully subscribed and we have no G.P's surgery, bank or post office.		Why has the majority of building in Rossendale have to take place in Edenfield? Surely other areas could be found which would not have as significant an impact on the surroundings. Edenfield would turn into another Helmshore which has been over-developed by the planners.
420	PAMELA MARY	BROWN	-		Object	I OBJECT TO THE SHEER SCALE OF WHAT IS PROPOSED FOR EDENFIELD WHICH WOULD RADICALLY ALTER THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE. I ALSO FEEL THAT THE EXISTING INFRA STRUCTURE WOULD NOT BE CAPABLE OF SUPPORTING ALL THIS DEVELOPMENT. EG ROAD TRAFFIC, SCHOOLS, PARKING, DOCTORS AND SEWERAGE/SURFACE WATER.		-
421	HARRY WORSLEY	BROWN	-		Object	I OBJECT TO THE SHEER SCALE OF WHAT IS PROPOSED FOR EDENFIELD WHICH WOULD RADICALLY ALTER THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE. I ALSO FEEL THAT THE EXISTING INFRA STRUCTURE WOULD NOT BE CAPABLE OF SUPPORTING ALL THIS DEVELOPMENT. EG ROAD TRAFFIC, SCHOOLS, PARKING, DOCTORS AND SEWERAGE/SURFACE WATER.		-
422	Helena	Whittle	-		Object	I object most strongly to the massive size of the development. The village cannot take all the extra houses which are being proposed to be built. Parking and traffic flow are horrendous at present but with maybe another 1,000 vehicles on the roads.		The two local schools are full to capacity, we do not now have a G.P's surgery, Bank or Post Office. - The loss of green belt land would have a significant impact on the village and the lovely open views across the Valley would be lost.
423	Gillian	Hulme	-		Object	I object most strongly to the sheer scale of the plans proposed for Edenfield and to the huge number of houses the Council envisages being constructed. Should these plans go ahead, there will be a very negative impact on the village, the whole character of which would be changed and certainly not for the better!		The infrastructure in the village could not cope with such a huge increase in population and, inevitably, traffic. The schools could not accommodate such an increase in pupils. The road through the village could not cope with the extra traffic. It can hardly cope now and when the bypass is shut because of an accident, there is total gridlock!
424	Olive	Ellis	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. The character of the village would be completely altered, for the worst. We feel that such a large amount of extra housing is unwarranted anyway as there are insufficient local jobs for the people who live here now.		My views are shared by my husband, Mr Gordon Ellis.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
425	Jamie	Irwin	-		Object	These plans will destroy the village of Edenfield. The village does not have the infrastructure to deal with a 50% or greater increase in housing and population. The road network already suffers due the large volume of traffic adding over 1000 cars would cause grid lock. - - The amount of development in Edenfield is much larger than all other areas, even though it is only a small village. - - The plans are also irresponsible when it comes to looking after the environment. Almost all the development is on greenbelt. Across the borough there is a large amount of brownfield sites that should be repurposed. - - I very strongly oppose the plans for Edenfield.		
426	elaine	howard	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		The road along market st is already fully congested and trying to park for people who live along the street is a nightmare. BUT THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE PARKING ANYWHERE. Extra traffic along this road will bring more chaos than there already is. Every week someone gets their wing mirrors knocked off. - - Are the council or the contractors going to find land for the residents of Market St to park? The answer is no, because there is nowhere to put a car park!!!!!! - - We only have two schools in the area, so how they are going to cope with a massive influx of children, goodness only knows, plus there are no plans for increasing GP services and Dentists in the area. - - It is not VERY GREEN for such a small village to put up with all the emissions from cars etc which will come with the houses.
427	Peter	Ward	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. Also the infrastructure for a plan of this magnitude is not in place to support this plan		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
428	Rita	Hudson	-		Object	I object to the number of additional houses being planned for Edenfield. - The extra vehicles alone could be about 1000 which will congest the village even more than it already is. The building contractors vehicles, whilst work is progressing, added to lorries from the quarries near here will congest our roads further. - Access to the site/new homes by families will probably mean even more restricted parking for people presently living on Market St. or Exchange. - 'Affordable housing' was mentioned several times by the council officers present, carries with it the potential for 'buy to let' and a subsequent downgrading of the villages 'desirability' mentioned in the plans. I noticed that one paragraph in the plans suggested some green belt sites may be 100% 'affordable' housing and therefore a target for 'buy to let' landlords. I would hope that 'affordable' means young new home-owners, preferably subsidised and helped the local council, not landlords. - Bearing in mind the location of our home we will be over-looked by any new housing built off Exchange St. Our reason for picking this as our home was that it offered views (which will be gone) up the valley and it gave us privacy for being naturist in our garden.		I sincerely hope that we will all be consulted further as this process goes forward...and not have to learn about it from our village residents association. We certainly never received notice from the council about the 'consultation'.
429	Alan	Ridehoulgh	-		Object	The scale of the development is on too massive a scale for the small village of Edenfield. There is no infrastructure in place, the roads are grid-locked already and the schools full.		I wonder if this has been the 'easy option' for the planners to propose so many houses in this area. I can accept some development but not on this scale. Why don't they look to improving some other areas in the Rossendale Valley?
431	Graham	Moxon	-		Object	I think this proposal for 489 more houses in Edenfield is far too massive a scale and will in effect more than double the existing housing stock. - Although I live in Ramsbottom, I spend a lot of time in Edenfield and also journey through many times, the village would lose it's lovely open aspect if this green-belt land were to be developed.		The roads would not cope with the extra burden of say 1,000 more vehicles and the two local schools are already full to capacity.
433	daniel	Butterworth	-		Object	.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
434	Jacqueline	Gaynor	-		Object	I wish to object to the enormity of the scale proposed for the removal of land from the Green Belt around Edenfield to allow developers to build on these sites. - According to the draft consultation the plan is to release land to build nearly 500 homes. This is totally disproportionate in a village that currently has 900 homes. There is no infrastructure in place to support such huge numbers. - The development would bring about 1,000 more cars to a village that already struggles for access along Market Street and for parking. - We are having to fight to keep the pharmacy, there is no bank and we recently lost the post office. There are no GPs or dentists and the two primary schools at either end of the village are already oversubscribed. Public transport links are appalling and the nearby bypass is frequently gridlocked at peak times. - The scale of the developments proposed would change Edenfield from a village to an urban sprawl and would totally destroy its character. - I understand from your officers at the consultation event no other individual settlement in Rossendale has been singled out for a 50% increase so why Edenfield? - For all the above reasons I wish to lodge my objections.		I am not against development per se, but I do object to the sheer scale of the proposals.
435	Carl	Gaynor	-		Object	I object to the proposals for the release of Green Belt land for development because of the huge scale of the plans. Edenfield is a village of 900 homes and the draft plan proposes a 50 per cent increase which is totally disproportionate and will destroy the character of the village. - There is no infrastructure to support such a massive increase. The roads cannot support the extra 1,000 cars that would no doubt be the result, the two primary schools at either end of the village are already oversubscribed and could not cope with the massive influx of children. Parking is already a struggle in the village and public transport links are very poor. In short, Edenfield would cease to be a village under these proposals such is the enormity of the scale.		I understand no other area in Rossendale has been signed out for a 50 per cent increase in size so why Edenfield? Would it not be more fair for other areas of Rossendale to share the allocation of land released for housing?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
436	Craig	Finn	N/A		Object	<p>I can see no clear demonstration of 'exceptional circumstance' to justify proposed amendments to existing Green Belt. As part of the Council's own evidence base in support of the Draft Local Plan content, I note that: - "The NPPF attaches great importance to Green Belts and stresses that their essential characteristics are 'openness and permanence'. It also advises that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances through the preparation or review of a local plan. - It is important to note that the relatively poor performance of land against Green Belt purposes is not, in itself, an exceptional circumstance that would justify release of the land from the Green Belt".(Rossendale Green Belt Review, November 2016). - I have an interest in HS2.71 (and parcel 34 as per the Green Belt Review in particular) and also note the following report comments: - "Release of this parcel [parcel 34 within HS2.71] from the Green Belt would push development further north which would not relate well or form a coherent extension to the current settlement edge. Development within the north of the parcel would introduce an element of sprawl and would negatively impact on the openness of the neighbouring parcel of P25 <a notable 'STRONG' performer against the NPPF's Green Belt 'purpose' and not identified as potential development land]. Removal of this parcel from the Green Belt would make the neighbouring P25 vulnerable to further ribbon development along Bury Road as developers may wish to 'fill in' the gap between the northern tip of the parcel and the road. Releasing this parcel is likely to have a negative effect on the performance of neighbouring parcels and the integrity of the wider Green Belt" (Rossendale Green Belt Review, November 2016). - Surrounding infrastructure is a key concern and the contents of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan are also noted. Geotechnical issues with the A56 embankment in Edenfield have been identified and would need to be addressed and there are no guarantees that the next Road Investment Strategy (RIS2) would identify funding to improve transport links in particular or that Highways England would likely grant construction of new access onto its network. (Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery Plan, July 2017). - Whilst the Draft Local Plan includes methodology to explain how the proposed number of 'housing/units' per site has been arrived at, there is no clear assessment of the number of potential occupants, assuming a mix of housing supply to complement the existing design of the village, thus the potential increased demand on services cannot be quantified. As the Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes, there is no guaranteed (NHS) funding streams for either staffing or premises expansion for GP or Dental Practices. Equally, Department of Health bidding rounds for funding may not take place in the future, nor is a Rossendale practice guaranteed funding should it apply. In these austere times, similar scenarios can be cited for Education, Social Services and Public Services generally. - It is acknowledged that New Homes</p>		None

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						Bonus arising from implementation of the Local Plan may act as a funding source to Rossendale Council (but realistically only replacing Central Government Grant) but I wish to object to the Draft Local Plan as I believe the suggested locations for potential development, and the number of units proposed therein, are not viable for the reasons set out above. -		
438	Fiona	Keir	-		Object	I object to the scale of the development proposed for Edenfield. I understand that development is needed but the number of houses proposed would not match the local amenities, for example no GP surgery in Edenfield, only two already fully subscribed schools in the area. The access from Exchange St would be a concern, there is usually only room for single file traffic along this road day and night currently due to the lack of parking in the area. Traffic flow would increase with many new houses and the road would be congested. The local park is on this road, and local preschool with young children frequently having to cross.		-
439	Jane	Howard	-		Object	I am concerned about the volume of houses proposed for the listed areas. Edenfield can only manage some housing in the area, it is a small village with no GP surgery and two full schools. A vast increase in traffic on side roads would lead to a congested village. Market St is usually double parked meaning slow traffic.		-
442	Ian	Fletcher	-		Object	I object to the proposals on the sheer scale of the proposed developments within Edenfield, which would completely ruin the character of the village. Increasing the housing by over 50% will destroy the village character and feel. - Traffic through Edenfield is already congested and insufficient areas to park and cannot cope with the substantial increase in traffic that this would incur. - - The local facilities, schools, Doctors, Emergency services could not cope with an influx of families to this scale. - - Access to these sites is also very restricted which would also add to congestion and difficulties within the Village. All of the above destroying the Village atmosphere and making it an undesirable area to live. - - For the land west of Moorlands view there is also a colony of Bats and although not sure where these live it is essential they are not disturbed.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
444	Dorothy	Jones			Object	Should this plan go ahead, the sheer size of it will completely alter the character of the village. - - Both Edenfield and Stubbins junior schools are at capacity and unable to expand further, so where will the children in these houses go to school? And where will older children go to school - Woodhey is at capacity. - - We have been informed that there will be no access to the by pass so all traffic will have to use Market Street which is already extremely busy, particularly in the morning and again in the early evening. - How do you propose to accommodate up to 1000 extra vehicles, working on at least two vehicles per house? - Is it true that the access to the main road will be through the space revealed by the demolition of the Horse and Jockey? At present the majority of houses in Market Street have to park on the roadside as there is no access to the rear of their properties - the proposed increase in traffic will cause chaos and road safety will be a thing of the past. - - There is no doctor in the village - where will the extra villagers go for medical and dental help? - - Will there be green spaces among the houses to enable children to play safely? - - Will the houses be executive 4 and 5 bedroom houses rather than affordable houses for the youngsters of the village? We need to keep young people in the village.		Please give serious consideration to the comments of the villagers, Edenfield is and always has been a village. With your proposals it will just become a huge housing estate with a continual traffic jam. Do you care? I sincerely hope you do give serious consideration to all the objections to your plans, After all there are other areas in Rossendale to develop, why ruin Edenfield? Some development of residencies could happen here, but not on the scale proposed by you.
445	Margaret	Hardman	-		Object	Although I do not reside in Edenfield, I spend a great deal of time there, as I am associated with Edenfield Cricket Club. - I love the open spaces around the village and think the proposed planned development is far too large for the village. There is no infrastructure in place, the roads are horrendous and parking is at a premium.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
447	Christine	Petterson	-		Object	<p>- I understand that you are planning to remove large areas from the Greenbelt so that the land can be built on. - - I object to the sheer scale of the proposals which would radically alter the character of the village. - - Policy HS5: Housing Density - An increase in housing of around 50% would obviously have a “detrimental impact on the amenity, character, appearance, distinctiveness and environmental quality” of the area. It would remove regularly used recreational land and drastically change the appearance of the village as the sites proposed spread the length of the village. The increased traffic would have a significant impact on the environment. - - Policy ENV1: c) Being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers, and avoiding demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area. - The amenities in Edenfield are already fully stretched with no GP surgery, no Post Office, one small local grocery shop and the two primary schools fully subscribed. - - Chapter 6: Transport Policy TR1: ...Proposals which reduce the need to travel will also be encouraged. Edenfield is already a “congestion hotspot”, particularly at peak times. When there are hold-ups on the Edenfield by-pass, which happen on a regular basis, traffic diverts through the village creating gridlock and is hazardous for pedestrians who have difficulty trying to cross the roads. - •Promoting sustainable transport solutions to address congestion and air pollution; - •Ensuring that development that generates significant movement is located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. ; - Bus services in the area are constantly being reduced with access to surrounding areas meaning that car travel has often become necessary. There is now no direct link with Manchester and limited bus services in an evening. Should the East Lancs Railway ever start to be used for commuter travel, this would not have an impact on Edenfield as a car/bus would be needed to reach the station. - An increase of almost 500 homes will almost certainly mean in increase in, possibly around 900, cars accessing the narrow roads in the area. - - - - -</p>		-
448	Bill	Dust	-		Object	<p>I object to such a large scale proposal which would double the size of the village of Edenfield. A village which is already bursting at the seams in terms of too many vehicles with insufficient safe parking. A main street which is virtually a single line of traffic with passing places due to car parking and a dangerous place at school times due to even more parking problems. - Facilities and services are already in short supply eg. schools bursting at the seams, no doctor, no dentist, no library etc.. - The proposal is too big and would add to the already stop start nature of the bypass at busy times by drivers trying to commute south.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
450	Carol	Mitchell	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposal. Apart from the fact that it will radically alter the character of the village, I do not feel that the village can cope with the inevitable influx of cars and people. - The infrastructure isn't there to support it. The roads are already completely full of parked cars making driving through the village difficult at the best of times. We are talking about the possibility of a further 1000 cars or thereabouts. - The tailback, in all directions, at the Rostron's Arms during the rush hour is already a nightmare. Imagine that with all the extra cars. The cottages round the junction will have a constant stream of vehicles outside their windows. They already suffer from terrible dirt on their frontages from the traffic that currently passes. It will be like pre bypass days. - There are only two primary schools in the village which are both already fully (if not over) subscribed at every new school year. Where will all the extra children go? - There is no doctors surgery and it is difficult to get doctors appointments in any of the surrounding areas. - I am completely against building on greenbelt until every scrap of brown field is developed and every empty or substandard house is either refurbished or demolished and replaced. Once gone greenbelt can never be returned. I also think the loss of the fields will increase the problem of flooding lower down the valley.		-
451	Karen	Duckworth	-		Object	Impact of such a large scale development on the character and amenities of the village, such as the school. Edenfield is not a town like Bacup or Rawtenstall so this large development will impact greatly and change the nature of the place. - - Market St is now problematic. There is heavy traffic and there are quarry lorries at one end. When the bypass is closed, traffic through the village grinds to a halt. Increased traffic from new developments feeding into Market St would be a nightmare adding to the number of vehicles significantly and to existing difficulties. - - So much removal of land from green belt would change the character of the place, a place which is enjoyed by ramblers and walkers. -		-
452	Barbara	Dewar	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - The road through the village is already very busy, extra traffic would make this much worse. The two local schools are oversubscribed at present and are unable to expand further. Doctors' lists are full. - I hope this is not just a routine exercise, I was concerned when I attended the consultation evening at the community centre - the standard reply from the council representatives was " We need more housing". - I appreciate there is a national need for more housing but looking at the county plan there are other sites around the area which could be developed to provide a more balanced response to this need.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
454	Graham	Elkes			Object	<p>I write in connection with the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from Greenbelt so it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan; Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market street, Edenfield land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I do not object to house building around the village, as I believe that we need further homes for an ever-growing population, but I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would radically alter the character of our village.</p>		
455	Lindsey	Elkes			Object	<p>I write in connection with the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from Greenbelt so it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan; Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market street, Edenfield land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I do not object to house building around the village, as I believe that we need further homes for an ever-growing population, but I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would radically alter the character of our village.</p>		
456	Craig L	Wilson			Object	<p>I write in regard to the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to request the government to remove large amounts of land around the village from the greenbelt so that it can be used for housing.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan; Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of market street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out will irrevocably ruin the character of our village</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
457	David	Wilson			Object	<p>I write in regard the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to request the government to remove large amounts of land around the village from the greenbelt so that it can be used for housing. These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land West of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of moorlands view, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far to large and if carred out will irrevocably ruin the character of our village.</p>		
458	Carolyn	Duncan			Object	<p>I am writing to strongly obkect to the draft local plan as proposed for Edenfield which entails removing significant areas which are of particular concern to me are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan and are as follows:</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield land off blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>The proposals contained within the plan would significantly and detrimentally affect both the character of the village and daily functioning of the village. I believe that the scale of the proposed development would produce negative impacts in terms of traffic congestion, parking issues, access to schooling and health services.</p> <p>I lived in the village for over 20 years and regularly return to visit family and friends. Parking and congestion within the village worsens year on year, currently making access from one end of the village to the other a significant challenge given the volume of traffic and the number of parked cars. Such proposed development would only add to this chaos and place further strain on various local services.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the environmental impact that this proposed development would have the area, destroying large areas of Greenbelt land. Given that there are several Brownfield sites within the rossendale area that could be developed for housing I fail to see the justification for developing on Greenbelt land at the expense of fundamentally and permanently changing the character of the village of Edenfield.</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposals and urge the council to rethink allowing such large scale development within this rural village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
483	Nabil	Isaac			Object	<p>I write about Council's local plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so than it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas I am particularly concerned about and are covered by reference HS2.71 on site map which accompanies the plan.</p> <p>land off exchange St. Edenfield land west Market St. Edenfield land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield land west Moorlands View Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. The village infrastructure, roads and schooling may not be sufficient and will be put under pressure.</p>		
491	Frances	Youles			Object	<p>I write about the council's local plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt so it can be built on.</p> <p>The below are areas about which I am very concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land off Exchange Street, Edenfield • land west of Market Street, Edenfield • land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield • land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would destroy the character of our village.</p> <p>Please acknowledge safe receipt and thank you for your assistance.b</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
494	M.D	Borkus			Object	<p>Thank you for the very informative consultation even at the Local Community Centre today.</p> <p>It is a great concern regarding the Council's Local Plan, and how it will affect Edenfield.</p> <p>It is obvious that since the previous consultations approximately 2 years ago that the Council has bowed to pressure from national developers to release larger plots of "Green Belt" land, and I am concerned that you will be recommending the removal of these large areas of "Green Belt" to the government.</p> <p>As the land in question has already been purchased by these developers they are obviously confident that this will be the case.</p> <p>The areas of concern are covered by reference HS2.71 as per the tabled site map.</p> <p>Land of Exchange Street Land West of Market Street Land off Blackburn Road Land West of Moorlands View. All above in Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals based upon the following:-</p> <p>A) The sites are too large and will destroy the character of the village in effect "urbanising" a community that wishes to retain its rural character.</p> <p>B) There is insufficient local amenities to sustain the increased community i.e school size, Doctors etc.</p> <p>C) The developments would not be sustainable. I.e Car usage.</p> <p>A development of say 200 houses with 2/3 cars on plot produces 400-600 car movements. The sites ear marked combined will have a greater density.</p> <p>Bus usage:- Buses are non existant after 19:00. The vast majority of the new residents would work in Manchester - with no public transport links. Even with a new road link to the A56/M66 (which the developers would probably offer to contribute to the costs) would not alleviate the traffic issues that will develop. The main road through Edenfield at present gets highly congested through the day compounded by heavy goods vehicles such as Quarry vehicles</p>		
495	Ian	Winfor			Object	<p>I write about councils local plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village to build on.</p> <p>Land off exchange street land west of market street, edenfield blackburn road, edenfield Moorlands view, Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
496	K	Scranage			Object	<p>As a resident of Edenfield for over 50 years I am appalled at proposals these will have on the village.</p> <p>In 1965 the "main" road was overwhelmed by the quantity of the variety of traffic which had to pass through Edenfield - in 1968 the by-pass was opened! It had taken many years for this to be achieved. However, from the local roundabout access was provided for northbound traffic to the valley - none to the south to manchester; is a big mistake! In 2017, gain entry to the feeder road at rawtenstall and traffic is the progressed to the M66. in a short time traffic from Haslingden merges into both lanes.from there on. Beyond Edenfield etc are obliged to use the slop road on the the M66. there is the development of gridlock!!</p> <p>Authorities of the past - looking after the interests of the valley- had the foresight to designate Brown and Green areas to protect the rural landscape for future generations.</p> <p>It now needs the residents to challenge proposals which threaten the very heart of, and character of Edenfield.</p> <p>We have had to sudder facility losses via post office, bank, newsagents and others whilst media and educational are stretched RETAIN THE GREEN BELT which PROTECTS EDENFIELD</p> <p>FIGHT FOR ROSSENDALE</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
497		Whittaker			Object	<p>We feel we have to write to you to register one strong objection to the Council's local Plan to remove large amounts of land around our village, greenbelt land, so that it can be built on - the proposed site allocations. The sites covered are those designated by the reference number HS2.71. We are concerned about the swallowing up of all sites, and especially those West of Market Street, Off Blackburn Road and West of Moorlands View, as well as land off Exchange street, i.e. the field below the recreation ground, which surrounds chatterton hey on two sides. We herewith wish to object strongly to the policy and site allocations.</p> <p>We feel - along with most of the village residents - must not be beshrouded with unwanted houses which would bring unwanted problems for those of us already living in Edenfield - problems with gridlocks, and more pollution, if another thousand or so vehicles use village roads, not to mention drivers frustrated by the futher congestion brought by an increase in vehicles. We do not want to see a massive influx of families living in four hundred plus houses. Villagers love their villages, and their well-being in a harmonious community, as we have at the present time, in of paramount importance to them.</p> <p>Proposed "development" - so called! - stems from the developers money fuelled and focused operations benefitting themselves, and to be frank, the council also. Consequences of the coice, and the effects of the present (any future villagers, too) people of Edenfield, have not been thouroughly thought through. The preserving of the present character of the village deserves to be, and must be continued.</p> <p>Such as the local plan policy and the proposed site allocations, which would, because of its outrageous scale and its lack of consideration for a healthy, integrated and harmonious community for the villagers of Edenfield - some of us have lived here for hundreds of years - destroy the fabric of a quintessential english village.</p> <p>We trust our objections will be taken on board and respected.</p>		
499		Butterworth			Object	<p>We object to all the listed applications on the grounds that local roads particularly hall street can not cope with the increase in traffic these extra houses would bring.</p> <p>Also services such as schools. G.Ps etc would not be able to serve an increase in populaton</p>		
500	John	Clements			Object	<p>Approximately 500 more houses in Edenfield may well cause more flooding in the valley including irwell vale (which already has a very bad flooding record) - due to faster surface water run off from additional roofs, tarmac, roads and drives)</p> <p>Also unacceptable congestion on roads, medical centres and schools. In the Edenfield area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
504	Simon	Hampson	-		Object	There are no plans for infrastructure improvements. The sheer scale of the planned development will change the character of Edenfield beyond belief. No increase in school or medical facilities. Where will all these people park? Bypass..A56/M66 will also need widening. It can't cope as it is! Please, see sense and scrap this nightmare plan?		I am not against change. This plan can't work and Edenfield doesn't yet have the infrastructure to support it.
506	paul	hopwood	edenfield resident		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for edenfield .To increase the population by 50% will change the character of our village. The pollution is already at high risk. The roads are very poorly maintained. The schools are full.We already have too many trucks,hgv's and other large vehicles on our narrow roads.We do not want to live in a building site for 10 years.Also we have no police prescence in the village.		-
507	moyra	franklin	-		Object	with regard to this draft plan I object strongly as the whole amount of development will alter both the area and character of what is a Ribbon village. The houses already create massive traffic problems and this would add some 1000 more vehicles which would add to danger and pollution as we currently have the quarry waggons going through all day. We do not have facilities including schools doctors or anything else and we have know where to put all this added requirements. It would completely change the status of the village and as we already suffer the problems of being on the edge of greater Manchester this would make life impossible. The sheer scale of this amount of housing I feel would be opposed in any similar area around the country. - There are many brown sites with in Rossendale that I'm sure would be better equipped to improve the housing shortage with less destruction to areas and population.		-
508	Sheila	Dust	-		Object	Far too much land being given over for housing development. It could create doubling of the village size which would totally spoil the village. - There is already a severe parking problem in general but at school times chaos and danger reigns. - At any time traffic is down to single file through the village with passing places here and there depending on parked cars. - Houses already for sale in the village are not selling so why more? - Car parking space is what is urgently needed to free up Market St as things stand at the moment without a further c800 cars to contend with.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
511	Greg	Willetts	-		Object	I object to the proposed plan due to the scale of development compared with the current size of the village of Edenfield, this will destroy the feel and nature of the current village and the scale is unacceptable. Of particular concern is the lack of infrastructure, roads, access points and amenities, schools, community centre, public transport etc. The village cannot cope with the increased numbers proposed - - The proposals talk of contribution being made by developers to contribute to amenities, however there is mention of Mark Pits, Haslingden sports centre , that is not acceptable. Edenfield will take the pain and brunt of the development, while other communities further up the valley get the benefit. Developers must be forced to pay for upgraded facilities and amenities in Edenfield, like a new community centre , playing fields and school upgrades. The community centre to be clear needs raptors be funded by the council and operated by the council over the duration of the development. - - A new junction onto the A56 would also be a benefit if we are forced to have this to avoid traffic congestion		The plan as outlined is unfair and feels disproportionately targeting Edenfield, rather than the developments being spread around the valley.
512	Karl	Denton	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
513	Philip	Leake	-		Object	I am concerned regarding the Council's Local Plan which will involve changing the above land from Greenbelt status to building land. Surely there are enough Brownfield sites within Rossendale to build on rather than losing more of a valuable resource for the whole community. - I have been advised that the need for sewers etc will be investigated by United Utilities but I find it hard to believe that current capacity will be sufficient to cope with what will be nearly double the usage. Worryingly the answer may be to dig up much of the area to increase capacity. - Access to the majority of the site would presumably be via Market Street, the heart of the village. Already there is congestion at both ends of Market Street where the road narrows and buses and commercial traffic are struggling to get past one another. Large amounts of construction traffic would increase this problem several fold. - The road network is insufficient to deal with initially all the construction traffic, and later up to an extra 1000 vehicles belonging to new residents. - I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and would turn the village into a building site for several years, whilst irrevocably ruining it's character. -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
514	Keith	Openshaw	-		Object	To increase the size of the village by the number of houses will completely change the whole fabric and in my opinion destroy the character of the village. - - When you look at the plan the proposed area of greenbelt being taken out of protection amounts to approx. 85-90% of the current residential area (using the dimensions from your maps). Surely this borders on the ridiculous by any standards. This is going to result in a population not far from double the current one. - - The main road (Market Street & Bury Road) is currently parked almost end to end on both sides with responding bottlenecks. - - I would also like to ask why all green belt on the west side of Market street is ear-marked for removal from green belt while east side not , you would have thought with the majority of the traffic going south in morning the east side would be a better bet (ie: turnng left into traffic) + it might make the village a little bit more balanced.? - - Edenfield is going to be an on/off building site for years to come, any drop in house demand will leave projects half done & looking a real mess with the council unable to do very much about it (in my experience). - - The traffic is going to be a nightmare it is already difficult to get thru the village when cars & vans parked both sides of Market St. & Bury Rd. this is only going to get worse, I remember talking to one of the planners regards-building near community centre many years ago when he said then 'the thing Edenfield needs most is more parking space not houses'. - - What plan is there for the additional school places that will be required? - What plan for a doctors surgery to be incorporated as the village will have enough people to expect one?		-
516	Chris	Bishop	-		Object	The Housing developments proposed are too intense for the village. It would not be able to cope. It increases the stretched resources, transport issues and changes the whole nature of the village.		There are no medical facilities in the village, Transport, when the Bye-pass is closed (accidents, maintenance etc) is awful. Parking would be a serious issue. Could the schools cope?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
517	Margaret	Rostron	-		Object	The proposed sheer scale of development planned in my opinion would radically alter the character of our village, Whilst acknowledging the need for new housing the proposed plans for Edenfield are on a scale that would mean: - 1. Increased traffic on an already saturated road, there is already double parking through the main part of the village and this results in traffic jams throughout the day and at peak times . - 2. In addition to this there is no longer a doctors surgery in the village and people have to go to either Rawtenstall or Ramsbottom and there are already issues around a shortage of healthcare staff which is currently an issue in Rossendale. - 3. Furthermore the two local primary schools are already over subscribed thus increasing the pressure on the schools to accommodate extra pupil numbers in future if these proposals are approved. - 4. The village contains approximately 900 houses and the proposal being considered is for a further 489 houses, this would change the whole village beyond recognition and there is no real infrastructure to cope the increased demand for services in Edenfield and the surrounding areas. -		I am not against new small housing developments but they need to be in context with the current size of the village and efforts should be made to retain the overall appearance and character in line with the current housing stock that runs along Market Str
518	Norma	Pilkington	-		Object	I am objecting to the scale of the proposals for Edenfield because it would radically alter the character of the village. I am also objecting on the grounds of school and GP capacity, parking and traffic problems which would be caused if the proposals were implemented.		Completed on my behalf by Mrs Elizabeth Latham of 8 Dearden Fold Edenfield, as I do not have internet access. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
522	Kathryn	Hopwood	-		Object	I object to the plans which are wholly too extensive for this village and its infrastructure. Market Street and the surrounding roads between Edenfield and by-pass junctions will simply not cope with the volume of traffic that will come of adding so many new residents. Public transport is insufficient and the school and medical provisions are insufficient for that many new residents. The project will simply change the village into a town and not only reduce its desirability and our current house prices but ruin the very nature of our little village. Talk of using the East Lancs railway as additional public transport is not only horrifying as it will ruin a main tourist attraction in the area but will have knock on effects on Ramsbottom as there is insufficient parking for such use, and all the surrounding areas that have a station on the line (crossing the county borders) will need massive upgrading and overhaul, ruining the East Lancs line all together. The By-pass is already prone to great disruption and a single incident on the whole stretch can leave Edenfield in grid lock already. The by-pass will not cope with more traffic. - - Our crime rates are low, our children play on the fields and dog walkers can be found all over the village all the time making full use of those green spaces we would lose. We would need more police, more places to walk dogs and more places for our young people to play and socialise. Edenfield playground has needed upgrading for such a long time for the current numbers of children, there will be nothing suitable for even more children and youths which will inevitably lead to more social and criminal issues, which will again knock on to reducing the quality of the lives of current residence.		-
523	Sharon	Exton	-		Object	The village cannot sustain this amount of extra housing. Most households have 2 cars & we have one main road through the village it will be chaos. The primary schools in the area will not be able to support all the extra children. Aesthetically the sheer amount of proposed houses will ruin our beautiful views of the surrounding hills & countryside.		-
528	Theresa	McGowan	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield, which would radically alter the character of the village.		I am concerned about the effect all this new building if approved would have on the level of traffic going through the village, which is already high.
530	Shirley	Taylor	-		Object	To add so many houses to such a small village would vastly alter the character of the village At present the traffic through the village is very congested at busy times. The two schools are full and we have no bank, post office, doctors or dentists in the village.		-
532	Ian	Quigley	-		Object	Having reviewed the proposed plans at the councils consultation event. I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		I am concerned that this proposed plan is wholly disproportionate. We do not have the infrastructure or amenities in place to accommodate such a large scale plan.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
533	Lesley	Quigley	-		Object	Having viewed the plans at the councils consultation event I object to the sheet scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		I am concerned that this proposed plan is wholly disproportionate. We do not have the infrastructure or amenities in place to accommodate such a large scale plan.
536	Paul	Harrison	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. It would radically alter the character of the village. There is no infrastructure in place to cope with such a drastic rise in the number of houses in the village. There are already very few school places available and the roads are already congested.		-
537	Leona	Tarnowski-harrison	-		Object	I have checked the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield Village. The roads and schools would not cope with such an expansion.		-
538	William	Hamblett	-		Object	To many new houses in centre of village will cause congestion on roads, put pressure on schools, and other services. It will also change this very friendly village and is surely not nessecary with so many brown field site around Rossendale		no
541	Susan	Whitehead	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield. This would radically alter the whole character of the village and the roads, schools and other services would not be in a position to cope with the magnitude of such developments.		-
542	Graham	Exton	-		Object	I can't believe the planning application has got this far, nearly 500 houses,a thousand cars and adults and two thousand five hundred children will completely destroy the village. The roads and motorway will become completely gridlocked, the schools will not be able to cope, it will put unbelievable pressure on the doctors,dentists etc and their will be hoards of bored kids roaming the streets as there are no playgrounds,clubs or fields to play in. I urge the councillors not to be narrow minded yes men/women and do the right thing and reject all these insane plans.		-
546	Doug	McIntosh	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is being proposed for Edenfield as it will radically alter the character of the village. - Traffic/parking in the village will become a major concern with the potential for an extra 1000 cars on the village roads. Any problems on the M66 or Edenfield Bypass has a major knock on effect on the village roads particularly Market Street and Bury Road. At rush hour the bypass south bound to the M66 resembles a car park most mornings with the reverse in the evening. unless the intention is to widen both the Edenfield Bypass and the M66 the congestion will only get worse. For people who work in Manchester there is no direct public transport from Edenfield. - The two schools would not be able to cope with an influx of children, parents struggle now to get their school of choice. The same applies to GPs and Dentists. -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
547	Mark	Wood	-		Object	I am objecting to the sheer scale of development proposed in Edenfield which will add 50% more housing to a village community and change the character of the village for the worse. I have just bought 57 Blackburn Road in Edenfield in August 2017 for the benefit of my family and in particular my two young girls. The views and village feel is a key part of my decision to return and live in Edenfield and this will all be lost should these plans be approved. - - I strongly oppose these plans and want to be notified about future consultations.		-
549	Susan	Leake	-		Object	I object to these proposals on the following grounds: - The scale of the plans are far too large and would negatively alter the character of the village. - The road network would be unable to deal all the extra traffic that would be generated by an increase of approximately 1000 cars belonging to new residents. - There is already a problem with backlogs being caused by commercial traffic at busy times (Market Street and Bury Road can be gridlocked when there are problems on the bypass). - The amount of upgrading of existing utilities to service the increased demand, and the excavation work necessary would put more pressure on the village and road network. - It is a lot of Greenbelt to turn over to building plots. -		-
550	Michael	Murrell	-		Object	I am not against new development in Edenfield but it is scale of the proposed development to which I wish to object. To consider increasing the number of houses by almost 50% would fundamentally change the traditional linear characteristics of the village and turn it into a modern dormitory town and involve a significant loss of land used by the village for recreational purposes. I do not object to reasonable infill development which has always taken place in the village. - I attended the Consultation Event but no details were available for any of the proposed sites so it is not possible to comment on traffic and congestion issues but these are bound to be very significant in view of the existing traffic flows in the area.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
554	Michele	Hanson	-		Object	Not only is the land part of Green Belt but the size of the village would not be able to withstand that amount of additional housing as firstly the roads can't cope with the volume of parking and road use. There is a lack of public transport as is, which means majority of people will have to use cars. When it snows, their roads won't be gritted so therefore their vehicles will have to be parked along the main road where there is a lack of space already. This will then mean more traffic through the village which in itself should be reason enough for the plan to not go ahead. The trucks from the surrounding areas are already damaging the houses and foundations on a daily basis, so any extra trucks during building works will cause more issues. the drivers of the trucks that are already using the roads don't slow down or pay attention to other road users and I feel this would be exacerbated if additional traffic is added. - The schools and doctors surgeries and dental practices probably wont have the space for the amount of additional people. the NHS is already under pressure and the surgery I use in ramsbottom is full to the point where it takes over 10minutes to make an appointment which can only be made on the day in most cases. - The sewers and drains are not built for the amount of additional housing proposed and what would happen with water and electricity supply? - Appreciate the area needs more housing but Edenfield is a small village and cannot cope with the extra housing proposed by this plan		-
559	Hannah	Convery	-		Object	I object whole heartedly to the scale of the development that is planned for Edenfield. - - 1. We do not have enough schools, both primary and secondary to support this expansion. - 2. Transport is already an issue around the village as the main road becomes a car park at busy times. - 3. We do not have the amenities as a small village to support such a vast expansion - no GPs, dentists, etc. to support these individuals. - 4. Edenfield has always been a small tight nit community and expanding it so greatly would damage the character of the village and also the community that has developed there.		-
565	Charles	Hart	-		Object	We object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		There is too much traffic going through the village already and to add more houses will make it a nightmare trying to get through the village.
566	Jason	Horsfall	-		Object	I am objecting to large scale building in the village and on proposed green belt land. There is enough brown land for small developments. Leave the village alone and there is enough parking issues without more vehicles.		Keep green belt alone. Leave the village alone. Find brown belt for small developments.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
567	George A.	Rogers	-		Object	I wish to object to the green belt land being released for development. The village, as it stands at the moment, is surrounded by lovely open views across the Valley, but if this development is allowed to go ahead all these green spaces would be lost. - The infrastructure too would not stand this amount of new houses. The two schools are already full and the roads are quite often grid-locked at present and with another maybe 1,000 cars using them would be unsustainable.		As I do not have a computer, I have asked J.M.Mead to complete this questionnaire for me on the information I have given.
568	Pamela R.	Rogers	-		Object	The infrastructure in the village would not cope with the proposed number of houses. All our lovely green fields would be lost to the developers and would significantly affect the lives of the residents who already live here. - The roads would not cope with the extra traffic and the schools are full already.		As I do not have a computer, I have given my comments to J.M.Mead who will submit my objection for me.
569	Bertha	Heys	-		Object	The village could not sustain this level of development. The village would lose its lovely open aspect with views across the Valley. - The roads could not cope with an extra 1,000 vehicles and the two local schools are already full.		As I do not have access to a computer, I have asked Mrs. J.M.Mead to complete the objection form with my own comments.
574	Paula	Tehrani	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		I just hope that the council does not allow for this to take place. The people that live in Edenfield live here because of the rural location and do not wish for any other properties to be built in the area that will spoil this. To add also that our small roads will not allow for heavy traffic nor will our schools be big enough to take in more children. This is a village with a small capacity of people and we wish this to remain so
575	james	Halligan	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		Edenfield is a quite village set within a lovely rural location. This was what attracted me to Edenfield in the first place. If the council is to go ahead with these plans it will devastate the community
576	Luke	Tehrani	-		Object	I have lived in Edenfield all my life, for 22 years. I have grown up here and loved the rural location To build as many houses as you are proposing would spoil the character that edenfield has. People come to live here because of the rural location and the village life, if the plans go ahead this will all be spoilt		I would urge you to reconsider your plans and think of the people in the village. Please put them first

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
580	Stuart	Dearden			Object	<p>I write with the upmost concern the Councils Local Plan for future potential housing developments in Edenfield Village. I understand you are planning to ask the Government to remove large swathes of land around the village from Greenbelt control so as to build large housing estates.</p> <p>The areas causing the most concerns are covered in your reference document HS2.71 with the site map of the plans for development off</p> <p>Exchange Street Market Street Blackburn Road West of Moorlands View</p> <p>Whilst I'm not against future development within the village your plan doesn't seem to take into consideration any provision for additional local services ie. provision for Schools, Health Care ,or additional road congestion, which at all times within the village verges on dangerous with cars parked on both Bury Road, Market Street, and Burnley & Bolton Road creating bottle neck condition and danger to life and limb.</p> <p>Subsequently I must object strongly to any proposal of this scale which potential will double the population of Edenfield without any consideration to the character or social conditions and general quality of life enjoyed in or village.</p>		
583		Barett			Object	<p>I write regarding the councils local plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land from around the village from the greenbelt so that houses can be built on it.</p> <p>The areas I am particularly concerned are covered by your reference HS2.71 on the site map.</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land West of of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road Land west of Moorlands View</p> <p>all in Edenfield, I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of the village</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
585	Arnold	Wilcox-Wood			Object	<p>I am writing about your local plan and how it will affect my village of Edenfield. You propose to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around the village from the greenbelt so houses can be built on it. The areas I am worried about are covered by your reference HS2.71 which is with your plan, this is:</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land West of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield and; Land West of Moorlands View</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of Edenfield village. The infrastructure would not cope with increased traffic & parking problems. The school could not cope with the increased demand. The village is blocked up now at school time and if the bypass is blocked up the village is the only escape route to Bury and Manchester. More thought is needed in the plan because once the greenbelt is gone it can't be replaced.</p>		
587	Shirley	Wilcox-Wood			Object	<p>I am writing about your local plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you propose to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around the village from the greenbelt so houses can be built on it. The areas I am worried about are covered by your reference HS2.71 which accompanies your plan</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield Land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land West of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of Edenfield village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
597	Sheila	Rostron			Object	<p>I understand that, in your local plan, you are considering an approach, to government, to remove large amounts of greenbelt land in Edenfield. The following areas of concern to me personally, are covered by in the site map by the above reference.</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street Land west of Market Street Land off Blackburn Road Land wet of Moorland View</p> <p>I object to the scale of the proposal as the infrastructure of the village is not suitable for such an extensive building plan. The character of the village has already been affected by the loss of medical facilities, heavy traffic, over subscribed schools and the large amount of parked cars preventing pedestrians use of the footpaths. We also have to bear in mind that the village borders the greater manchester boundary and no doubt they will have their own local plan which would have a knock on effect in the opposite direction to the proposed areas listed above.</p> <p>The council has the responsibility and duty to consider alternate sites before using the greenbelt areas. Please notify me of future considerations on the local plan</p>		
619	Melanie	Read	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.	-	
620	Nicola	Fletcher	-		Object	<p>I object to the proposals on the sheer scale of the proposed developments within Edenfield, which would completely ruin the character of the village. Increasing the housing by over 50% will destroy the village's unique character and feel. You will in effect be destroying it. - - Traffic through Edenfield is already congested and there are insufficient areas for the current residents to park and without a doubt we cannot cope with the substantial increase in traffic that this proposal would incur. - - The local facilities; school, doctors and emergency services could not cope with an influx of families to this scale. Furthermore we don't have a consistent, reliable and extensive public transport network to accommodate. - - Access to these sites is also very restricted which would also add to the congestion and difficulties within the village. All of the above destroys the village atmosphere and then makes Edenfield and UNdesirable area to live. - - For the land west of Moorlands View there is also a colony of bats and although we are unsure to their exact roosting it is essential that they are not disturbed. - - My final point is i believe green belt land should be preserved especially when they are multiple brown land sites around the area which could be used in the place of green belt. Edenfield is desirable as we maintain a country village feel, there is countryside and farm land however by taking away the green belt status you risk creating a environment that is very urbanised, - -</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
622	Mark	Whitehead	-		Object	I object to the size of the development proposed especially concerning the use of green belt land when there are old industrial sites that could be utilised first.		The consultation event that took place in Edenfield seemed to be scheduled for a time that deliberately excluded the many people who would be at work - - It would be sensible to host these type of events over a longer time period (similar to a polling station) in order to allow the maximum number of people to attend
623	Clare	Whitehead	-		Object	I object to the scale of the development proposed and especially the use of green belt land.		-
624	Ethan	Whitehead	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the development which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
626	Harriet	Flynn	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - - The traffic through the village would be awful and the building process would be very disruptive		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
632	Nicola	Rollo	-		Object	<p>This is disgraceful. How you can think that a village such as Edenfield and its infrastructure can cope with the number of additional houses you are proposing is absurd! There are two schools which are already oversubscribed, there is no longer a Dr's surgery in the village as this relocated to Rawtenstall, the village roads will not be able to cope with construction traffic never mind the additional number of vehicles if the proposals go ahead - I challenge you to try and get down Market Street during rush hour/school pick up and drop off times. The M66 is an abomination and travel times in and out of the valley are already ridiculous. Bus services have already been withdrawn connecting Rossendale with Manchester - how do you expect so many people to get in and out of Edenfield with one road in and out?! One miserable little park which has been the same for the last 30 years and little else for children. No longer a post office or a bank. In fact a lot of local bank branches are closing down in local towns. - - As far as Helmshore is concerned, my objections are largely the same - poor infrastructure will not cope with additional number of people. - - And then there's the environmental costs. The Edenfield sites run adjacent to the bypass with poor air quality. You are proposing ruining/destroying areas of our countryside. - - I have lived in Rossendale for 39 years - grew up in Edenfield and now live in Helmshore. What you are proposing will wreck the places I consider to be home and you should be ashamed of yourselves. Do not ruin our valley, none of your proposals will improve it and you will remove the aspect most residents love the most - the fact we live in a rural setting with plenty of green spaces. I want my kids to have the childhood memories I did. My daughter attends Helmshore Primary - this school can't take the extra number of pupils it would be required to. - - Your money would be better spent on dealing with the vast number of empty properties across the borough and developing brownfield sites.</p>		-
636	Christine	Murrell	-		Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of the proposed development for Edenfield. - Its size would - 1) radically alter the character of the village - 2) Increased traffic through the village - 3) Access to the proposed site off Market street (road already congested) - 4) Parking space implications for the village which is already at a premium. - 5) increased pressure on local schools,GP's etc. There are no plans for expansion of these services</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
637	Hilary	Bowden	-		Object	I must start by saying I am not against some development in the village BUT the number of houses proposed in the Local Plan cannot be supported by the size and structure of the village . - - The sheer number of cars generated from the building of 489 houses that will need to be accommodated into an already bottleneck of traffic through the village does not bear thinking about. The Edenfield bypass is also a bottleneck at peak times more traffic chaos there and although this is not Rawtenstall's problem, traffic going down into Stubbins past the school and then on into Rambottom will inevitably result in more traffic problems. - - I am sure the two primary schools Stubbins and Edenfield are already up to maximum or near maximum numbers so is there land available to cater for another school for an influx of children? - - Nursery and pre-school places would be required as additional accommodation. The Community Centre would be totally inadequate. - - I am sure there would eventually be other problems, but in conclusion, a one street village is surely not the place to site such a large number of new houses. - -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
638	James	Lester	-		Object	<p>I grew up in Edenfield and have carefully observed the changes the village has undergone. Whilst I accept due to the national immigration policy (that no one I know has voted for) there will need to be a increase in housing to accommodate the ever increasing population. Rossendale should bear the weight as every borough must to meet the need. - - Rossendale council has attributed a large proportion of the proposed houses to be built in Edenfield, which seems to be at the behest of the developers. Edenfield is one of the few remaining villages in the borough. Developers will stand to gain and who can blame them. Of course properties built in a village will sell quicker and for more money. However we rely on the council to ensure development is always in the longterm interests of residents. To relinquish Green Belt land on mass is a short sighted approach and one which threatens to drastically reduce the quality of life for the majority of the current residents. As Winston Churchill remarked, we shape our buildings, thereafter they shape us. The same is true for planning and development. - - Fairness and alternative sites - - As acknowledged Rossendale and Edenfield should take on a fair share of developments inline with the national targets. This can be done in a much less obtrusive manner than releasing greenbelt as currently suggested. Off the top of my head there are a number of sites which could see development, these include: Ewood Bridge where Stand Athletic Football Club and the opposite industrial land has stood vacant for many years. The road provides good connections to Manchester would not lead to traffic passing through any busy residential areas. There are a number of micro plots which could also be developed within the village that would not impact the current residents in such a violent manner. - - Health - - I work in the health industry and follow closely the impacts of increased air pollution on communities. Research has suggested those living close to or on busy roads have a higher chance of developing dementia and are more likely to die of strokes. I see no research from Rossendale Council about the impacts of the increased traffic on the quality of lives for residents living on Market Street or elsewhere in the borough. Further to this it seems our roads are already in poor condition. - - Education - - Edenfield primary school has already undergone 3 extensions since i was a student. The poor children barely have a playground to play on. What will the impacts be on the quality of education these pupils receive? Does anyone care? - - Future Value - - All to often grown adults are drawn to the short term gain, whilst ignoring the longterm outcome. Edenfield is set to become another satellite town like Helmshore. While the council and developers stand to gain. The quality of life for the average resident will decline and the longterm value of properties will suffer. Its a scenario from George Orwell's 1984. The question is who has the vision and foresight to prevent yet another characterless estate being built?</p>		<p>I grew up in Edenfield and have carefully observed the changes the village has undergone. Whilst I accept due to the national immigration policy (that no one I know has voted for) there will need to be a increase in housing to accommodate the ever increasing population. Rossendale should bear the weight as every borough must to meet the need. - - Rossendale council has attributed a large proportion of the proposed houses to be built in Edenfield, which seems to be at the behest of the developers. Edenfield is one of the few remaining villages in the borough. Developers will stand to gain and who can blame them. Of course properties built in a village will sell quicker and for more money. However we rely on the council to ensure development is always in the longterm interests of residents. To relinquish Green Belt land on mass is a short sighted approach and one which threatens to drastically reduce the quality of life for the majority of the current residents. As Winston Churchill remarked, we shape our buildings, thereafter they shape us. The same must be true for planning and development. - - Fairness and alternative sites - - As acknowledged Rossendale and Edenfield should take on a fair share of developments inline with the national targets. This can be done in a much less obtrusive manner than releasing greenbelt as currently suggested. Off the top of my head there are a number of sites which could see development, these include: Ewood Bridge where Stand</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
								<p>Athletic Football Club and the opposite industrial land has stood vacant for many years. The road provides good connections to Manchester would not lead to traffic passing through any busy residential areas. There are a number of micro plots which could also be developed within the village that would not impact the current residents in such a violent manner. - - Health - - I work in the health industry and follow closely the impacts of increased air pollution on communities. Research has suggested those living close to or on busy roads have a higher chance of developing dementia and are more likely to die of strokes. I see no research from Rossendale Council about the impacts of the increased traffic on the quality of lives for residents living on Market Street or elsewhere in the borough. Further to this it seems our roads are already in poor condition. - - Education - - Edenfield primary school has already undergone 3 extensions since i was a student. The poor children barely have a playground to play on. What will the impacts be on the quality of education these pupils receive? Does anyone care? - - Future Value - - All to often grown adults are drawn to the short term gain, whilst ignoring the longterm outcome. Edenfield is set to become another satellite town like Helmshore. While the council and developers stand to gain. The quality of life for the average resident will decline and the longterm value of properties will suffer. Its a scenario from George Orwell's 1984. The question is who has the vision and</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
640	malcolm & maureen	Lowerson	-		Object	We object to size of the project proposed for Edenfield - 453 houses =680 cars =225 children approximate - ONE SCHOOL - ONE CHEMIST - ONE BUTCHERS - ONE BAKERY - ONE HAIR SALON - TWO PUBS - NO POST OFFICE - NO DOCTORS - NO BANK		foresight to prevent yet another characterless estate being built? Extra traffic through village existing parking not adequate
642	Eileen	Hinson	-		Object	My objections are based on the following: - - 1) Site location & issues with additional car movements. Edenfield is already suffering from the large number of cars and lorries travelling through it which would be exacerbated by new housing development - - 2) Use of Green Belt when there remain significant areas of brown land		No
644	Karen	Burns	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		None
646	Erena	Pillitteri	-		Object	I object to the plans as the sheer scale of what you are proposing to Edenfield will radically alter the character of the village. - - I attended the consultation and it was clear no real thought had gone into this apart from how many houses could fit in the space. There was no plans for road improvements, increase in schools, doctors or dentists. When I quizzed the representatives they could only answer that you were in talks with relevant authorities but there was nothing concrete. - - There is only one road into Edenfield and I cannot imagine how bad the traffic will be with such an increase in population. When there is an accident on the M66 traffic travels through Edenfield and the roads are very very busy. There was an accident recently and a 5 minutes journey from home to the motorway took 25 minutes, this is what it would be like every day. - - I strongly object to these plans and urge you to reconsider. - - Kind regards - - Erena Pillitteri		no
647	David	Dewhurst	-		Object	I write about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. - - These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan; - - land off Exchange Street, Edenfield - land west of Market Street, Edenfield - land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield - land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield - - I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. - - Yours faithfully - - David Dewhurst		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
650	Helen	Quinton	-		Object	I object to the these proposals on the following grounds: - a) The sheer scale of the plans are far too large and would radically alter and ruin the character of the village. - b) The scale of the plans would increase traffic and vehicle numbers to a level which the village would be unable to cope with. - c) The scale of the plans would increase traffic pollution radically. - d) The scale of the plans would impose dramatically on services and amenities e.g. school places - e) The scale of the plans would destroy the green space and wildlife habitats surrounding the village - - Edenfield is a village community, the size of the proposed plans would destroy that community.		
651	Daniel	Quinton	-		Object	I object to the these proposals on the following grounds: - a) The sheer scale of the plans are far too large and would radically alter and ruin the character of the village. - b) The scale of the plans would increase traffic and vehicle numbers to a level which the village would be unable to cope with. - c) The scale of the plans would increase traffic pollution radically. - d) The scale of the plans would impose dramatically on services and amenities e.g. school places - e) The scale of the plans would destroy the green space and wildlife habitats surrounding the village - - Edenfield is a village community, the size of the proposed plans would destroy that community.		
652	Julie	Ridings	-		Object	I object to the these proposals on the following grounds: - a) The sheer scale of the plans are far too large and would radically alter and ruin the character of the village. - b) The scale of the plans would increase traffic and vehicle numbers to a level which the village would be unable to cope with. - c) The scale of the plans would increase traffic pollution radically. - d) The scale of the plans would impose dramatically on services and amenities e.g. school places - e) The scale of the plans would destroy the green space and wildlife habitats surrounding the village - - Edenfield is a village community, the size of the proposed plans would destroy that community.		
653	John	Ridings	-		Object	I object to the these proposals on the following grounds: - a) The sheer scale of the plans are far too large and would radically alter and ruin the character of the village. - b) The scale of the plans would increase traffic and vehicle numbers to a level which the village would be unable to cope with. - c) The scale of the plans would increase traffic pollution radically. - d) The scale of the plans would impose dramatically on services and amenities e.g. school places - e) The scale of the plans would destroy the green space and wildlife habitats surrounding the village - - Edenfield is a village community, the size of the proposed plans would destroy that community.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
654	Frances	Hartley	-		Object	I object to the these proposals on the following grounds: - a) The sheer scale of the plans are far too large and would radically alter and ruin the character of the village. - b) The scale of the plans would increase traffic and vehicle numbers to a level which the village would be unable to cope with. - c) The scale of the plans would increase traffic pollution radically. - d) The scale of the plans would impose dramatically on services and amenities e.g. school places - e) The scale of the plans would destroy the green space and wildlife habitats surrounding the village - - Edenfield is a village community, the size of the proposed plans would destroy that community.		
656	Lindsay	Marcroft	-		Object	I object to the scale of the development proposed. Edenfield is already a busy village, and I am concerned about the increase in traffic, as well as the loss of the greenbelt land. Our village would be a village no longer, and this development would hugely alter the local environment. I do support progress and development, but not on this scale.		
663	Pauline	du Plessis	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield village which would radically alter the character of the village. - - The schools are full so another school would have to be built taking up more land from the green belt. - - Traffic through Edenfield main street (Market street) is a nightmare at times and parking is also a big problem. - We have no doctor surgery in Edenfield anymore.		The scale of these plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village which attracted me to the area in the first place. I have lived here for over thirty years and although I appreciate more housing is probably necessary, to undertake this scale in one little village is unacceptable.
670	Melvin	Britton	-		Object	I object to the scale of the plans because it would ruin the character of our village and also cause dangerous escalation of road traffic.		
671	Lindsay	Britton	-		Object	I object to the scale of the plans which would radically alter the character of the village and cause a dangerous increase in traffic.		
672	Mark	Tweedale	-		Object	I am objecting to the proposed development in Edenfield and the allocation of current 'green belt' land to housing. - The scale of the proposal would catastrophically affect the semi-rural character of the village and is completely out of proportion with the current size of the village and the available facilities. - - Edenfield already has problems with traffic congestion/parking on the main road routes through the village and on the wider M66/A56 network. The size of the proposed development will massively increase this problem and create regular gridlock situations in the village. Public transport is currently very limited and hence most commuters have no choice but to use a car - the proposed development will obviously exacerbate this problem - - Current school, health, shopping, public transport and leisure facilities are limited in Edenfield. The proposals do nothing to improve the current situation, but worse than that they do not attempt to alleviate the obvious impact of the scale of the new development. -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
678	Alison	Bentley	-		Object	I do not want large amounts of land around the village of Edenfield being removed from Green belt in order that it can be built on. The results would be catastrophic to village life and ruin the character of the village. The sheer scale of the proposals for Edenfield i.e. An increase of about 50%... is ludicrous. - We would become another suburb of Greater Manchester as people move out of the city for 'village life'. However they then travel back in to work every day and the increase in vehicles on our already suffering roads would cause even more traffic congestion, delays, and air pollution all around the valley. - Traffic turning out of all all these sites ...which are all on the west side of the village would make the main road a nightmare. That's not even considering the heavy lorries etc which would be the first to arrive whilst building goes on for quite a length of time. Many of the houses on the main road through the village are old cottages that have no rear access or car parking available and therefore park on the main road. They would be seriously disadvantaged if double yellow lines were introduced onto Market St because of the increase in turning/joining traffic. - The 2 local schools could not cope with increased numbers of children. - Looking at the overall plan for the valley it would seem that Edenfield is bearing the brunt of the changes. (possibly because we are nearest to Manchester, possibly because Wimpey have been buying up the land in advance!) There are numerous brown field sites around this valley which are an eyesore and I believe that they should all be brought back to better use (housing) first, before resorting to the use of green belt, for once its gone it's gone for ever for future generations.		Strongly Object
686	Alan	Ogden	-		Object	I feel that the scale of the development is far too large for Edenmfield village to cope with. The roads are already very, very busy and if the by-pass is closed then the traffic through Edenfield is grid-locked. Also the schools are fully subscribed and we have no medical practice etc.		I have given permission to Mrs. [...] to submit my objection on my behalf as I do not have access to a computer.
687	Cynthia	Ogden	-		Object	The village of Edenfield would lose it's lovely open aspect, with the green spaces swallowed up by development. I realise Edenfield is a desirable place to live in the Rossendale Valley, but it won't be if all this development is allowed to take place. - The roads could not cope with the extra traffic and the two local schools are already full to capacity.		I have given my comments to Mrs. J.M.Mead to submit as I do not have access to a computer.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
688	Ian	Lord	-		Object	The Plan proposes that over 15ha of greenbelt land in Edenfield is released for development. Greenbelt areas were established many years ago for good reasons. Those reasons are just as applicable today as they were then if not more so. Greenbelt areas must be retained to ensure an acceptable quality of life for both residents and visitors. - The total number of proposed additional houses is 489 (of which 450 are on greenbelt land) which is a 55% increase on the existing housing stock. This compares to an average increase of approx. 12% for the entire Rossendale area which is extremely inequitable. - The scale of the potential development in Edenfield will totally change the character of the village and overwhelm existing facilities and infrastructure. In particular traffic congestion (which is not addressed in the Plan) will become horrendous. The additional housing will mean that there would be approx. an additional 1,000 cars located in Edenfield most of which will travel through the village at least twice per day. Whatever improvements are made to the road network the existing bottlenecks (in the village centre and by the school) cannot be resolved. A new primary school or substantial extensions to the existing schools will be required due to the increased population further adding to the traffic congestion.		-
689	Janet	Desprez	-		Object	I object mainly to the huge scale of the project, whereby the number of houses in the village, and therefore, the number of people, would increase by almost 50%. There is no way that the amenities within the village could cope with this. There is no mention of any increase in facilities, (or where, for that matter, they could go!), nor of access roads. There is no way the current roads could cope with this influx of vehicles, also making it more dangerous for the children of the village. I, myself, have a horse which I frequently ride in, around, and through Edenfield and Irwell Vale, and have first hand knowledge of how busy the roads can be without an influx of, potentially, 1000 more vehicles. (On my own estate the majority of houses have two cars, and several have more, including vans and other 'work' related vehicles.) - - Having moved to a newly built house myself, in 1979, I cannot in all conscience object to new houses being built for people to live in and enjoy the overall rural peacefulness of this lovely village. But to decimate its character with such a huge build is totally unacceptable. -		No
693	Joanne	Garner	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
694	David	Garner	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
696	Beverly	Cocks	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
702	Darryl	Rae	-		Object	We object to the proposed plans due to the impact it will have on the surrounding countryside . The affect on the roads which are barely able to cope with the traffic flow as it is now . Also the impact it will have on the village as a whole. These plans would ruin the character of the village and change it so drastically in our opinion ruin Edenfield forever and what everyone holds dear about this village.		-
709	Andrew	Manley	-		Object	The proposal to build 489 houses in Edenfield is too large a development for the small village of Edenfield. The lovely open green belt fields would be lost and Edenfield would become like Helmshore which has been over-developed by the planners. - The condition of the roads is very bad now, but with an expected 1,000 extra vehicles through the village the roads would be unsustainable. - The schools are now full to capacity as well. - I understand the need for some new housing but not on such a large scale in a small area.		This objection has been completed, using my comments, by J.M.Mead as I do not have access to a computer.
710	Carol	Smith	-		Object	The scale of proposed development is far too large for a village of this size. - The roads are already very busy and if the by-pass is closed then traffic is at a stand-still through the village. - Both local schools are fully susscribed and there is no medical practice/post office/bank facilities. - Whilst I accept that extra houses will have to be built to conform to the Government's proposals, this development in Edenfield is extremely large and will do away with the lovely green open spaces residents so enjoy.		My objection has been submitted by Mrs. [...], using my comments (as I do not have access to a computer)
713	Patricia	Dodd	-		Object	I do not object to some development within the village. I am objecting to the sheer scale of the proposed development which will radically alter the character of the village, making it no longer a desirable place to live. Edenfield is a ribbon development with one main street running the length of the village; this road is already congested with cars parked on both sides, so that we have to make way for oncoming traffic, including buses and trucks from the quarry. Already if there is a problem on the bypass, the traffic spills over into Edenfield and local roads are gridlocked. The village cannot cope with another 500 or more vehicles. - - The infrastructure is not there to support a large scale development - there are two oversubscribed primary schools, no doctor or dentist and a few small shops. If the main attraction for the developers is easy access to Manchester and the motorway network, then traffic from the development must at least be directed straight onto the bypass and not through the village. Even so, the loss of such a large area of green fields for housing development will spoil a longstanding attractive village and is grossly unfair on the residents.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
716	Alan	Dodd	-		Object	My objection to the proposal is based on the size and scale of the plans. The proposed development is far too large and if carried out will dramatically alter the character of our village. - Edenfield village is a "ribbon" development with a single main road through its centre. There is already limited parking availability in the village. This will not be improved with the introduction of such a large scale development and the attendant increase in vehicle numbers. When the by-pass closes, as it does from time to time, the only alternative route is through Edenfield village. This currently results in traffic congestion, delays and inconvenience to residents which can only be exacerbated by the introduction of many more vehicles. Nor does it take in to account the volume of heavy goods vehicles such as that from the local quarries, a primary bus-route and delivery vehicles. Furthermore, the infrastructure of the village does not lend itself to even a modest development. Its two primary schools are fully subscribed. The village does not have surgery, clinic or dentist or other similar services such as a post office. There are, in fact, very few shops in Edenfield village. For these reasons I strongly object to the large scale of the proposal.	-	
734	Ally	Strachan			Object	<p>I write with reference to Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the GREENBELT so that it can be built on.</p> <p>The areas about which I am particularly concerned are referenced HS2.71 on the site map accompanying the Plan, and are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land West of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land West of Moorlands View. Edenfield <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and I understand would be irrevocable. They are insensitive to the village and its residents. They would be destructive to our rural environment and in fact to the very nature of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
735	Ian	Strachan			Object	<p>I write with reference to Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the GREENBELT so that it can be built on.</p> <p>The areas about which I am particularly concerned are referenced HS2.71 on the site map accompanying the Plan, and are;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land West of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land West of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and I understand would be irrevocable. They are insensitive to the village and its residents. They would be destructive to our rural environment and in fact to the very nature of our village.</p>		
736	Rhona	Strachan			Object	<p>I write with reference to Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the GREENBELT so that it can be built on.</p> <p>The areas about which I am particularly concerned are referenced HS2.71 on the site map accompanying the Plan, and are;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land West of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land West of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and I understand would be irrevocable. They are insensitive to the village and its residents. They would be destructive to our rural environment and in fact to the very nature of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
737	Paul	Formby			Object	<p>I write further to Rossendale's draft Local Plan (the "Plan") and the ongoing consultation process.</p> <p>I have reviewed the information available on the Council's website including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the Plan and the accompanying policies map; 2. the sustainability appraisal of the local plan 2017; and 3. the habitats regulation assessment 2016. <p>I also attended the consultation meeting at the Edenfield Community Centre on 12 September 2017 with a large number of other residents in the village when I was also able to consider the Lives and Landscapes Assessment for Rossendale Borough Council (dated December 2015 and prepared by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects).</p> <p>I am horrified by the proposal to remove from the greenbelt significant areas of land from around Edenfield village in order to facilitate the building of 489 new houses.</p> <p>The areas which I am particularly concerned about are set out within reference HS2.71 of the policies map which accompanies the Plan and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the land off Exchange Street, Edenfield; - the land west of Market Street, Edenfield; - the land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield; and - the land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield. <p>The purpose of this letter is to set out my objections to these proposals.</p> <p>The need for new housing in Rossendale</p> <p>At page 6 of the Plan under the title 'Chapter 1: Housing' the Council's policy HS1 is set out in relation to meeting Rossendale's Housing Needs.</p> <p>The Plan states:</p> <p>'The need for new housing in Rossendale has been assessed in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMA) (2016). This study, which is consistent with the Government's current policy position, examined a range of housing, economic and demographic evidence to assess housing need and demand in Rossendale.'</p> <p>Further to the SHMA the need for additional housing is estimated at 3,975 new homes over the period covered by the Plan (2019-2034).</p> <p>Objection 1</p> <p>In relation to Edenfield the Plan proposes that 489 new houses to be built which equates to 12% of the new housing required under the SHMA.</p> <p>It is inconceivable to me that Edenfield as a village of approximately 900 homes at present should bear such a significant proportion of the overall burden of new house building in Rossendale. The current population of Edenfield is significantly less than 12% of the overall population of Rossendale.</p> <p>Objection 2</p> <p>As set out above when the SHMA was undertaken it was 'consistent with the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Government's current policy position'. I note that the Government's policy in relation to new housing has now changed to such an extent that it appears that the SHMA is no longer consistent with Government policy. On 15 September 2017 the MP for Rossendale and Darwen, Mr Jake Berry, published a post on Facebook which confirmed that under the Government's new plans which were announced on the same day that the number of new houses required to be built in Rossendale had been reduced to 2,120. Under same post Mr Berry called upon the Council to suspend and proposal to remove land from the greenbelt and to prioritise new developments on brownfield and former industrial sites. The proposed development in Edenfield would therefore constitute almost 25% of the housing need for the whole of Rossendale. In these circumstances it is clear that the SHMA and the Plan are now inconsistent with central government policy and I would invite the Council to suspend the current consultation pending a review and a redrafting of the Plan.</p> <p>The Lives and Landscapes Assessment for Rossendale Borough Council (dated December 2015 and prepared by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects) ("LLA") At the consultation event in Edenfield Village Hall on 12 September 2017 hard copies of the LLA were available to be reviewed. I note that the LLA is not available on the Council's website in relation to the Plan. Is there any reason why this document has not been published online in the same way as the habitats regulation assessment 2016? I note that the LLA states that it was commissioned by the Council to be incorporated within the Council's Site Allocations and Development Management Plan Document. At section 3.2 of the LLA a description is given of 'Settled Valleys Landscapes Type' and the report states: 'Early on in this assessment it became clear that the single definition of Settled Valleys as 8a Irwell, while entirely appropriate for the northern part of the Borough and Whitworth, was not an accurate description of the landscape of the southern section of the Irwell Valley between Rawtenstall and Edenfield which is more rural in nature and importantly has little or no development in the valley bottom. It was decided to create a new Settled Valleys character area: 8b Irwell Valley south which more accurately describes this situation' ... 'Settled Valleys LCT, extending from the valley bottom in many areas to elevations of 300m or more, can be an appropriate location for development, though dense development on the valley floor is not appropriate in 8b Irwell Valley South because of the much more rural nature of the Valley.' The LLA therefore acknowledges that the area described as 8b Irwell Valley south (which includes Edenfield) is rural in nature and is not appropriate for</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>dense development. Given the relative size of the proposed development and the current size of Edenfield I would characterise the proposed development as 'dense'.</p> <p>At the end of section 5 of the LLA is a map of the area covered by the Plan titled 'sites overview' and described as 'figure 6'.</p> <p>That map highlights the proposed sites being considered for development by the Council and categorises them as either: (1) undevelopable, (2) developable with mitigation or (3) developable.</p> <p>I note that in relation to the area covered by HS2.71 in the Plan the vast majority of the proposed land is described as undevelopable with some small areas referred to as developable with mitigation. None of the land is described as developable.</p> <p>This appears entirely inconsistent with the proposed development in Edenfield.</p> <p>Exhibited to the LLA at volume 4: appendix 9 is the supporting information for the assessed sites (the assessment of the areas around Edenfield are set out at pages 88 to 122 of the same).</p> <p>I have set out the conclusions reached by the LLA in relation to these specific sites below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The outcome of the site assessment for the land at Blackburn Road (pages 88 to 89) is that the land is not suitable for development on landscaping grounds. 2. The outcome of the site assessment for the land at Burnley Road (pages 92 to 93) is that the land is not suitable for development on landscaping grounds. 3. The outcome of the site assessment for the land at Eden Mill (pages 96 to 99) is that the land described as A- C is suitable for development with mitigation but that the land described as D is not suitable for development on landscaping grounds. 4. The outcome of the site assessment for the land east of the motorway (pages 110 to 114) is that the land described as A is not suitable for development on landscaping grounds, the land described as B (being the site of the House and Jockey public house) is suitable for development and areas described as C – D are suitable for development with mitigation. 5. The outcome of the site assessment for the land at Pinfold (pages 116 to 120) is that the land described as A suitable for development with mitigation, the land described as B is not suitable for development and area described as C is suitable for development (this land is a small section of open space between 2 existing plots). <p>Objection 3</p> <p>Further to the LLA significant areas of the land which under the Plan as drafted will be released from the greenbelt in Edenfield have been described as unsuitable for development. The Council therefore appear to have disregarded a report which they have commissioned regarding the suitability</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>of the land in Edenfield for housing.</p> <p>I am aware that the Council is already facing significant criticism and embarrassment as a result of the failed empty homes scheme which is estimated to have cost £4 million. I understand that one of the numerous criticisms of the Council in a report prepared by auditors was the Council overlooked or overrode its internal financial and legal procedures and the opinions of senior officers were ignored.</p> <p>I trust that lesson have been learned as a result of the same and that the Council will now urgently review the proposed changes to the greenbelt referred to above.</p> <p>The habitats regulation assessment 2016 (HRA")</p> <p>At paragraph 1.3.2 of the HRA a description is given of Rossendale as follows: 'Its main settlement areas are Bacup, Haslingden and Rawtenstall and there are a number of smaller villages including Facit, Crawshawbooth and Weir.' It is telling that Edenfield is such a small village that it is not even referred to by name within the HRA yet under the current Plan it is proposed to permit the building of 489 new properties (which is almost a third of the new properties required to be built in the entire valley.</p> <p>At paragraph 1.4 of the HRA it states: 'RBC [the Council] have presented Lepus with a list of sites which have been identified as being suitable for housing, employment, tourism, retail, green infrastructure and mixed use development.'</p> <p>It would therefore appear that the Council had already taken the decision to ignore the conclusions of the LLA (which predates the HRA) when referring the land surrounding Edenfield set out in HS2.71 for consideration for development.</p> <p>At paragraph 1.5 of the HRA the policies under which the sites have been considered have been set out.</p> <p>I note that this includes the requirement to meet Rossendale's housing requirement. For the reasons set out above this housing requirement has materially changes since the HRA was commissioned and published. The conclusions of the HRA should therefore, in my opinion, be reviewed as a result.</p> <p>At paragraph 3.6.3 of the HRA it states: The large developments proposed at sites Land at Alder Bottom, Land to the South East of Edenfield and Area of Search to the East of Edenfield may reduce this characteristic linear settlement form and vastly increase the size of Edenfield.'</p> <p>The HRA therefore acknowledges that the proposed development will significantly alter the characteristics of Edenfield.</p> <p>At paragraph 3.6.5 of the HRA it states: 'Development at these sites [Land to the west of Moorland View, Land west of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Blackburn Road, Land between Chatterton Hey and Nursing Home and Land at Alder Bottom] may result in the loss of linear settlement pattern and/or possible urban sprawl.'</p> <p>At paragraph 3.6.21 of the HRA it states:</p> <p>'A watercourse runs through Land at Alder Bottom, Irwell Vale Mill and Acre Meadow; and Area of search to East of Edenfield and Land to the southeast of Edenfield. Contains springs. The boundary of Edenwood Mill, Land at Market Street, and Land of Blackburn Road (A0 are at high risk of surface water flooding. Areas of surface water flooding are also located inside the boundary of the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - land at Alder Bottom; - Acre Meadow; - Land between Chatterton Hey and Nursing Home; - Area of search to East of Edenfield; - Land to southeast of Edenfield; - Land off Blackburn Road (A); - Land west of Blackburn Road; and - Plunge Mill. <p>Development of these sites would be at high risk of surface water flooding. Given the impact of the flooding over Christmas 2015 and New Year 2016 I am surprised that concerns regarding potential flooding have been overlooked. At paragraph 3.6.25 it is acknowledged that all sites within Edenfield are over 1km from a GP and over 8km from a hospital. It is also acknowledged that the capacity for GP surgeries to take the residents of these developments is unknown. I note that under the Plan no provision has been made for additional facilities such as a GP surgery.</p> <p>Reference is made at paragraphs 3.6.30 and 3.6.31 to the location of primary and secondary schools.</p> <p>As far as I am aware Edenfield Primary School is already full subscribed and there is only one road from the village to the nearest Secondary School. No reference is made in the HRA to the capacity of these schools to take pupils from the proposed developments and I note that under the Plan no provision has been made for additional facilities such as schools.</p> <p>Objection 4</p> <p>The facilities available in Edenfield do not have the capacity to cater for the increased population of Edenfield if the proposed development proceeds.</p> <p>Objection 5</p> <p>The HRA sets out a number of reasons for the land contained in HS2.71 being deemed unsuitable for development which do not appear to have been given due consideration.</p> <p>The Plan</p> <p>The details of the Plan relevant for Edenfield are set out in HS3: Edenfield of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>the Plan.</p> <p>I note that the proposed development for Edenfield is dependent upon a number of factors including a comprehensive development of the entire site. Given the intention to disregard the advice received by the Council regarding the unsuitability of large parts of the area to be developed in Edenfield I presume that the development of the site (26 hectares) would be undesirable or uneconomical if only smaller sites (such as the land at the Horse and Jockey public house) were released for development.</p> <p>HS3 also sets out requirements for a scoping study, transport assessment and travel plan to be agreed with Lancashire County Council.</p> <p>Reference is also made to ensuring the development promotes the use of public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>Objection 6</p> <p>Whilst if it proceeds, any development may have plans to maximise the use of public transport, walking and cycling, no consideration appears to have been given to the fact that the vast majority of facilities used by residents are in either Ramsbottom, Haslingden or Rawtenstall. Journeys to these areas require the use of cars. Given the size of the development in relation to the size of the village the road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the resulting increase in vehicles.</p> <p>Objection 7</p> <p>Even at the moment (before the significant additional traffic which will be created by the new development) at peak times, such as morning and evening or during the weekend, traffic on Market Street is heavy. During these times Market Street effectively becomes a single track road outside of the shops at the south end of the village for cars and for the whole length of Market Street when buses or lorries are travelling through the village. The infrastructure of the village simply cannot cope with development on the size proposed.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
744	Elaine & Brian	Pritchard			Object	<p>We write about the Council's Local Plan and how it will adversely affect Edenfield. We understand that you are planning to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the area's about which we are particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan; Land off Exchange Street Edenfield Land west of Market Street Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield</p> <p>We wish to object to these proposals on the grounds;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. 2. Parking and passing through the village by vehicles is already a problem. 3. Amenities within the village are poor. 		
752	Antonia	Farrell	-		Object	<p>I am completely opposed to the sheer scale of the proposed development. If this is to go ahead (regardless of the strength of opposition from the residents) the face of Edenfield will change forever. My primary concern is that the village cannot cope with that amount of development and the amount of traffic that it will bring. Firstly, there is effectively one road through the village. When there is a problem on the bypass the village is gridlocked. The addition of 489 house with possibly two cars per home would leave the village permanently gridlocked. What is more, the level of pollution that this would bring would mean that the residents here would be living with dangerous levels. My second reason for the objection is that the village has no infrastructure to service the needs of another 489 houses. We do not have a doctor, dentist, post office and the local school is already at capacity. That means new residents have no alternative but to use their cars to access these services as local transport connections to our village are abysmal. - - If you look at the proposed development in Rossendale, Edenfield has clearly been targeted as a desirable place to live but the disproportionate scale of development is outrageous. I do not think you would have the same level of opposition had you opted to build small developments around the area but the scale of the proposal means that the character of our village which we cherish will forever be lost and we will no longer be a village. - - I understand the need for new housing and I am not opposed to new developments per se however Edenfield has been unfairly targeted with the number of houses proposed. As this is a council wide strategy the development should be spread around the area and not concentrated in just one area. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
753	Peter	Farrell	-		Object	I live in Edenfield, and have done for last 10years as well as when a child. I came back to Rossendale, and specifically Edenfield due to it being a quiet village with plenty of greenfield space and very friendly close knit community feel. - - The proposals not only directly impact me and my young family but also the whole village, as the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield is far too large and is grossly disproportionate to the size of the village. - - Not only would the scale of the plans, if carried out, ruin the character of Edenfield village, they would also severally impact on the day to day quality - especially with the increased vehicles on the road, and loss of important green fields for rain water absorption. - - Edenfield village infrastructure is already stretched, the schools are full, we now have no post office, there are no doctors surgeries, the M66 is gridlocked, and Market street is extremely busy with double parked cars, lorries and busses. Adding the proposed scale of houses will bring further gridlock and more worryingly pollution to the village, and local services will not be able to cope. - - During the heavy rain storms of recent winters the fields surrounding Blackburn Road and other of the pre-1900 houses including Market Street helped protect the local houses from worse impact by absorbing much of the heavy rain fall, if this had been roads and houses significant flooding damage would not have been avoided. - - Reviewing the proposals as a whole across the Rossendale valley, Edenfield is being disproportionately targeted with a massive increase in proposed housing, rather than a more acceptable incremental growth plan, keeping within the character and nature of the village.		-
760	Sarah	Cotton	-		Object	I am objecting to the sheer scale of the proposal for Edenfield which will radically alter the character of village. Releasing green belt for development has the potential to double the amount of houses in the village. I'm concerned that any proposed improvements to the infrastructure will not be able to cope with such a significant increase in traffic. The current infrastructure is already under considerable strain.		-
765	Andrew	Keir	-		Object	Too many houses proposed. I'm not disputing the need for more housing, but the number is too much for a small village to house. Not enough school places, and I think the entrance via Exchange St to the proposed site there would not withstand the traffic, it is usually double parked and the road could not be widened as the recreation ground is protected (as I understand it).		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
771	Barbara	Lord	-		Object	The Plan proposes that over 15ha of greenbelt land in Edenfield is released for development on which it is proposed that 450 houses could be built out of a total of 489 for Edenfield. The scale of this increase on a village with currently only around 900 houses is enormous and would totally change the nature of the village for the worse. Particular problems which do not seem to have been considered adequately if at all are: - Traffic congestion on Market St which is a problem now but would be total gridlock with an additional 1,000 cars resident in the area and substantial construction related traffic for 15 years. - Traffic access from the new developments onto existing roads including construction traffic. - Loss of recreational areas for outdoor recreation including dog walking. - A new school or substantial extensions to the existing schools to provide for hundreds of new children. - Plot on the landscape of a beautiful natural area. -		
772	Kieran	Proffitt-Holmes	-		Object	I believe that all of the proposed new building and housing will change Edenfield from the nice village that it is and completely change the place in a way I don't want to see.		
775	Mathew	Ball	-		Object	I object to the proposed development on the following grounds: - the sheer size and scale of the development will completely destroy the village of Edenfield - Market Street is already almost impassible at certain times of the day due to the number of vehicles. Cars are parked all over the village. there is insufficient infrastructure to support the increased population for such a small village. No bank, no school places, no GP, no post office. - the number of houses being proposed is more than 50% of the existing houses, thus the effects will be felt to a far greater extend that adding these numbers to a already large town. by changing the greenbelt you will be completely at odds with the five stated purposes of including land within the green belt as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework. and i do not see any legal basis where these plans should be able to continue. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas -To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. - Regards - Mathew		
776	Leslie	Hallam	-		Object	This would increase the numbers of houses in Edenfield by 50 percent. - The roads are busy as it is and more traffic would make it impossible . - Main services sewers , water , gas and electric would need to be doubled.. - The school could not cope , no room for extension . - No doctors or dentists in the village and apparently no possibility of having them . -		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
777	Christopher	Hanson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - - This proposal will also potentially increase the number of vehicles by 1000 which will greatly affect the traffic and parking, which is already at a premium. - - There are only two schools which would not cope with the massive influx of children. - - There are no plans for increasing the GP and Dentist services in Rossendale to cope with the increase in population that this would cause.		-
782	Jean	Plumb	-		Object	Too many houses for this small village to deal with. - The schools cannot cope, both Edenfield Primary and Stubbins Primary schools are over subscribed each year. - I have no doubt that the new estates of houses will have roads to service them as part of the plans but there is still only one road in and out of Edenfield which will find it impossible to deal with the traffic. - There are no amenities in Edenfield, everything is a car/bus ride away. No shops, no dentist, no doctors. The park is nothing special and we have a community centre that just about caterers for the groups that use it at the moment. - This is not a good plan. I object to it strongly. -		-
786	James	Sixsmith	-		Object	I think the building of this many houses would have a negative impact on the Village of Edenfield, the whole character of the village will disappear making it a less desirable place to live. - I also think the infrastructure would not sustain such a development. Local roads are barely passable at busy times of the day so adding maybe a further 500 to 1000 cars is going to cause mayhem if not a bottle neck going through the centre of the village. The local schools, Primary and Secondary, are running to full capacity so how would this be addressed? There isn't a doctor's surgery or a dentist so where would the new residents attend as local doctors and dentist lists are already stretched . - I object to a development of this scale. - James Sixsmith Online survey comments received 07/10/2017: I have been a resident in this village since 1952, it is absolutely ludicrous what Rossendale Council are proposing, and down right disgusted by everyone working there. You are a Disgrace		I object to this development - I think the building of this many houses would have a negative impact on the Village of Edenfield, the whole character of the village will disappear making it a less desirable place to live. - I also think the infrastructure would not sustain such a development. Local roads are barely passable at busy times of the day so adding maybe a further 500 to 1000 cars is going to cause mayhem if not a bottle neck going through the centre of the village. The local schools, Primary and Secondary, are running to full capacity so how would this be addressed? There isn't a doctor's surgery or a dentist so where would the new residents attend as local doctors and dentist lists are already stretched . - I object to a development of this scale. - James Sixsmith

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
788	Sharon	Jeffrey	-		Object	I work at Haslingden High school and have to drive through this village. My Dad also lives in Edenfield. - I think the building of this many houses would have a negative impact on the Village of Edenfield, the whole character of the village will disappear making it a less desirable place to live. - I also think the infrastructure would not sustain such a development. Local roads are barely passable at busy times of the day so adding maybe a further 500 to 1000 cars is going to cause mayhem if not a bottle neck going through the centre of the village. The local schools, Primary and Secondary, are running to full capacity so how would this be addressed? There isn't a doctor's surgery or a dentist so where would the new residents attend as local doctors and dentist lists are already stretched . - I object to a development of this scale - Sharon Jeffrey		I object to a development of this scale. and I think would ruin the character of the village.
789	Adele	Hanson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - - This proposal will also potentially increase the number of vehicles by 1000 which will greatly affect the traffic and parking which is already at a premium - - There are only two schools which would not cope with massive influx of children. - - There are no plans for increasing the GP and Dentist services in Rossendale to cope with the increase in population that this would cause.		-
807	Brenda	Chadwick	-		Object	I have heard of the Council's plans to remove a large amount of land out of the green belt for development purposes, and I feel that I must object strongly to this. I have been visiting Edenfield since 1978 and have always loved the lovely open aspect which surrounds the village and feel that a development as large as the one proposed would have a very detrimental effect on the area.		-
808	Gordon	Chadwick	-		Object	I have been visiting family members in Edenfield since 1978 and have always enjoyed the lovely open aspect which surrounds the village. I understand that plans are afoot to develop this green belt land and feel that this would be detrimental to the area. The scale of the development is far too large for a village the size of Edenfield and the infrastructure could not cope with this scale of development.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
809	Adrian	Donkin	-		Object	Edenfield has grown organically since it was a simple coaching stop to it's present size of around nine hundred dwellings. Whilst there are undoubtedly some pockets which could accommodate new housing, the huge increase proposed would simply not work. The village's situation and facilities will not sustain an expansion of fifty percent plus in the number of dwellings. - - The quantity of land proposed for release from green belt is almost equal to the area of land currently occupied by the village as it stands. The implication being that the new build housing will drastically change the nature of the village due to it's quantity and character. - - It seems highly unlikely that the folk who might move into the proposed housing would be working within Rossendale. Where is the sense in creating large quantities of housing in an area lacking in employment opportunity. Build the houses and most of these folks will be commuting somewhere, most of them to Manchester. By bus - what bus? By car - on the by-pass? - take a look during morning rush hour and imagine more cars; more congestion; more pollution; more frustration. - The roads of the village are creaking at the moment and the residents get regular glimpses of the future when a lane closure on the by-pass sends re-routed traffic through the village. Or the frequent occasions when morning traffic is so heavy that large numbers of motorists choose a "rat run" through Edenfield in preference to sitting on the by-pass. Even if the roads (and residents) could cope what about the environmental load of all those new commuters. - - Where will the new children go to school? Where will they find a G.P. or a dentist? Where will they shop? Where will they socialise? - - One final question: What chance that any promises made to assuage Edenfield will ultimately be delivered?		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
811	Nadia	Krasij	-		Object	<p>1. Scale of development would irrevocably alter the character of the village -</p> <p>2. An additional 489 houses in the village would result in a large increase in noise and disturbance due to increased traffic and have an adverse impact on the residential amenity -</p> <p>3. The loss of view for many existing properties will have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of many properties particularly in reference to the proposed developments on Blackburn Road and west of Moorcroft -</p> <p>4. Lack of infrastructure and amenities to support potential additional residents -</p> <p>5. Inability to access southbound A56 at Stubbins will result in a greater volume of traffic through the village on narrow roads -</p> <p>6. Proposed development is likely to generate a significant increase in local traffic which will have a detrimental impact on highway safety -</p> <p>7. Any loss of on-street parking as a result of increased traffic will mean the loss of a valuable residential amenity -</p> <p>8. There is no direct public transport link between Edenfield and Manchester, indeed there is no public transport through the village after 8pm -</p> <p>9. Flood risk impact of building alongside the by pass must be considered - there is standing water and flooding frequently on and alongside the by pass. -</p> <p>10. Open vistas would be severely impacted by mass development both from Market Street but also, significantly at the village boundary at 'Fingerpost' by development at Blackburn Road</p>		-
815	Adam	Barnes	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
816	Paul	Petterson	-		Object	I understand that you are planning to remove large areas from the Greenbelt so that the land can be built on. - - I object to the large scale of the proposals which would spoil the character of the village. - - Policy H55: Housing Density - An increase in housing of around 50% is far too big and the current infrastructure of the village would not be able to cope such as the increase of double the cars parked in what is now overcrowded. The increased traffic would have a significant impact on the environment. - - Policy ENV1:. c) Being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers, and avoiding demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area. - The amenities in Edenfield are already fully stretched with no GP surgery, no Post Office, one small local grocery shop and the two primary schools fully subscribed. How can any more be sympathetic? - - Chapter 6: Transport Policy TR1: ...Proposals which reduce the need to travel will also be encouraged. Edenfield is already very busy especially at peak times. When there are hold-ups on the Edenfield by-pass, which happen on a regular basis, traffic diverts through the village creating gridlock and is hazardous for adults and children who have difficulty trying to cross the roads. - •Promoting sustainable transport solutions to address congestion and air pollution; - •Ensuring that development that generates significant movement is located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. ; - There is insufficient public transport now and many bus services are being axed. There is now no direct link with Manchester and limited bus services in an evening. Should the East Lancs Railway ever start to be used for commuter travel, this would not have an impact on Edenfield as a car/bus would be needed to reach the station. - An increase of almost 500 homes will almost certainly mean in increase in, possibly around 900, cars accessing the narrow roads in the area. -		-
817	Katie	Barnes	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-
820	Elizabeth	Lawton	-		Object	I am objecting to the scale of the developments proposed. Edenfield is a village and has a character as a village. Due to the large developments proposed I feel the large increase in the number of houses will detract from village life. There will be a huge increase in the number of cars in the village which will increase pollution and congestion. Having been brought up and lived in the village for 30 years, I now live outside the area but due to having a family had been considering a move back to the village. With the proposed changes I do not feel these would benefit myself or my young family. Due to the impact on the school this has also impacted on my decision to return to the village. I have family still resident in the village and visit on a regular basis and I am aware of the negative impact that large scale development would have on facilities, amenities and resources for the local community.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
822	Chris	Seeley	-		Object	This is Green Belt land - it's protected for a reason. - Do not allow it to be built on !!!		Your are our councillors. We DO NOT want Green Belt land built on. So please see the will of the people is respected, it is your job after all.
823	Lee	Ash	-		Object	I am objecting to the scale of your proposed plan. We have one main road in and out, and if there is an accident on the M66 or the bypass - Edenfield is gridlocked. And what about the lack of schools, doctors, social activity and the multitude of infrastructure that is needed to make Edenfield free flowing and operational? - Edenfield is a lovely village with greenbelt which contributes significantly to fresh air for miles. Building houses close to the bypass is unhealthy and wrong for all citizens. - Parking for cars is also limited as it stands so how will this be rectified with such a large amount of added cars and traffic?!		-
826	Donna	Kean	-		Object	I strongly object to the proposed removal of areas of green belt for the purpose of building a ridiculous amount of houses. The green belt is fundamental to the beauty of living in this area and to remove it would be a travesty. Edenfield is a small village and the addition of approx 490 additional homes is absurd. - Traffic through the village, on my road and on the M66 already backs up extremely quickly at peak times on a routine basis without the burden of the extra homes and their associated vehicles. Added to this is the parking situation in the village which like elsewhere in the area is on street. Additional residents will increase parking issues while accessing local shops which will put an extra burden on the road through the village. - The local services could not cope with such an influx of people e.g. doctor, dentist, schools,council. As a resident of Edenfield for the past two years I have been refused allocation of a green waste bin on the basis that they had all been allocated and even if they could give me one, they wouldn't empty it as the refuse collection round is already at capacity. My house is approx. 100years old so this is not an addition to the route and I am paying my already incredibly expensive council tax, so how is the council going to cope with all these new extra homes? - These proposals are absurd and appear to have been proposed by someone who has no idea about the area they are planning to develop and no consideration of the impact on the existing community or surroundings. The proposals would alter the character of the village irrevocably and should not be allowed to proceed.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
827	Emily	Formby	-		Object	<p>I write further to Rossendale’s draft Local Plan (the “Plan”) and the ongoing consultation process. - - I have reviewed the information available on the Council’s website including: - - 1. The Plan and the accompanying policies map; - 2. The sustainability appraisal of the local plan 2017; and - 3. The habitats regulation assessment 2016. - - I also attended the consultation meeting at the Edenfield Community Centre on 12 September 2017 with a large number of other residents in the village when I was also able to consider the Lives and Landscapes Assessment for Rossendale Borough Council (dated December 2015 and prepared by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects). - - I am horrified by the proposal to remove from the greenbelt significant areas of land from around Edenfield village in order to facilitate the building of 489 new houses. - - The areas which I am particularly concerned about are set out within reference HS2.71 of the policies map which accompanies the Plan and include: - - The land off Exchange Street, Edenfield; - The land west of Market Street, Edenfield; - The land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield; and - - The land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield. - - The purpose of this letter is to set out my objections to these proposals. - - The need for new housing in Rossendale - - At page 6 of the Plan under the title ‘Chapter 1: Housing’ the Council’s policy HS1 is set out in relation to meeting Rossendale’s Housing Needs. - - The Plan states: - - ‘The need for new housing in Rossendale has been assessed in the Council’s Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMA) (2016). This study, which is consistent with the Government’s current policy position, examined a range of housing, economic and demographic evidence to assess housing need and demand in Rossendale.’ - - Further to the SHMA the need for additional housing is estimated at 3,975 new homes over the period covered by the Plan (2019-2034). - - Objection 1 - - In relation to Edenfield the Plan proposes that 489 new houses to be built which equates to 12% of the new housing required under the SHMA. - - It is inconceivable to me that Edenfield as a village of approximately 900 homes at present should bear such a significant proportion of the overall burden of new house building in Rossendale. The current population of Edenfield is significantly less than 12% of the overall population of Rossendale. - - Objection 2 - - As set out above when the SHMA was undertaken it was ‘consistent with the Government’s current policy position’. - - I note that the Government’s policy in relation to new housing has now changed to such an extent that it appears that the SHMA is no longer consistent with Government policy. - - On 15 September 2017 the MP for Rossendale and Darwen, Mr Jake Berry, published a post on Facebook which confirmed that under the Government’s new plans which were announced on the same day that the number of new houses required to be built in Rossendale had been reduced to 2,120. - - Under same post Mr Berry called upon the Council to suspend and proposal to remove land from the greenbelt and to prioritise new</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>developments on brownfield and former industrial sites. - - The proposed development in Edenfield would therefore constitute almost 25% of the housing need for the whole of Rossendale. - - In these circumstances it is clear that the SHMA and the Plan are now inconsistent with central government policy and I would invite the Council to suspend the current consultation pending a review and a redrafting of the Plan. - - - The Lives and Landscapes Assessment for Rossendale Borough Council (dated December 2015 and prepared by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects) ("LLA") - - At the consultation event in Edenfield Village Hall on 12 September 2017 hard copies of the LLA were available to be reviewed. - - I note that the LLA is not available on the Council's website in relation to the Plan. Is there any reason why this document has not been published online in the same way as the habitats regulation assessment 2016? - - I note that the LLA states that it was commissioned by the Council to be incorporated within the Council's Site Allocations and Development Management Plan Document. - At section 3.2 of the LLA a description is given of 'Settled Valleys Landscapes Type' and the report states: - - 'Early on in this assessment it became clear that the single definition of Settled Valleys as 8a Irwell, while entirely appropriate for the northern part of the Borough and Whitworth, was not an accurate description of the landscape of the southern section of the Irwell Valley between Rawtenstall and Edenfield which is more rural in nature and importantly has little or no development in the valley bottom. It was decided to create a new Settled Valleys character area: 8b Irwell Valley south which more accurately describes this situation'... - - 'Settled Valleys LCT, extending from the valley bottom in many areas to elevations of 300m or more, can be an appropriate location for development, though dense development on the valley floor is not appropriate in 8b Irwell Valley South because of the much more rural nature of the Valley.' - - The LLA therefore acknowledges that the area described as 8b Irwell Valley south (which includes Edenfield) is rural in nature and is not appropriate for dense development. Given the relative size of the proposed development and the current size of Edenfield I would characterise the proposed development as 'dense'. - - At the end of section 5 of the LLA is a map of the area covered by the Plan titled 'sites overview' and described as 'figure 6'. - - That map highlights the proposed sites being considered for development by the Council and categorises them as either: (1) undevelopable, (2) developable with mitigation or (3) developable. - - I note that in relation to the area covered by HS2.71 in the Plan the vast majority of the proposed land is described as undevelopable with some small areas referred to as developable with mitigation. None of the land is described as developable. - - This appears entirely inconsistent with the proposed development in Edenfield. - - Exhibited to the LLA at volume 4: appendix 9 is the supporting information for the assessed sites (the assessment of the areas around Edenfield are set out at pages 88 to 122 of the same). - - I have set</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

out the conclusions reached by the LLA in relation to these specific sites below: - - 1. The outcome of the site assessment for the land at Blackburn Road (pages 88 to 89) is that the land is not suitable for development on landscaping grounds. - - 2. The outcome of the site assessment for the land at Burnley Road (pages 92 to 93) is that the land is not suitable for development on landscaping grounds. - - 3. The outcome of the site assessment for the land at Eden Mill (pages 96 to 99) is that the land described as A- C is suitable for development with mitigation but that the land described as D is not suitable for development on landscaping grounds. - - 4. The outcome of the site assessment for the land east of the motorway (pages 110 to 114) is that the land described as A is not suitable for development on landscaping grounds, the land described as B (being the site of the House and Jockey public house) is suitable for development and areas described as C – D are suitable for development with mitigation. - - 5. The outcome of the site assessment for the land at Pinfold (pages 116 to 120) is that the land described as A suitable for development with mitigation, the land described as B is not suitable for development and area described as C is suitable for development (this land is a small section of open space between 2 existing plots). - - Objection 3 - - Further to the LLA significant areas of the land which under the Plan as drafted will be released from the greenbelt in Edenfield have been described as unsuitable for development. The Council therefore appear to have disregarded a report which they have commissioned regarding the suitability of the land in Edenfield for housing. - - I am aware that the Council is already facing significant criticism and embarrassment as a result of the failed empty homes scheme which is estimated to have cost £4 million. I understand that one of the numerous criticisms of the Council in a report prepared by auditors was the Council overlooked or overrode its internal financial and legal procedures and the opinions of senior officers were ignored. - - I trust that lesson have been learned as a result of the same and that the Council will now urgently review the proposed changes to the greenbelt referred to above. - - The habitats regulation assessment 2016 (HRA") - - At paragraph 1.3.2 of the HRA a description is given of Rossendale as follows: - - 'Its main settlement areas are Bacup, Haslingden and Rawtenstall and there are a number of smaller villages including Facit, Crawshawbooth and Weir.' - - It is telling that Edenfield is such a small village that it is not even referred to by name within the HRA yet under the current Plan it is proposed to permit the building of 489 new properties (which is almost a third of the new properties required to be built in the entire valley. - - At paragraph 1.4 of the HRA it states: - - 'RBC [the Council] have presented Lepus with a list of sites which have been identified as being suitable for housing, employment, tourism, retail, green infrastructure and mixed use development.' - - It would therefore appear that the Council had already taken the decision to ignore the conclusions of the LLA (which

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

predates the HRA) when referring the land surrounding Edenfield set out in HS2.71 for consideration for development. - - At paragraph 1.5 of the HRA the policies under which the sites have been considered have been set out. - - I note that this includes the requirement to meet Rossendale's housing requirement. For the reasons set out above this housing requirement has materially changes since the HRA was commissioned and published. The conclusions of the HRA should therefore, in my opinion, be reviewed as a result. - - At paragraph 3.6.3 of the HRA it states: - - The large developments proposed at sites Land at Alder Bottom, Land to the South East of Edenfield and Area of Search to the East of Edenfield may reduce this characteristic linear settlement form and vastly increase the size of Edenfield.' - - The HRA therefore acknowledges that the proposed development will significantly alter the characteristics of Edenfield. - - At paragraph 3.6.5 of the HRA it states: - - 'Development at these sites [Land to the west of Moorland View, Land west of Blackburn Road, Land between Chatterton Hey and Nursing Home and Land at Alder Bottom] may result in the loss of linear settlement pattern and/or possible urban sprawl.' - - At paragraph 3.6.21 of the HRA it states: - - 'A watercourse runs through Land at Alder Bottom, Irwell Vale Mill and Acre Meadow; and Area of search to East of Edenfield and Land to the southeast of Edenfield. Contains springs. The boundary of Edenwood Mill, Land at Market Street, and Land of Blackburn Road (A0 are at high risk of surface water flooding. Areas of surface water flooding are also located inside the boundary of the following sites: - - Land at Alder Bottom; - - Acre Meadow; - - Land between Chatterton Hey and Nursing Home; - - Area of search to East of Edenfield; - - Land to southeast of Edenfield; - - Land off Blackburn Road (A); - - Land west of Blackburn Road; and - - Lunge Mill. - - Development of these sites would be at high risk of surface water flooding. - - Given the impact of the flooding over Christmas 2015 and New Year 2016 I am surprised that concerns regarding potential flooding have been overlooked. - - At paragraph 3.6.25 it is acknowledged that all sites within Edenfield are over 1km from a GP and over 8km from a hospital. It is also acknowledged that the capacity for GP surgeries to take the residents of these developments is unknown. I note that under the Plan no provision has been made for additional facilities such as a GP surgery. - - Reference is made at paragraphs 3.6.30 and 3.6.31 to the location of primary and secondary schools. - - As far as I am aware Edenfield Primary School is already full subscribed and there is only one road from the village to the nearest Secondary School. No reference is made in the HRA to the capacity of these schools to take pupils from the proposed developments and I note that under the Plan no provision has been made for additional facilities such as schools. - - Objection 4 - - The facilities available in Edenfield do not have the capacity to cater for the increased population of Edenfield if the proposed development proceeds. - - Objection 5 - - The HRA sets out a number of reasons for the land contained in HS2.71

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						being deemed unsuitable for development which do not appear to have been given due consideration. - - - The Plan - - The details of the Plan relevant for Edenfield are set out in HS3: Edenfield of the Plan. - - I note that the proposed development for Edenfield is dependent upon a number of factors including a comprehensive development of the entire site. Given the intention to disregard the advice received by the Council regarding the unsuitability of large parts of the area to be developed in Edenfield I presume that the development of the site (26 hectares) would be undesirable or uneconomical if only smaller sites (such as the land at the Horse and Jockey public house) were released for development. - - HS3 also sets out requirements for a scoping study, transport assessment and travel plan to be agreed with Lancashire County Council. - - Reference is also made to ensuring the development promotes the use of public transport, walking and cycling. - - Objection 6 - - Whilst if it proceeds, any development may have plans to maximise the use of public transport, walking and cycling, no consideration appears to have been given to the fact that the vast majority of facilities used by residents are in either Ramsbottom, Haslingden or Rawtenstall. Journeys to these areas require the use of cars. Given the size of the development in relation to the size of the village the road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the resulting increase in vehicles. - - Objection 7 - - Even at the moment (before the significant additional traffic which will be created by the new development) at peak times, such as morning and evening or during the weekend, traffic on Market Street is heavy. During these times Market Street effectively becomes a single track road outside of the shops at the south end of the village for cars and for the whole length of Market Street when buses or lorries are travelling through the village. The infrastructure of the village simply cannot cope with development on the size proposed. - - Please acknowledge safe receipt of this objection and let me know the process and time scales for the remainder of the consultation. -		
829	Dave	Clark	n/a		Object	I would like to object to the sheer scale of the proposed development. My objection is also to the proposed destruction of green belt. This is my children's legacy and must be preserved. There are a number of brownfield sites that can be used but the developers have instead chosen green belt locations - purely down to the profit they can make. I understand there is a requirement to build more houses as we have a growing population, but to target precious green belt for profit is disgusting. The council - as our representatives - have a moral obligation to the people of the borough to choose what is right and not to pander to developers in this way.		This is just wrong. The scale and location of the development should be reconsidered.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
830	Amy	Clark	n/a		Object	I would like to object to the proposed development. My objection is to the proposed destruction of the countryside. There are a number of brownfield sites that can be used but the developers have instead chosen green belt locations - purely down to the profit they can make. I understand there is a requirement to build more houses as we have a growing population, but to target precious green belt for profit is disgusting. The council - as our representatives - have a moral obligation to the people of the borough to choose what is right and not to pander to developers in this way. People have chosen to live here because of the countryside, by removing this you are making the area poorer.		No - the proposal is wrong and should be reconsidered.
832	Susan	Smith	-		Object	The size of this development is too great for the area and would change the whole village of Edenfield. It is the robbery of the Greenbelt and would affect future generations.		Rossendale must have enough brownfield sites for use before looking at existing greenbelt land, e.g in Edenfield there is the land at Rosebank which is just becoming a dangerous ruin and the land off Wood Lane.
834	Melanie	Kay	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what it proposed for edenfield as this will dramatically alter the character of the village. There are a number of brownfield sites in rossendale that could be utilised without removing fields from the greenbelt. Areas such as stand football club, Mayfield chicks as examples. - The village can not maintain such an expanse of housing the infrastructure and road network is not suitable .		-
835	Matthew	Leake	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposals. Edenfield does not have the infrastructure to cope with the increased demand, and the whole character of the village would be adversely affected.		-
836	Matthew	Mead	-		Object	I am objecting to the proposal of turning large areas of Edenfield into brown belt areas and the building of far too many houses to fit inside our villages infrastructure. - My Family has lived in this village since early 1900. They and i have seen the village house population grow bit by bit and the shops close one by one and the bins emptied less and less, the grass cut less and less, the once clean public paths get serviced and cleaned less and less, the schools get fuller and fuller.... - Are nearly 500 houses going to improve any of this? - This is a lovely quiet village and it's on the verge of being ruined by some fat cats that don't even live here. - I am also very concerned about the fact that 6 months ago that most of the proposed land was bought by a large house builder and its lands that the council are putting up to be developed. I feel like there is a conspiracy at work. - Matthew Mead		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
837	Margaret	Jones	-	Along bypass	Object	This is a large single expanse of greenbelt, with no history of development that you are looking to change to residential. It would change the make up of the area with effectively a new village, rather than infilling pockets with in the existing village envelope and brown field sites. There are other sites such as the old Mill sites at dearden clough or Rose bank which are brown field sites. These would be smaller pockets of housing, providing in fill. Yes they would have to be more sensitively developed to accommodate the water as is the he case with Mills, and steeper ground, but, this is the case with much of the borough. The green belt, green field sites should not be given up because they are easy to develop, they are. Far far more important to the nation nevermind the local population than that.		I understand the need for a local plan and the need for a number of properties to be built, and that these have to be properties people want to live in, as just having a house isn't enough in our country. But I feel that giving up large saves of greenbelt to achieve this rather than prioritising the development of derelict Brown field sites of our industrial past is unacceptable approach.
838	Ben	Bentley	-		Object	Having been brought up in Edenfield and still living in Rossendale I object strongly to any removal of green belt land and any large scale building development. - Local schools could not take any increase, I couldnt get my children into Edenfield as they were full. There are no GP services there either. - The impact on health from extra traffic would be immense and the loss of green land which helps purify the air we breathe would be detrimental to us all but in particular to children and future generations. The noise of traffic would be greatly increased. Its already very noisy from the A56 in certain wind conditions. - Edenfield village centre would become a traffic nightmare as cars turned out onto the main rd and trundles through. Rawtenstall roundabout hardly copes as it is. More traffic, more congestion, more fumes more noise. - The charming character of the village and the valley in general would be spoilt by the scale of these developments as we would become a vast sprawling suburb, no longer a 'green' countryside area.		-
839	Lisbeth	Smith	-		Object	I wish to object to the size of proposed development in Edenfield. The current infrastructure will be unable to cope with the influx of potentially an 50 per cent increase in the population and transport to the area. - The current schools within the area will not be able to cope with such an increase in children, there are no plans for an increase in medical facilities. - Transport will be a nightmare, the current M66 and bypass will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic. Public transport has already been drastically cut, there used to be 2 direct bus routes through Edenfield to Manchester (X44 and X35) both these services have been withdrawn with one of the companies stating that drivers found it difficult to get through the village due to congestion! This will be made even worse if the proposed number of houses are built. - The character of the village will be drastically destroyed.		I do not oppose some development but the sheer size of the proposed development is out of sync with the whole area.
840	Joanne	Maddocks	-		Object	There are plenty of sites more suited to being developed such as the field facing the duckworth arms, dearden clough and the land at the side of wood lane. - The developers simply want to build executive homes on land with excellent views, this doesnt fit in with the design of Edenfield and how it has evolved over the years.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
841	estelle	hopwood	-		Object	I object to the scale of propose housing. Edenfield is a tiny village and could not cope with the extra housing. The pollution is already high, schools are full, roads full and narrow. Already to many trucks.No doctors surgery. - - I do not want green belt to be built on		the council had no right to sell this land.
842	jenny	Greenhalgh	-		Object	I object to this plan and the council had no right to sell our green belt.Edenfield is a small village and to add nearly 500 houses is madness. - - there is no benefit to the local resident but just negatives - higher pollution , more traffic problems , more crime, no doctors, schools are full, damage to wild life, roads are crumbling and to narrow. - -		if the council have to build house's, then make sure they fit into the environment, Terrace house's could be built which wont take up much land. But then this is all about money.
843	PAUL	DODD	RESIDENT		Object	I object to the use of Greenfield sites to increase the housing in Edenfield by nearly 50%. The planned massive increase in housing in Edenfield will irrevocably change the character of this small village area: for the worse. In the draft plan I cannot see any rationale or purpose to the increase in housing in this area: especially a reason for using and destroying Greenfield space. - I have lived in Edenfield for over 25 years and the reasons for first moving here have remained more or less the same. This is an area that is small and relatively self-contained; it is unspoilt; and it has plentiful green spaces within a short walk. Whilst the local amenities have contracted and diminished over the years, Edenfield remains a good place to live. Any large - scale increase in housing will, I believe, have a detrimental impact on the village and its environs. - For the above reasons, I strongly oppose any large - scale increase in the number of residential properties in the Edenfield area.		No
844	Lorna	Ball	-		Object	I wish to object to this proposal on the grounds that Edenfield simply does not have the required infrastructure to support expansion on this scale. There are already considerable strains on the area in terms of roads, schools and utilities. I can see no way in which a development of this scale would enhance the local area and feel that it would only prove detrimental. I feel that the environmental impact would be that this would no longer be a rural space but simply an area of urban sprawl with very little concern being shown for its impact on existing residents.		-
845	Joanne	Lewis	-		Object	Keeping the land green belt is vital to preserve the character of our village. There is also the very serious infrastructure and Safety issues that so many new properties would bring - Strain on the schools - Parking on Market street - Additional traffic etc -		Green belt should never be considered for use until all brownfield sites have been exhausted.
846	Paul	Whitehead	-		Object	I am objecting to this on the sheer scale of what is being proposed for Edenfield as this would radically change the character of the village.		No thought has been given to the services that are needed in a community of the size being proposed i.e. Schools, roads, doctors, jobs etc. This village cannot cope with such an increase to the community

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
847	Jean-Pierre Louis	DESPREZ	-		Object	Extremely strong objection to the size of the proposed development in an area already swamped by cars and traffic, limited parking spaces, lack of community facilities (no surgery, no post office etc), Such an alteration to the village would not only alter its character but in the long term destroy it.		None other than those outlined in question 8. Only the cynical comment that the Green Belt is applicable when it suits - see those people who have tried to obtain planning permission in the past for minor improvements.
849	David	Sallis	-		Object	we are a small village and the scale of housing is not feasible. This plan will add pollution, increase traffic, take away green belt, ruin local wild life and spoil the area. We don't want to live in a building site.		but the residents before profit. build low cost house's that locals can afford and house's that fit in the area , like terrace. don't build too many.
850	Denise	Sallis	-		Object	we are a small village and currently have problems with our infrastructure, so to build so many house's is unthinkable. Green belt should stay green belt. Pollution is already high and another 1000 cars will not help. These house's will not be affordable to local people nor fit into the area. The wildlife will be affected. I do not want to live in a building site for 15 years.		the council should put residents before profit and they had no right to sell the green belt.
851	Anthony	Heffernan	-		Object	I wish to object to the scale of the development proposed for Edenfield and the fact that the council intend to give away the green belt land instead of using existing/brown belt. The village infrastructure cannot support a development of this size.		It is an easy option to build on green belt instead of looking for alternative sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
855	Michael	Flatley	-		Object	<p>Access and through traffic routes. - Edenfield village is a relatively small area but contains a number of arterial routes that converge in the village. These routes link to Rawtenstall and the adjoining areas, Haslingden through to Blackburn, Ramsbottom through to Bolton, Bury, Rochdale, and of course Manchester. - - These routes all converge to go through the village, though there is a bypass between Edenfield and Rawtenstall. The bypass already struggles during peak periods and as such people also use the main road through the village, which at peak times is already heavily used and is becomes congested. The area around the primary school also suffers with traffic at the start and end of the school day, which is a potential safety issue already! - - This arterial route will not cope with further traffic. The village already suffers with parking due to the existing terrace housing that fronts the road (with no alternative parking) and as such the use of parking restrictions on the road is not an option. Bury road in particular suffers with traffic as this is a direct route from traffic leaving the M66 at the Ramsbottom junction. Bury road suffers with collisions and many near misses. - - Increased traffic through the village is not viable as this will cause major delays and more seriously is a huge potential for accidents. It will also impact heavily on the noise created by traffic and of course air pollution. - - Please also note that any problems on the M66 and the A56 cause huge delays and major congestion through the village. This is becoming a more frequent occurrence, and any increase in housing in Rossendale will have a significant impact. - - Unfortunately the existing roads – Bury road, Market Street and Rochdale road do not lend themselves to alterations to cope with additional traffic. Please also note that there are a high number of elderly residents who are less likely to have vehicles than the average. As the population is refreshed the number of vehicles owned by the residents will increase which will put a strain on existing available parking, and further congest the routes through the village. - - Amenities. - Edenfield has very few amenities, with residents already having to travel out of the village for even the more basic requirements. It does not have any health care as the local doctors surgery relocated to Rawtenstall many years ago. The primary schools are currently full and secondary places in the borough are in the same position. Edenfield does not have a dentist. The community centre and recreational areas are not suitable for an increase in residents. - - Location of the proposed housing. - Many of the proposed houses will be located very near to the bypass. That area has a high noise level, especially during peak periods and when the road is wet. The area will also suffer from a high level of pollution due to the proximity of the bypass and also the increased traffic. - - The character of the village. - Edenfield is a quaint village with a village feel. Increasing the number of houses will make it loose that character. That character is very precious and once gone cannot be replaced. You cannot just build a village with this type of</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
						<p>character in the future as this has come through the age and history of the village. - - Use of green belt land. - The green belt was introduced for a reason and once it's gone, it's gone. Has the need for green spaces decreased – NO! If anything the need for these areas is more important today than ever. Don't throw these areas away, they are far too precious. - - As a resident of Edenfield I strongly protest these proposed developments. -</p>	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
856	Karen	Adams	-		Object	<p>How dare you attempt to turn our green Village into a Town. I grew up in Edenfield, my family live in Edenfield, my children attend Edenfield C of E Primary School, we support the local businesses in our area, Myself and my family live just outside of Edenfield on the outskirts of Ramsbottom (another area that is threatened with it's green belt being taken away - that's another local council area so my objections for there will go to Bury.gov). If we all wanted to live in a city we would have moved to the busier places like Bury and Radcliffe but we have chosen to make her homes in a rural area. We chose it because its green and without high level population, we chose it because we like the community feel. City people live in the city because they chose that life for themselves. So how dare you swamp out green belt with more houses and take our rural spaces away from us. - - The roads do not have the capacity to deal with the volume of traffic this number of houses will give us, the Primary Schools have already increased their intake, there is no more room for even further intake. (Have you even been in Edenfield Primary School?). Over the Summer holidays another classroom was added which has sectioned off the inside of the school hall. The beautiful hall has shrunk and it's stain glass windows are now hidden behind a classroom. There is no more room for more children. Rossendale Council cannot even provide us with a School Crossing Patrol Person at our school (we have had no lollipop person since this term started at the beginning of September) our 4-11year old children are currently crossing over an already busy main road without any safety assistance endangering their lives daily. I am led to believe due to council cuts there are no spare staff. So are we expected to believe our council will provide provisions for this large influx of residents? We dont have GP's in the area, we dont have Dentists we all travel into the towns for NHS services. Is their plans to increase GP's, Dentists, Schools in the area? I am certain not. Market Street is such a busy road now already. We do not need the volume of traffic increasing through our already busy village. - - I understand that housing needs to be increased but build near the already populated areas not on our green belt, building in Edenfield is to line the pockets of House Building companies NOT to create affordable housing for first time buyers. Edenfield is a sought after area because it is rural, that automatically puts the prices of homes up so first time buyers are not the people that would be able to afford these homes. I do not believe these homes are for people that are struggling to find affordable homes. It's business and it is simply rich people getting richer. I wonder if those making the decisions to take away our green areas live in highly populated areas themselves (out of choice). I am certain they themselves don't live in densely populated areas, with no greenery and failing road infrastructure and over-subscribed schools. I am certain not. - - Those are my comments.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
859	Roger	Wynne	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what the Council is proposing because it would radically alter the Character of the Village		no
861	Carol	Meeks	-		Object	I OBJECT TO THE SCALE OF WHAT THE COUNCIL IS PLANNING BECAUSE IT WOULD RADICALLY CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF OUR VILLAGE. THE EFFECTS ON OUR ROADS AND SCHOOLS ARE ALMOST UNTHINKABLE.		I am grateful to Mr Bradburn for doing these comments on my behalf.
863	Ian	Bailey	-		Object	I strongly object to the sheer scale of this proposed development of Edenfield. It would forever alter the character of the village. There is no infrastructure to handle such an increase in the number of houses. All roads in and around the village are already over capacity. - - This is not an appropriate use of Green Belt land.		I sincerely hope the strength of feeling of the residents of Edenfield are taken seriously. The scale of this proposed development is disgusting. It has taken 5 CENTURIES for the village to evolve to the current 900 houses, and the proposed plan would see 500 more in the space of 15 years. It is sickening.
864	Terence	Kitson	-	Market Street	Object	Whilst very few if any of the proposed housing will address the needs of local affordable housing in Rossendale what is the point. People from outside Rossendale who can afford the extortionate priced luxury houses Taylor Wimpey want to build and want to live in the countryside and commute to work are only exacerbating problems that Rossendale need to address already with the present population of the valley ie infrastructure transport schools health services. Edenfield is in no position to consume this enormous increase in population. - - I wonder if the land to the west of the Edenfield bypass opposite this proposed site has been considered. It is of ample size to accommodate the proposed 4 sites in Edenfield and would alleviate traffic through the village at least access could be made from Hardsough Lane and the bypass at Haslingden. Not that I endorse either site but like someone said Taylor Wimpey didn't buy this land to graze sheep sounds like they have had a nod and wink.		The whole of Market Street is at present reduced to a third of its width by parked vehicles 24/7 so imagine another 800 plus trying to negotiate the village if your current plans go ahead. That's daily and before an incident on the bypass when all traffic is diverted through the village. - - The only primary school in well oversubscribed and parking a nightmare at drop off and pick up. - - There are no medical services in the village again all the nearest are oversubscribed. - - Air pollution should be considered. - - Run off water from the moors will go where if you concrete over 31 acres. - - The whole plan is too big smaller better selected affordable housing once infrastructure is improved might be possible but your plan does not serve the existing population of Rossendale in any way it exacerbates existing problems.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
867	Tina	Rushton	-	all the above sites are covered by one single Ref No on the map	Object	I object to the scale of the plans for Edenfield which is too large and would radically alter the character of the village	-	
868	Andrew	Rushton	-	all the above sites are covered by one single Ref No on the map	Object	I object to the sheer scale of the plans for Edenfield which will radically alter the character of the village	-	
869	David	Rushton	-	all the above sites are covered by one single Ref No on the map	Object	I object to the sheer size of the plans for Edenfield which is too large and will radically alter the character of the village	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
871	Colin	Campbell	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is being proposed for Edenfield and which I feel would radically alter the character of the village. - -		Edenfield is a desirable village however with the amount of houses proposed it would no longer be a desirable village. It would be more beneficial to the whole of the valley if the amount of houses that need building be shared out over the area, this would absorb the amount of houses within the areas and the strain on doctors, schools, dentists would not be as concentrated. - - The dangers of building so many houses in one place would increase, too much traffic (of which there is already), the heavy building equipment going through the village and parking would put people at risk. Especially children. - - The disruption that will be caused over the years that the proposed housing will be built is totally unacceptable. - - This village cannot cope with the traffic that already passes through it so with more houses and the disruption they will cause whilst being built will put far too much strain and inconvenience far too many people over an unacceptable amount of years. - -
874	Louise	Ogilvie	-		Object	I am objecting to the plans to develop circa 500 houses on green belt land. First I object on the basis that green belt space should be maintained for environmental and leisure reasons. Secondly I object on the basis of lack of sufficient infrastructure to sustain the size of development - roads are small and narrow and developing would create huge traffic problems. - - Thirdly, I object on the basis of lack of local infrastructure such as schools and other public services such as no doctors, dentists or community services available in the village. These services are accessed by residents of Edenfield in surrounding villages and are already overstretched. The development would bring thousands more residents needing such services. - -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
876	Mervyn	MacDonald	-		Object	I believe the extent and nature of the proposal is on such a scale as to be totally inappropriate to be commensurate with the surrounding area and that it will destroy village life as currently experienced in that existing residents and infrastructure will be overwhelmed. Furthermore the loss of green belt land will reduce air quality both in Edenfield and further afield plus it is potentially dangerous to facilitate residential areas close to motorways/dual carriage-ways in view of the higher incidence of air pollution in these areas.	-	
877	Jacqueline	MacDonald	-		Object	An extra 500ish houses is excessive for a village the size of Edenfield. Everything possible should be done to protect the Green Belt. There were good reasons for establishing Green Belt areas in the first place and these are still valid today and therefore the Green Belt should be left undisturbed for future generations.	-	
878	Chrstine	Caudwell	-		Object	I object to these proposals on the grounds that these large scale proposals would completely change the character of the village for the worse. It would greatly increase the volume of traffic in and around the village, which is already a problem in the area. The village doesn't have services that could cope e.g. Lacks school places, doctors, decent access to local bus services. I am also concerned that by developing this land you could be worsening the effect of flooding both on the bypass roads and the run off down to the river irwell and chatterton and stubbins.	-	
880	Gerald	Bowden	-		Object	I am not against some small developments in the village but I object to the proposals in the Local Plan - as the number of houses proposed (489) is excessive and cannot be supported by the size and structure of the village. - - A one street village is definitely not the place to site a development of the size outlined in the Local Plan. - - 489 houses would increase the properties in the village by over 50% which would result in approx. 1000 cars at those houses. This is impossible to accommodate in our one street village. - - There is no facility for primary school places and secondary education in the area is nearly at full capacity. The services of Doctors and Dentists would also be an additional problem.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
881	Gordon	Ellis	-		Object	My wife Olive has already stated several objections to the scale of the proposed development, which I agree with, but on further reflection I would like to add the following. - I feel it is vital to protect the Green Belt in the Rossendale Valley. Once it vanishes we will lose forever the benefits of green spaces for the health of the human population, and the wild life corridors essential for maintaining the species diversity for which this area is well known. - It might also be argued that building houses bordering the M66 could be a ticking time bomb for Rossendale Council: it is well documented that noise and particulate matter from heavy traffic pose both physical and mental health problems so encouraging house building there could have legal implications for the Council. - I hope the Council will stand up for Rossendale residents by retaining all the Green Belt which benefits everybody in the Rossendale Valley - Thank you for your attention.		Please fully utilise brown field sites for necessary housing, and do not succumb to Government pressure which seems to think huge numbers of houses are needed here. We do not have the jobs for the proposed increase in local population.
882	James	Byrom			Object	The proposals would completely change the character of the village and not in a good way. The heavier traffic will cause enormous problems for the residents. It will also increase the number of homes by over 50% in a short period. I object to the proposed size of this. The proposals will completely alter the character of the village, in a negative way. The additional traffic will have a detrimental effect and locals will endure difficulties especially at peak times. The main reason however is the fact that the proposals are on green belt land which will ruin the landscape forever.		No
883	Daniel	Ross	-		Object	i strongly disagree to this plan, as it will bring lots of pollution and destroy the habitats of thousands of animals living in the fields.		it will cost too much. i enjoy having beautiful views from my window
884	Jenna	Healey	-		Object	Haveing moved to the area 1 year ago due to the greenery and location and lack of air pollution I am very disappointed in the plans for a number of houses building up the area. I also find it disgraceful that I plan to develop on my own land for a garage which will be built with the character of the area and property that I have to jump through hoops for the permission as I was told by the planning inspector that they tend not to agree planning permission in this area due to the green belt and they do not want a rise in buildings - how can they tell me this when he plans are to hrow up hundreds of houses on that same land. I think it is a little contradicting and does not make sense. I there for submit my objection for this extra reason and hope this is taken on board.		-
885	Lynn	Clegg	-		Object	Leave our greenbelt alone. Traffic is a joke now in the area the roads schools can not cope now.		-
887	David	Hayhoe	-		Not Applicable	Not acceptable		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
891	Michael	Thompson	-		Object	I object to the massive scale of the proposed plan in Edenfield as it will totally alter the the character of the village. - I also object to the use of green belt land when there is brown belt land not being considered. - I have serious concerns that the area cannot sustain such a large increase in population.	-	
893	Morag	Thompson	-		Object	I object to the massive scale of the proposed build in Edenfield as it will radically change the character of the village. - Also the the use of green belt land when brown belt land is not being used.	-	
894	Harry	Stringfellow	-		Object	We object as a community to the scale of this plan as we feel it will ruin the integrity and character of our village. Submitted on 09/10/2017: I object to these proposals on the grounds that the sheer scale of the development plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of the village.		The aforementioned areas are in Edenfield.
895	Verity	Stringfellow	-		Object	We object to the scale and the aim of what is proposed for Edenfield. The plans would radically alter and decimate the character of our village.	-	
897	Michele	Crossley	-		Object	The village is already heavily conjested at times with traffic. Living on Dearden Fold we back into Dearden Clough and Bury Road. It is regular to hear vehicle collisions, near misses and road rage. Bury Road is narrow and conjested with parked cars, the extra traffic with construction vehicles plus the cars from people living in new houses would be to much for Edenfield village. - - Moved back to Edenfield 5 years ago for a healthier, more relaxed, way of life. Now looking at takeing away the green belt from us, the reason we moved back!	-	
898	Hannah	Seeley	-		Object	Edenfield is perfect as it is, and the land (as well as the locals) will not take kindly to more houses being built.	-	
900	Liam	Fahey	n/a		Object	I object in the strongest possible terms to massive unprecedented scale of the proposed development for Edenfield. - - An increase of just under 500 large houses represents an increase of over 50% of the entire house numbers which is completely unsustainable in terms of infrastructure, parking, schooling (local Primary and high school provision), and health. - - The removal of such a huge swathe of the Green Belt land will diminish our community and lives, and siting so many houses, families and young people so close the busy A56 will be a health risk to the proposed new residents.		This huge scale ripping up of the Green Belt land must not, cannot, be allowed. This is not a case of "BIMBYism", I agree some development will be needed, and a managed extension to the village is needed if local children are to be able to stay in the village; but brown field development MUST be examined rather than taking the simple option to allow development on our Green and Pleasant greenbelt Lands which I believe has already been purchased by a major housing developer.
904	Rosemary	Trippier			Object	there is too much traffic in the village already we dont need to add to it		go build some where else

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
905	Matthew	Scanlon	-		Object	I strenuously object to the purposed development on these grounds. - There is no infrastructure to accommodate a extra 489 house in the small village Edenfield. - Traffic is down to one lane on Market street at present. Because of parked cars. Large vehicles struggle to get through. - If there is a accident or closure on the A56 the traffic diverts through Edenfield. Which causes major traffic jams and problems.I believe the witchway x43 as terminated it Edenfield service because of traffic problems. - School children can not cross the roads safely at present, no zebra crossings no traffic calming measures. Accident waiting to happen. There isn't enough parking at moment. If double yellows on Market street wouldn't work. Because there isn't anywhere else for residents of visitors to park. - All the local schools are over subscribed even though they have all been extended numerous times. Doctors and dentists are over subscribed. - I'm a local plumbing and heating engineer and work with local utilities companies in and around Edenfield. A lot of the utility's are running at full capacity at present. - Greenbelt shouldn't be built on when there are lots of brown field sites which are not being put forward for development. Probably because they are not as profitable for the developers. - Lots of people travel to Edenfield to enjoy the greenbelt and it's openness. Which brings money for local businesses and jobs for people. Building on greenfield sites around Edenfield would ruin the character and nature of this historic village. - There are a few small developments going ahead in Edenfield which I don't have a problem with. Because they will not cause to much damage. 489 in Edenfield houses is a quite unbelievable.		
908	Natalie	Paintin	-		Object	Traffic - the building of more than 450 new homes could result in up to 800 more cars using the already busy roads daily. Market street is already a busy road. - Green belt land - the proposed area is green belt land. It should be kept that way. It's Green belt land for a reason. - Schools - the schools in the area are already full, and very popular. Where are all the children in the area going to go to school?! - Stress to current residents - from driving through edenfield every day and seeing the posters objecting in their windows, and attending local meetings, its obvious that this is creating a great deal of distress for many people who are concerned about houses being built in front of them. They are worried about their children not being able to go to the local schools. They are worried about the increased traffic. -		
910	Stewart and Geraldine	Wilkins	-		Object	We object to the proposed plans as the scale of such plans would radically alter the character of our lovely village. The road through the village is already far too busy with traffic and simply couldn't cope if these plans were to go ahead.		Edenfield is a beautiful quiet village. Please keep it that way.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
915	Jonathan	Glover	Private Citizen		Object	Edenfield has not the infrastructure to support such a development- the roads can't cope already with the traffic (including the Scout Moor quarry traffic). Parking will become even more of a nightmare - there is no Doctors Surgery - the two schools will not be able to accommodate such an influx. Badly thought out. -		Wrong development at the wrong place.
919	Russell	White	-		Object	Strongly object to these plans as Edenfield could not cope with the amount of development proposed.		-
920	PETER	HAWORTH	-		Object	The objection is to the removal of the above stated areas being removed from the GREEN BELT and the unacceptable scale of the development that would inevitably follow such action.		-
921	Jennifer	Wolfenden	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is proposed because it will totally change the Character of our village and amongs other things bring hundreds of extra cars onto our roads making it much more difficult, for example, to cross Bolton Rd North to take my children to school since the County Council has removed the Lollipop Lady.		I had difficulty doing the comments myself because I did not know the reference numbers etc and was not sure about some of the jargon viz. Site Allocation or Policy, so I was happy when Mr Bradburn offered to do it for me.
923	Michael	Southern	-		Object	What the council is planning would completely change the village which I absolutely oppose, so I object to the proposals.		I do not have a computer and so am grateful to Mr Bradburn for his offer to make my comments on the plan.
924	Peter	Hardman	-	Several areas of removal of green belt off Exchange st and west of Market St, Edenfield	Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. Traffic / parking would become a huge problem as would insufficient schools, shops, pubs and other infrastructure. Access to the motorway at the Ramsbottom junction would be impossible in morning's especially and a southern access from the Edenfield junction would be imperative.		-
925	Angie	Pearson	-		Object	I strongly object to the proposed plans to the above areas. I have lived in this beautiful village for many years and these plans will radically change it. Apart from all the obvious problems ie) lack of school/ doctors etc.. We already have a severe traffic congestion problem. There is difficulty on the Main Street.. Market St... As residents have to double park therefore access through the village is chaotic.. This is magnified at rush hours and school hours making the area around the school and church dangerous. I live on a farm which means I use Exchange St several times a day. Exchange St is impassable at times.. Emergency vehicles would not be able to pass .. Any delivery wagon we have and the bin wagon often have to back out on to the main road and redirect through the housing estate.. Which again isn't the safest as many children play out. - The village just isn't set up for increased traffic!!! Also if there is an accident on the bye-pass as there often is... The village takes this extra traffic also - In my eyes it is just a crazy idea! - Angie Pearson		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
926	Paul	Thompson	-		Object	If this plan is implemented it will totally change our village and so I object that. It would generate perhaps as many as 1000 extra cars, how will the roads cope?		I was grateful when Mr Bradburn offered to make these comments on my behalf.
927	John	Castley	-		Object	What is planned would radically change our village for the worse and I oppose it. As I understand it, if implemented the population of the village would increase by over 50% which I believe is wrong.		I am grateful to Mr Bradburn for offering to make these comments on my behalf.
928	Glyn	EWall	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is planned as it would totally change our village.		I am very busy and am grateful that the Residents Association has offered to make these comments on my behalf.
929	Barbara	Denton	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which will ruin the countryside character of the village		-
930	Claire	Wall	-		Object	I object top the scale of what is planned as it would totally change our village		I and my husband are very busy and are grateful that the Residents Association has offered to make these comments on our behalf.
931	Greg	Wall	-		Object	i object to the scale of what is planned as it would totally change our village.		My husband and I are very busy and are grateful to the Residents Association for offering to make these comments on our behalf.
932	Kirsten	Wall	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is planned as it would totally change our village.		I am very grateful to the Residents Association for offering to make these comments on my behalf.
933	Barbara	Knight	-		Object	I object to the scale of what the Council is planning as it would totally change the character of our village.		I aam grateful to the Residents Association for offering to make these comments on my behalf.
934	Andrew	Higgins	-		Object	I object to a plan which would totally transform Edenfield because of the large number of houses which it includes.		I do not live in Edenfield but have family there and visit regularly, and am appalled by what is planned which in my opinion would change the character of the village for the worse.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
936	A	Hough	-		Object	I object to the scale of the proposed development. Some limited housing would be acceptable but to propose an additional 450 plus houses in the village is totally unacceptable and would ruin the character of the village for ever. - Traffic in the village is a problem now but would become a huge problem should this development be allowed. When the Edenfield bypass is blocked by accidents all the motorway traffic is diverted through the village as happens now from time to time and this would cause gridlock. - The two schools in the village would not cope with the influx of children without building classroom extensions thus adding to the development and further loss of green space. - This proposal to build so many houses in Edenfield is ill conceived and the character of the village must be prtotected. I urge the Council to rethink the policy and drastically reduce the number of houses to be built in our beautiful village.		-
937	David	Giblin	-		Object	The scale of the proposed number of 461 units for this single policy is excessive and disproportionate in the context of the existing numbers of houses in the area. Pursuit of such a policy would bring about a fundamental change in character to Edenfield and would intensify not only calls on facilities in the area such as schools, places of worship, parks, playgrounds and open spaces but also on the highway network which is ill equipped to deal with modern vehicle ownership levels let alone another potential 1,000 vehicles. Local roads cannot cope with such levels and the M66 is already suffering from congestion as commuters move from Lancashire southwards towards Manchester. The M66 is practically at saturation point in terms of capacity and any disruptions due to weather, accidents or road works creates substantial delays and inconvenience to individuals and businesses costing local economies millions. This policy and others in the area are going to compound this problem and no HE RIS or TfN interventions have been identified let alone programmed. - - It is acknowledged that development has to occur somewhere but it must be done in a way sympathetic to the existing surroundings and is inappropriate development. Consequently, HS2.71 needs to be re-evaluated to drastically reduce the currently proposed number of units to something that can be considered sustainable by the area without changing its character. The Green Belt parcels of P39, P43 and P44 were put in place to prevent urban sprawl. Increasing the housing in this area by an additional 50% or more does not comply with this ethos or safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and sits, therefore, in direct contravention of the NPPF with respect to protecting Green Belt land. Very special circumstances cannot be demonstrated for what equates to inappropriate development and so HS2.71 must fail in that respect.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
938	Neil	Clegg	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of this proposed development. - I do not think the infrastructure will be able to cope with the extra demands placed on it. - This is exemplified when the bypass is closed and traffic is funnelled through the village. - This is a linear village with no parking facilities.. the village would be permanently gridlocked.		-
940	B	Hough	-		Object	I object to the shear scale of the development the Council are proposing in Edenfield which in my opinion would radically adversely alter the character of the village for ever. - - Some limited house building would be acceptable but to desicrate our beautiful village in this way is totally unacceptable. The Council must alter and reduce the proposals. - - The development of over 450 houses would create additional traffic to such an extent that Market Street would not cope without parking restrictions on both sides. This will put more pressure on parking space already at a premium. - - The local schools will find it difficult to cope with the extra pupils without some additional classrooms being built. - -		-
941	Clair	Clegg	-		Object	There are three key issues - 1 : Air quality not just for the residents who would be living adjacent to the bypass , but for all the residents of the village - 2: In order for traffic to be free flowing dbl. yellow lines would have to be put on both sides of the road to accommodate the safe passage of traffic. This compromises the ability of current residents to park their cars in the vicinity of their homes and as there is almost NO off road parking this would be a HUGE problem. - 3: Safety in the village for children attending Edenfield School is already compromised by the sheer weight of traffic passing through the village at present. This traffic increases massively if the bypass is gridlocked or closed for any reason. In addition the 30 mile speed limit is not being adhered to by much of the traffic and indeed the speed should be reduced to 20 mph outside the school - 4. Additional traffic, possibly around 1000 cars, on the roads around the area will also exacerbate the safety problems. - 5: The impact on the green environment of the proposed housing development is massive. The surrounding areas are already at capacity for housing and have more or less merged into one. The green corridor is essential for the health, well being and quality of life that it provides. These are the exact features that should be nurtured and we have a duty to preserve them.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
942	Susan	Brooks	-		Object	I am objecting to the sheer scale of the proposed development. - As a keen walker and lover of the countryside I am concerned about the increased traffic and pollution that would stem from it. - I walk on a daily basis through the village and in the past five years I have noticed a big increase in traffic flow. Not only at peak times but throughout the day. - With the reduction in public transport available to residents(we have had no service on Rochdale Road for years). people, young and old have been forced to travel by car in and out of the village and that would only get worse. - The infrastructure available to young people is nonexistent therefore necessitating travelling out of the village.. which again would have to be by car because there are no buses after 6pm ANYWHERE!!	-	
943	Frank	Brooks	-		Object	I am a keen cyclist and runner in and around Edenfield. - Currently I take my life in my hands cycling through the village as cars are parked on both sides of the road and there is little respect for the speed limit. - We have very large quarry lorries coming through the village in both directions causing pollution and wear and tear to the road surfaces. They often drop large stones and the dirt comes off the wheels causing slippery road surfaces - Market Street ,,the main road through the village is at present classified as a B road: The B6527. - Why would you promote building extra houses alongside a road that was never built to take this amount of traffic?? - This scale of this development is just not feasible.	-	
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16358, SHLAA16255, SHLAA16256	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. -	-	
951	Valerie	Haworth	-		Object	I object to the removal of these areas from the Green Belt. It is understood that in excess of 450 houses could be built on this land if it were released from the Green Belt. The village currently has around 900 homes. It is unthinkable that an expansion of this magnitude should be even considered. The Green Belt must be preserved for future generations.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
952	Justine	Crossley	-		Object	The proposal is a huge scale which will radically alter the nature of the village. My son attended the school which has a small capacity . The traffic is also to busy around the main road area and gets even worse with motorway closures on the m66 and m62.		I no longer live in the village but do travel this way every day. I have concerns about the new generated amount of traffic and volume if residents this would bring. Were are these people going to have a doctors dentist schools etc. There are many factors influencing this decision and hopefully common sense will prevail.
954	Gaynor	Parkes	-		Object	I wish to object to the scale of the proposed development as I feel it will damage the integrity of our village and put an intolerable strain on the local services and infrastructure. To expand the housing stock by 489 dwellings would mean Edenfield was no longer a village community but simply a collection of mixed housing on the periphery of Ramsbottom. We would also lose all the surrounding green belt land which makes Edenfield such a lovely place to live. - I am obviously sympathetic to the need for additional housing in Rossendale and Edenfield should be prepared to accept a proportion of that increase but not to the extent proposed.		I urge the planners to reconsider this plan and support the local community in preserving some green belt areas in Edenfield for both current and future generations.
956	Victoria	Stanley	-		Object	The size and scale of this proposal in Edenfield will radically alter the character of the village. Other issues that i feel will be detrimental to the village include increased traffic volume during the proposed building of these sites from contractors and the volume of traffic following this due to the increase in population of the village.		Other factors that I feel will be an issue will be impact the increase in traffic volume will have on the roads and the rural views that will be permanently spoilt. There will be a negative impact on the local Wildlife which will not recover and I also have concerns about the rate of crime in the area once the population increases.
957	anna	Webster	-		Object	I strongly object to the massive scale of development proposed for Edenfield, it would massively affect so many people, the traffic, schools and our green space that we love so much. - - It is unacceptable to develop so much in such a small area. The roads are already choked and the schools are over subscribed. This will affect people travelling through the village too. - - We love our greenspace and this is not acceptable to change an area so much.		-
958	Karl	Stanley	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		I would like to object this proposal to build as I believe the increase in population will massively impact the roads and will increase the already increasing traffic that passes through the village. Crime rates will also rise and the village will be permanently changed for the worst.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
959	Susan	Goodchild	-		Object	I object to the scale of the proposed developments plus it will totally change the character of the village. I have lived here for 14 years and whilst I appreciate that more houses need to be built to house our growing population, the amount proposed is way too much considering the size of Edenfield. Thankyou.		-
960	Valerie	Pilkington	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposals for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. The bypass was originally built to take traffic away from the village but these proposals could result in an additional 500 cars using the roads and cause congestion and increased pollution. Also, the proximity of the proposed developments to the bypass could result in those residing there being exposed to unacceptable levels of pollution.		-
961	Audrey	Davis	-		Object	I strongly object to the proposed removal of green belt around Edenfield. There is precious little left in the valley as it is. The sheer scale of the proposal would dramatically alter the character of the village. The valley is in danger of becoming one large housing estate with little green space left. - If the green belt is removed and subsequently developed how on earth would the infrastructure cope? - The increase in traffic would not only cause severe congestion - Market Street, Bury Road and Bolton Road North struggle now at peak times - but also the increase in pollution would be detrimental to everybody's health. The 'bypass' is also severely congested every morning and evening with accidents occurring on a regular basis. - There are no Doctors or dentists, the 2 primary schools are already over subscribed, the bus service is inadequate, etc. etc... - There are brownfield areas suitable for development throughout the valley, including some in Edenfield - which should be utilised without the need for removal of green belt. -		-
963	Kenneth	Davis	-		Object	I object to the removal of green belt around Edenfield. - Edenfield would be no longer a village if the proposals are implemented. The scale would change it forever. - If it is removed, the potential to enable increased development of more than 50% of the existing housing would cause so many problems, not just for the existing residents of Edenfield, but to any future residents and vistors. The roads and services can barely cope now. - PLEASE CHANGE YOUR PLANS.		-
965	Joseph	Williams	-		Object	I strongly object to the proposed removal of green belt from around the village. - If all the green belt was developed Edenfield would no longer be a village but merely another huge housing estate with no character left. - I have lived here for over 60 years and seen it's loss of services already over the years. - There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with development on the scale proposed. -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
966	Kathleen	Hutchinson	-		Object	I believe the plan to release the Green Belt land around Edenfield for housing is completely disproportionate. It has taken 400 years for this village to reach 900 homes, but this plan is planning to add nearly 500 more in 10/15 years. - There is no infrastructure in the village to support a development of this scale, which would change the face and character of Edenfield forever. I also believe we should cherish our green spaces wherever possible, they are our green lungs. A development of this scale would drastically increase the pollution of the area to the detriment of us all, but also to people moving in and living so near the by-pass.		I urge you not to release green Bwlt land built to use brownfield sites to reach whatever housing targets the government sets.
967	Hannah	Lovick	-		Object	I object to the scale of the proposal. Traffic is horrendous enough without extra houses. And this volume of new housing would seriously alter the character and life of the village.		-
968	Andrew	Meeks	-		Object	I object to the large scale development proposed for Edenfield. This village cannot cater for such a huge number of additional residencies. The infrastructure is not designed for so many additional people, vehicles and demands on its schools and other facilities. Such a development would turn this village into a large town and would spoil its charm and tranquility.		-
969	Ryan	Lovick	-		Object	I object to this proposal due to the sheer scale of what is proposed. This would ruin the village and seriously compromise our standard of life.		-
970	Beth	MacDonald	-		Object	I believe that building 489 houses in Edenfield will ruin the lovely village and the atmosphere that it beholds. I think building these houses shall bring along other issues eg parking due to the already being difficulties regarding parking.		I object
971	Gary	Tattersall	-		Support	To remove the green belt from Edenfield is to remove an area of natural beauty. There are plenty of brown belt areas to develop throughout the valley which are more appropriate. - - Developer want to make the extra profits of executive housing so little will be achieved against the government s plan to build over 2500 houses in Rossendale. - - Regards - - Gary Tattersall		Do not take away the green belt land
977	Nikki	Pearson	-		Object	I object to the size, I moved here 20 years ago it's a small village, and it's character is such, this would completely change the character of the village by the size of the development. People here don't want that, it would ruin the whole character of the village		Please listen to residents, not land owners and developers, if this goes ahead, it would be a huge disruption

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
978	Claire	Jewell	-		Object	Scale of proposal for the village would radically alter the character of the village. No consideration for flooding appears to have been given did you see the water in December 2015? If the fields were houses where would the Council propose the water running off the hill will go? We currently have an electricity power cut on average every 3 months, to add this number of houses would impact on what is already currently unacceptable in 2017. Infra structure such as broadband does not appear to have been considered, currently unless a household is paying extra for fibre broadband, the speed is unacceptable and would make it impossible for anyone to work from home. For example we are paying for 100mb fibre but get 40mb. To increase demand on already stretch broadband resource would reduce this speed so even the fibre would become ineffective. - The impact of the volume of traffic that would be created by this scale of houses would clearly have a significant impact on the village.		see point 8
981	Graham	Jewell	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposed plans for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the villiage. - Traffic is an issue today, as is parking more houses would exasperate this. The current drains do not support the flood risks from rainwater off the hills. - Broadband is quite poor. Adding more houses would reduce speeds even further. - Public transport is infrequent meaning more cars and emissions, impacting local air quality - Edenfield suffers frequent power cuts. - Most of the proposed works are green belt. This should be protected and existing available brown belt locations prioritised - -		-
984	Russ	Chadwick	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield, which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
985	Jodi	Strange	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposal, which would radically change the character of the village and put a strain on resources.		-
986	Martin	Appleton	-		Object	I'm filling in this form due to the scale of the proposed development and how it will effect Edenfield. I cannot comprehend how the Government think there is the infrastructure in the local area to support the proposed number of houses and it will massively affect all the people currently living in the local area in regards to traffic, schools and amenities. - - I object completely to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of what is proposed is far too large and would ruin the character of the village and surrounding area as a whole.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
987	Catherine	Hignett	-		Object	I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to remove the aforementioned land out of the Green Belt. - Whilst understanding the need for additional housing both locally and nationally, this should not be to the detriment of existing communities. The proposal to increase the number of dwellings in Edenfield Village(currently just over 900) by 489 or by over 50 per cent, is unacceptable; this is much too large a scale of development, disproportionate in terms of the current size of the village and would frankly destroy the very appeal Edenfield has as a small community. It would no longer be a village but a sprawling urban mass. - It is vitally important to retain and protect Green Belt, not only for the character of the village but to support healthy living of the community and population, both near and far. - There are a number of brown field sites which should be used first, not only in the vicinity of Edenfield, for example the Mayfield Chicks site at Ewood Bridge, Rosebank Mill area near Stubbins, but across the whole valley including Bacup which would undoubtedly benefit from investment and development. Whilst developers may feel these sites are less attractive, I would expect the Council to support its residents in retaining and protecting the Green Belt and make these brown field sites more attractive to developers. -		Not at this time.
988	Victoria	Small	-		Object	I object to the large scale of this development, as it would totally change the character of Edenfield village & the surrounding areas. The infrastructure of the area is not designed to cope with a development of this size. Traffic congestion and pot holes are already a problem and with recent bus service cuts this will only get worse. Green belt land should be protected to conserve the beauty of the area which in turn attracts Tourism & business to Edenfield and Ramsbottom!		-
989	Shirley	wheeler	-		Object	I appreciate that the council needs to support more house building but I am concerned about the extent of the plans for Edenfield which essentially increase the size of the village by approx. 50%. The infrastructure is not in place to support this level of expansion. This doubling of the village will completely and adversely change the nature of the village. I understand from the document that this plan for Edenfield is the biggest area of development in the whole valley which is outrageous given the size of the valley.		Please reconsider and look at more alternatives

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
990	Jeffery	Hignett	-		Object	I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to remove the aforementioned land out of the Green Belt. - Whilst understanding the need for additional housing both locally and nationally, this should not be to the detriment of existing communities. - The proposal to increase the number of residences in Edenfield Village (currently just over 900) by 489, or by over 50 per cent, is unacceptable; this is much too large a scale of development, disproportionate in terms of the current size of the village and would undoubtedly destroy the very appeal Edenfield has as a small community. It would no longer be a village but a sprawling urban mass. - It is vitally important to retain and protect Green Belt, not only for the character of the village but for future generations to enjoy as well as supporting the health living of the community and population as a whole and both near and far. - There are a number of brown field sites which should be used first, not only in the vicinity of Edenfield, for example the Mayfield Chicks site at Ewood Bridge, Rosebank Mill area near Stubbins, but across the whole valley including Bacup which would undoubtedly benefit from investment, development and regeneration. - Whilst developers may feel these sites are less attractive, I would expect and now ask the Council to support residents in retaining and protecting the Green Belt; make the brown field sites more attractive to developers.		Not at this time.
991	Rebecca	Hignett	-		Object	I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposal to remove the aforementioned land out of the Green Belt. - I do understand the need to build additional housing both locally and nationally, however, this should not be to the detriment of existing communities. - I believe the proposal to increase the number of houses in Edenfield Village (currently just over 900) by 489, or by 50 per cent, is unacceptable. This is much too large a scale of development, disproportionate in terms of the current size of the village and would most certainly destroy the very appeal Edenfield has a small community. It would no longer be a village but a sprawling urban mass. - It is extremely important to retain and protect the Green Belt, not only for the character of the village but for future generations (whether they are resident or visiting) so that they too can enjoy and reap the benefits of Green Belt areas. Such areas are essential to support healthy living and benefit all communities. - There are a number of brown field sites which should be used first as well as the numerous empty houses that can be seen across the valley. Bacup is an area that would most definitely benefit from investment and regeneration. - If developers do not find these brown field sites attractive, I look to you, the Council, to address this. I also ask that you support the residents of Edenfield in protecting and retaining the Green Belt.		Not at this time.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
993	Ellie	Whitehead	-		Object	The sheer scale of this proposal is not acceptable. No thought has been given given to the impact on resources and local services. This would radically change the character of Edenfield village.		More thought should be given to the local services that are needed for an expansion of this size. - The infrastructure of the whole village would need to change. - Roads, schools, shops, jobs, medical provision etc. Totally unacceptable!
994	John	Handley	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village and put pressure on resources.		-
995	Natasha	Crompton	-		Object	Object		-
1004	Denise	Cirne	-		Object	500 new houses would surely generate another 1000 cars in a very small village causing chaos at peak times. You only have to look at Haslingden Road with the Moorlands site, not to mention Rawtenstall and the gridlock there. Are you proposing the same for Edenfield? - Are you also proposing new schools or just the extension of existing? I could go on about infrastructure but I would love to know what you are proposing.		No
1006	Ian	Mcglynn	-		Object	I feel that the plans if implemented would overwhelm Edenfield and totally change the character of the village and therefor I am opposed to them.		I do not have a computer and am grateful to the residents Association for enabling me to make these comments.
1008	William & Patricia	Hilditch	-		Object	We oppose the plans which we feel would change the character of the village.		We do not have a computer and are grateful to the Residents Association for helping us to make these comments
1009	Helen	Kelly	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which I feel would radically alter the character of village. These sites are green belt. Does this not stand for anything anymore ? As far as I can see this plan does not take into consideration the access needed to accommodate such a vast amount of housing. The volume of traffic through the village currently is quite high and heavy at various times of the day. This would multiply by vast amounts if this plan is accepted and passed. What this plan do to our village ? Totally ruin it.		-
1010	Ross & Nina	Atherton	-		Object	We were shocked to see what is included in the pland because this would totally change the character of our village and we oppose it.		We were not sure how to go about opposing the plans so we are very grateful to the Residents Association for helping us in this matter.
1012	Michelle	Green	-		Object	I am opposed to such large scale development in our village which I think would change it for the worse.		I do not have a computer and was unsure how to make my comments so I am grateful to the Residents Association for enebaling me to do so.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1013	Julian	Allpress	-		Object	We object to then shear scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		No
1015	Gerry	Dawson	-		Object	I believe that the scale of what the is in the plan is far too great and I oppose it wholeheartedly.		I do not have a computer and am grateful to the Residents Association for aiding me in making my comments.
1016	Dorothy	Lynn	-		Object	Potential number of houses is far too many for local facilities to cope with especially shops and roads.		-
1021	Stewart	Longworth	-		Object	<p>I strongly object to this proposed development in EDENFIELD; not only to the size and scale of this but also to its concept. Quite simply, this proposal will radically alter the village of Edenfield from its present size, to one of almost small dormitory town proportions. - I consider no thought has been incurred into the potential effects on volume of traffic, access from each of these proposed sites or indeed the effect on the 2 local schools, both of which are already at or near their annual potential maximum pupil intake.</p> <p>Letter received 09/10/2017: I am writing concerning the Council's Local Plan and particularly how the proposals will affect Edenfield. I am given to understand that the Council is proposing to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land from around the village of Edenfield from its current designated 'Greenbelt' title, so as to enable these pieces of land to be used for residential and perhaps other types of new building. The areas I am particularly concerned about are covered by Reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield • Land west of Market Street, Edenfield • Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield, and • Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield <p>Therefore, will you please note that I object to these proposals on the grounds that the area covered by these proposals is far too extensive, and if carried out would effectively ruin the current nature, size and indeed character of the village of Edenfield from its current form. Please acknowledge its safe receipt.</p>		This last 10 years or so I much regret to say that Rossendale Council has not done itself any favours in its handling of most matters concerning its residents. - Its policies appear to be dominated by the infighting between both the Conservative and Labour political groups who are represented on the Council. This has obviously had a stifling effect on its true role and potential aspirations. The officers appear to be mere puppets to the elected councillors - rather than the officers guiding and directing the councillors. - I regret having to be so negative but can only hope that at least with regard to this proposed development for Edenfield, that common sense prevails and despite the so called Government pressur, that Rossendale Council realises the huge mistake it will make if this is approved.
1022	David	Ingham	-		Object	i object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the charter of the village		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1024	annette	fobister	-		Object	I object to the size of this proposed development on the grounds that it would ruin the character of the village, the scale being far too large to be accommodated in such a confined village setting. - - There are already serious issues with the flow of traffic through the village with tail backs and congestion at busy times, already added to by the Rochdale road quarry traffic. There is also now no parking facilities in the village other than main road which is adding to congestion on market st, Rochdale road and Bolton road. - - The character of the village would be lost		Whilst more housing on a national scale is necessary, I feel it important to understand local impact issues and scale this proposed development down to reflect the infrastructure that exists within this village and that there is a saturation point, far exceeded by this proposal.
1027	sylvia	atkinson	-		Object	It is called a village because of its rural setting which will disappear if this proposal goes ahead. - - Getting in, out and through Edenfield is difficult already and would become a nightmare if all these houses were to be built, each with at least one car. - - The village cannot accommodate the extra facilities needed to furnish such development. - - Parking is non existent now and residents rely on using the main street to access the shops. If this development went ahead traffic would come to a standstill, shops would have to close and there would be a knock on effect on Rochdale road into Turn Village which is already taking extra traffic coming from the quarry.		Please consider this proposal carefully, the future of ours and other villages is under threat. - - We can accommodate some further development, but not on this scale
1030	Trevor	McPartland	-		Object	I object to the scale and site of the proposed development.		Please consider the increased amount of motor traffic and pollution this would bring to Edenfield and beyond.
1031	colin	williams	-		Object	I OBJECT TO THE SHEER SIZE OF THE PROPOSAL FOR A VILLAGE OF EDENFIELDS - SIZE WHICH WOULD RADICALLY CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE AND SURROUNDING AREA,		
1032	Antony	Drake	-		Object	Green belt was put in place to protect the land and all that uses it, including nature, to stop greedy developers and bent councilors from getting their pockets lined this is a disgrace Please go and pick on all the brown sites and all the redundant property's elsewhere in Rossendale/Lancashire - Once this is breached you might as well just build on all areas including SSSI (Sites of Specific scientific Importance)so there is no more green fields for all to enjoy. - Also there will be traffic issues the Village is congested at the moment to introduce another 495 Houses will be bedlam.		Green belt was put in place to protect the land and all that uses it, including nature, to stop greedy developers and bent councilors from getting their pockets lined this is a disgrace Please go and pick on all the brown sites and all the redundant property's elsewhere in Rossendale/Lancashire - Once this is breached you might as well just build on all areas including SSSI (Sites of Specific scientific Importance)so there is no more green fields for all to enjoy. - Also there will be traffic issues the Village is congested at the moment to introduce another 495 Houses will be bedlam.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1034	Helen	Iggulden	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. The schools are already full , there are no GP or dental services , access would cause severe traffic congestion on the main service road, with no room to widen it. The proposal suggests a more than 50% increase and threatens future "urban sprawl" towards Irwell vale and Rawtenstall, which Green Belts are meant to forestall.		Rossendale has a pilot Brownfield Site register which should be made publicly available to the residents of Edenfield to ascertain whether full use is being made of these sites for housing development to meet need, and whether Edenfield is being disproportionately targeted to maximise profit for developers rather than meet local housing needs for the local community.
1040	John	Rostron	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposal, which will radically alter the character of the village.		Rossendale Borough Council has already proved to me that it is inept as a planning authority; it fails to adequately consult, it is behest of local businesses and does not consider road safety, privacy, noise. etc.
1041	Denise	Rostron	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield, which will radically alter the character of the village.		-
1043	Sarah	Monaghan	-		Object	I do not object to houses being built in Edenfield as I understand that houses need to be built in Rossendale according to government plans, but why have so many houses been allocated to Edenfield and not other parts of Rossendale. I object to the sheer scale of houses being built and being built on greenbelt land. Market Street can't cope as it is with the amount of traffic that passes through Edenfield as residents double park, consequently traffic struggles to pass. Edenfield only has one primary school, which is full. There is no doctors, post office, petrol station, and there is only one shop. How will the sewers cope? There is no job opportunities in Rossendale. Also the proposed plans for these houses to be built alongside a busy bypass is dangerous. There will be an increase in accidents, air quality will reduce due to noxious fumes and tyre/road debris and consequently increase respiratory conditions like asthma; especially in children. There will also be an increase in noise pollution. - I was brought up in TunrVillage and have consequently chose to settle in Edenfield to bring up my own children as I love the area. I love the open space, green fields, being able to step out my front door and set off walking in the countryside, which are of educational and recreational use to my children. You are now planning to change all that. You plan to change the character of one of the few remaining true villages in Rossendale by building on greenbelt land which is there to provide the people of the village with good quality air, access to the countryside, and protect the unique character of the village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1044	David	Smith	-		Object	Building more houses on that scale with such a minor main road is completely crazy. There will be about 750 extra cars which the roads can't take. there will also be about an extra 750 children with no extra school places to take them in. Even the secondary schools are full. There are no doctors facilities and how will Blackburn and Bury hospitals cope with all the extra population increase in the area. The worst thing that happened to Rossendale was the motorway arriving in the 70's. It should have been left to develop like other small towns like Hebden Bridge, Todmorden, Haworth, etc. What did it bring - a shambles of a town that is Rawtenstall. This house building madness will only bring further problems. You can't even get a town centre developed correctly, so how can you be trusted with all this mass house building. It'll be another 30 years of madness by some idiot who doesn't have to live with the consequences. Rossendale will just become a part of Manchester like Bury and Ramsbottom, and dragging up the dregs from that area yet again, dragging us down to their level, like they have done since the 70's. You can't move around Bury town centre now, what do you think it will be like trying to get round the roundabout in Rawtenstall with thousands of extra cars, nothing is going to move at peak times. - You people must be living in another universe if you think all this is going to work.		-
1046	CAROL	JARY	-		Object	* There are still ample brown field sites in the north-west on which to re-develop for housing, instead of taking (what appears to be) the easy option of building on green field sites - * The amount of properties proposed would contribute to an increase in traffic through the village substantially; the narrow road through the village centre is already a bottle neck at peak times. Any access in conjunction with Market Street particularly would simply increase the traffic problems that already exist - * One of the reasons for proposing Edenfield was for its pleasant aspects; these would be eradicated with the removal of the green fields sites - * Local social infrastructure is generally poor - eg. no doctors or health facilities, full schools		-
1051	janet	brooks	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
1052	jean	brooks	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-
1054	stanley	brooks	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for edenfield which would radically alter the village -		-
1055	steven	brooks	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1059	Elizabeth	Bridge	-		Object	I object to the above mentioned land being removed from Green Belt and also to the scale of the development. - I believe the scale to be relevant because: - The character of Edenfield would be radically changed; - Traffic in The Village is already excessive. This would vastly increase and the roundabout access to and from Rochdale Road and Turn Village would prove a major hold up; - There is a lack of school places, few shops, very limited bus service, no doctor's surgery and very little parking. Therefore present facilities are minimal and could not take increased pressure on such a scale - In addition, the number of wildlife corridors would be affected. -		I think it more appropriate to use Brown Field sites available in Rossendale before considering the removal of land from Green Belt
1062	Kate	Hildred	-		Object	The bulk of our Finance is plowed into Bacup and Rawtenstall whilst the basic needs of other areas are neglected. Adding 50% more houses here may result in further neglect. 489 houses with 2 adults and 2 children in each is 978 adults and 978 children. - - Once built and Bacup has been transformed, will the council have any funds available to clean up the additional mess and rectify the addition damage that is caused. - - Once Built will there have to be more take-aways, a supermarket, a MacDonalds and their associated mess? - - How will the additional 978 children be accommodated in these schools? - - How will they safely get to the schools? - - How will the roads (particularly Market St) cope with the increase in cars? - Presumably a road from the large site will be required onto Market Street because Exchange Street alone would not suffice. - - We would then have to have lollypop ladies and traffic lights, reinstated bus service, larger play area, the list goes on. - - Will The council also look at the problem of collapsed culverts to ensure that the flooding through our gardens is not made worse? - - Edenfield is, for the most part, a village environment with a good number of residents who take pride in and do their very best to look after the area. As LCC/RBC have no regard or pride in Edenfield and other outer areas of Rossendale, I can only surmise that we would suffer greatly. - The whole character of the village will change and the infrastructure would not cope.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1063	Marc	Monaghan	-		Object	I do not object to the houses being built in Edenfield as I understand that houses need to be built in Rossendale according to government plans. However how come so many houses have been allocated to Edenfield and not other parts of Rossendale. I object to the sheer scale of houses being built and being built on greenbelt land. Market St can't cope as it is with the amount of traffic that passes through Edenfield as residents double park, consequently traffic struggles to get through. Edenfield only has one primary school which is full. There is no doctors, post office, petrol station, and there is only one shop. How will the sewers cope? There is no job opportunities in Rossendale. Also the proposed plans for these houses to be built along the bypass is dangerous. There will be an increase in accidents, air quality will reduce due to noxious fumes and tyre/road debris, consequently respiratory conditions like asthma will increase, like asthma in children. There will also be an increase in noise pollution. - I'm originally from Helmshore and moved to Edenfield with my wife who is from the area, and our children. You are planning to destroy the reason we moved to Edenfield. We enjoy living in the countryside and being surrounded by green open space and want our children to be able to enjoy it as they get older. By building so many houses in Edenfield you will change the character of one of the few remaining true villages in Rossendale. By building on greenbelt land your denying the villagers of good quality air, access to the countryside, and you are not protecting the unique character of the village.		-
1073	Richard	Brace	-		Object	Edenfield will be overwhelmed with the large number of new homes proposed under this plan. The village will be altered and present residents will experience an increase in numbers in the village.		Only to repeat my objections to this planned development
1074	Jacqui	Brace	-		Object	The village of Edenfield will be altered by the new proposals to the detriment of the area		The present plans require too much building
1075	Zac	Brace	-		Object	Any development of this size in Edenfield will alter the village for the worse		-
1076	Lesley	Barlow	-		Object	I object to the massive number of proposed houses to be built. The village will no longer be a village and will be congested.		-
1077	Robyn	Brace	-		Object	An introduction of a high number of residential homes in the village will change the character of the village forever. The high number of vehicles this will bring to the area will result in large queues throughout the area and grid lock. Local services will be unable to cope with the demand and existing residents will suffer the consequences as a result.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1078	Alexandra	Black	-		Object	<p>Whilst I am not opposed to some development in and around Edenfield, it is the scale of the planned development and the amount of greenbelt affected that concerns me. - Traffic - Market Street already struggles to deal with the volume of traffic and cannot accommodate 2-way traffic due to parked cars, particularly if large vehicles such as tractors or busses need to pass. The road becomes particularly congested by The Rostrons mini roundabout and outside the primary school. - Yellow lines on Market Street – most existing residents that live in the terraced properties on Market Street would have nowhere to park, as there is no off-road parking or side-streets they could use as an alternative. I also believe that yellow lines along Market Street would be damaging for local businesses as people would stop using their services if they couldn't park. - The area is not adequately serviced by local bus routes, trains or trams. There are no high schools within walking distance of the village. - The A56 is the main route into Manchester / motorway network from The Ribble Valley, Blackburn and Burnley. I believe the A56 is already operating at full capacity and would struggle to accommodate the volume of additional traffic the proposed plans would generate. Once the A56 becomes congested, or in the event of an accident/road-works, all traffic is diverted off the A56 through Edenfield and along Market Street, which brings the area to a standstill. - Schools - The local primary school has been extended in recent years and I cannot see how it could be extended further at its current site. The school was over-subscribed last year and has been for a number of years. There are no other primary schools in walking distance. The closest alternative primary schools were also over over-subscribed in recent years. The two local high schools, BRGS and Haslingden, are heavily over-subscribed, as are Alder Grange, All Saints and Woodhey. Local - Utilities - I believe many of the local utilities in Edenfield are already running at full capacity. - Greenbelt – we need to protect local greenbelt and consider brown field sites that local residents would encourage development of. Many people visit Edenfield and the surrounding area due to the wealth of walking and biking opportunities it offers; bringing money and outside investment into the area.</p> <p>Letter received 10/10/2017: I am writing with regards to the Council's Local Plan, specifically the proposed development of Edenfield and your plans to request to remove large amounts of land around the village from the greenbelt in order to build houses. Please find below a list of the areas I am particularly concerned about, covered by reference HS2.71. Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>PLEASE NOTE I HAVE ALSO OBJECTED ONLINE - THIS LETTER IS TO SUPPORT THE ONLINE OBJECTION</p> <p>Whilst I am not opposed to some development in and around Edenfield, it is the scale of the planned development and the amount of greenbelt affected that concerns me. I have outlined my primary concerns below:</p> <p>Traffic and Congestion on Market Street</p> <p>Market Street is currently the only road in and out of the village, and it is my understanding that access to the new homes would be via Market Street. The road already struggles to deal with the volume of traffic and cannot accommodate 2-way traffic due to parked cars, particularly if large vehicles such as tractors or busses need to pass. The road becomes particularly congested by The Rostrons mini roundabout and outside the primary school. The road outside the primary school is already hazardous particularly when children are starting/finishing school due to the fact cars approach from 4 different places.</p> <p>The suggestion of yellow lines on Market Street concerns me greatly - most existing residents that live in the terraced properties on Market Street would simply have nowhere to park, as there is no off-road parking or side-streets they could use as an alternative. I also believe that yellow lines along Market Street would be damaging for local businesses, as people would stop using their services if they couldn't park.</p> <p>The area is not adequately serviced by local bus routes - The Witchway service into Manchester was terminated a number of years ago, leaving only an intermittent local service. The area is not serviced by local trains or trams. There are no high schools within walking distance of the village.</p> <p>The A56 is the main route into Manchester / motorway network from The Ribble Valley, Blackburn and Burnley. I believe the A56 is already operating at full capacity and would struggle to accommodate the volume of additional traffic the proposed plans would generate. Furthermore once the A56 becomes congested, or in the event of an accident/road-works, all traffic is diverted off the A56 through Edenfield and along Market Street, which brings the area to a complete standstill.</p> <p>Schools & Public Services</p> <p>The local primary school has already been extended in recent years and I fail to see how it could be extended further at its current site. Even with the extension the school was over-subscribed last year and has been for a number of years. There are no other primary schools in walking distance. The closest alternative primary schools - Stubbins, Broadway and Helmshore - were also over subscribed in recent years. Forcing residents to consider schools further afield would compound the traffic problems even further.</p> <p>The two local high schools, BRGS and Haslingden, are heavily over-subscribed, as are those further afield such as Alder Grange, All Saints and Wood hey. Additional homes would place extra strain on already over-stretched public</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
					services. Local Utilities It is my understanding many of the local utilities (gas, electricity etc) in Edenfield are already running at full capacity, and could simply not cope with hundreds more homes. Greenbelt Finally I would like to raise my concerns with regards to developing on greenbelt. Whilst I appreciate the need to build new homes, I firmly believe we need to protect our greenbelt and consider brown field sites local residents would encourage development of. We should use the need to build homes as a way to help regenerate some of the areas across Rossendale that need investment, rather than simply where the most profit lies for landowners. Many people visit Edenfield and the surrounding area due to the wealth of walking and biking opportunities it offers; bringing money and outside investment into the area. I firmly believe that the over development of Edenfield would affect local businesses and local residents, but also people across Rossendale and beyond who currently enjoy what the area has to offer.			
1079	Sharon	Mullineau	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield . - It would ruin the whole character of our lovely village. - How would the village cope with such a large increase in people, traffic etc. - How would the schools and roads cope. -	-	
1082	Paul	Mounfield	-		Object	I am concerned that this plan will adversely affect the village feel as the scale of the development will swamp the existing village. We have four grandchildren growing up in the village and are concerned about the vast increase in the volume of traffic. Apparently there will be no increase in medical and dental facilities. This development has not been thought through and is not practical.	-	
1083	steven	bennett	-		Object	i OBJECT STRONGLY TO THIS PROPOSAL AS I FEEL THAT A DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SCALE WILL HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON THE VILLAGE AND PUT UNDUE PRESSURE ON ROADS AND LOCAL SERVICES. i ALSO THINK THAT THIS WOULD IMPACT NEGATIVELY ON THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE..	-	
1084	David	Wolstencroft	-		Object	The traffic on Bury Road Edenfield already makes life difficult for the residents so with hundreds more cars on the roads of the village this plan can only make matters much, much worse.		I do not have email and so am grateful to the Residents Association for enabling me to make my comments about the plan
1085	Alice	Wozencroft	-		Object	The traffic passing my door on the lower part of Bury Road is very heavy and this development would make matters much worse, so I am very much opposed to it.		I DO NOT HAVE EMAIL AND SO AM GRATEFUL TO THE rESIDENTS ASSOCIATION FOR ENABLING ME TO MAKE MY COMMENTS.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1086	Elizabeth	Mounfield	-		Object	- I am concerned that this plan will adversely affect the village feel as the scale of the development will swamp the existing village. We have four young grandchildren growing up in the village and are concerned about the vast increase in the volume of traffic and more parked cars will cause extra hazard. Apparently there will be no increase in medical and dental facilities. This development has not been thought through and is not practical.	-	
1087	Derrick	Lawson	-		Object	I am opposed to what the Council is proposing because it will change our village for the worse and bring hundreds of extra cars onto our streets.	-	
1088	Richard	Lester	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposals for Edenfield, which would seriously affect the character of the village and which require the village to bear a disproportionate amount of the new housing required in the Borough as a whole. - I object also to the cavalier approach in the proposals to the removal of land from the Green Belt and the insufficient regard for the Green Belt's essential characteristic of permanence and for the contribution of the sites in question to the purposes of the Green Belt. - Development on the scale proposed would test the capacity of the local classified road network.	-	
1089	Denis	Chadwick	-		Object	I object to the plan because of the huge change it will bring to the village, it will change out of all recognition.	-	
1090	Sheila	Chadwick	-		Object	I am opposed to the plan because of the drastic changes it will make to our village.	-	
1091	Steve	Davies	-		Object	The proposal is both unrealistic and would undermine the history and environment of what is currently a local village. - - As a life long resident in the village, and growing through the changes we have had, there has always been a culture of village life that has been maintained by residents respecting the value this brings. The attraction here would be removed by the cost and frustration that urban chaos would bring. - - The sheer volume of people, traffic, upheaval of construction of not only highway changes, unsightly buildings and removal of our heritage, but we would lose the standards and quality of life that we lived here for in the first place. - - The proposals are not to generate affordable housing due to population demands, but to generate more wealth for the few. There are several sites across the valley that are prime for development, but do not have the value that residence in the village bring, and would not take away the countryside and scenery we have. - - Allowing this proposal to be implemented with the requirements it would need such as new sewage systems local facilities traffic controls and general havoc for 10 years would not only be devastating to experience, but would "kill" the village all together and with it all the history and memories. - - - - -		Please do not pursue this plan out of greed, and lack of respect for others!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1092	Catherine	Hulme	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - - The amount of further traffic, school and supporting services for many more families will cause traffic chaos in Edenfield and surrounding areas. - - All this on top of the wind farm recently erected in Edenfield which has afflicted and blighted the lives of the local residents.		-
1094	Wayne	Hulston	-		Object	I am objecting on the grounds of the scale of the proposals, the loss of so much of our greenbelt would completely alter the aesthetics of the village. Also there would be major problems with infrastructure, schools, traffic and parking.		Completed at the request of Mr Hulston by Elizabeth Latham
1095	Ian & Lynda	Holt	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		No
1096	bohdan	kowalczuk	-		Object	Dear Sir/Madam, - - I strongly object to the councils plan to build such a huge amount of new houses on greenbelt land around our small village of Edenfield. - - This will have huge impact on the level of traffic coming to the area as well as the financial possibility of House prices going down. - - Greenbelt land is there for a reason and such a vast expanse of new houses will severely damage the character of our village. - - Kind Regards - - Bohdan - - - -		-
1097	Sandra	Hulston	-		Object	I am objecting because of the scale of the proposals and the loss of the greenbelt which would completely alter the character of the village. Also because of the problems that would be caused in terms of transport, traffic, parking and schools.		Completed at the request of Mrs Hulston by Elizabeth Latham
1098	susan	kowalczuk	-		Object	Dear Sir/Madam, - - I strongly object to the councils plan to build such a huge amount of new houses on greenbelt land around our small village of Edenfield. - - This will have huge impact on the level of traffic coming to the area as well as the financial possibility of House prices going down. - - Greenbelt land is there for a reason and such a vast expanse of new houses will severely damage the character of our village. - - Kind Regards - - Susan -		-
1101	stephen	bowater	-		Object	the council should not be selling green belt and this number of house's is not sustainable for a small village. Our infrastructure within the village can not cope with such a mass influx of people. - The pollution is all ready high .Building by a bypass is a health risk . The wildlife will be disturbed.		other sites should be investigated before green belt is lost.
1102	Michael	Sixsmith	-		Object	I troltally object to these planning proposals, this is a small village,with narrow roads,and to build 489 houses is dam right LUDICROUS, IT will take away the character of the village, will put stress on all the residents living here, put strain on the already under sized schools , would increase cars in the village more than double. Go and build your new village somewhere else		Although i understand there is a housing shortage, I dont believe Edenfield need 489 expensive houses building on greenbelt land, the sheer size of the plan is crazy
1104	Michaela	Coulson	-		Object	I Totally Object,		DONT BUILD THESE HOUSES.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1105	Karen	Farquhar	-		Object	<p>1. Scale of development would irrevocably alter the character of the village. -</p> <p>2. 489 additional houses would result in a large increase in noise and disturbance due to increased traffic; this has an adverse impact on the residential amenity. -</p> <p>3. The loss of view for many existing properties will have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of many properties, particularly those affected by the proposed developments on Blackburn Road and west of Moorland. -</p> <p>4. There is a lack of infrastructure and a lack of general amenities to support this number of potential additional residents. Significant additional investment would be required by the council to remediate this. -</p> <p>5. Inability to access the A56 Southbound at Stubbins will result in a greater volume of traffic through the village on narrow roads, increasing congestion and pollution. -</p> <p>6. The development will increase local traffic generally which will have an impact on highway safety. -</p> <p>7. Any loss of on-street parking as a result of measures taken to alleviate traffic congestion will mean the loss of a valuable residential amenity. -</p> <p>8. There is no frequent direct public transport link between Edenfield and Manchester. There is no public transport through the village after 8pm. This means new residents would need to utilise cars, further supporting my objections 5, 6, and 7. Significant financial subsidies by the Council to bus companies would be required to satisfactorily provide such public transport services to adequate levels. -</p> <p>9. Recent years have shown flooding is a problem on the A56 / Edenfield bypass and surrounding areas. This must be considered in the flood assessments and will affect any new development in that area. -</p> <p>10. Open vistas would be severely impacted by mass development. This applies especially to the village boundary at "Fingerpost", Blackburn Road.</p>	-	-
1110	Julie	Bailey	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		There aren't enough services available to accommodate the amount of houses that you propose to build.
1111	James	Yates	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1113	Greta	Wood			Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield, this would radically change the character of the village. - The time scale that would be involved is totally unacceptable, the disruption to the village during such a length of time would be dangerous, add far too much congestion, the pollution, dirt and noise would impact and could seriously affect the health of many people, especially those who have existing conditions such as asthma. - the infrastructure of the village would not sustain the amount of people of this excessive amount of new houses. the schools are already over subscribed as are the doctors and dentists. - Edenfield is a desirable village to live, it is close to the motorway network. However, the village can barely cope with the sheer volume of traffic that passes through it and this is impounded by the parking. The motorway and bypass can barely cope with the amount of traffic on it now and this also has an impact on the route to get to the motorway and queuing in the rush hour traffic is the norm already. This would get far worse and the desirable village would be no longer! This adds to the safety of the village residents and the school children going to school. - It appears there is very little other building going to be happening in the rest of Rossendale and Edenfield is getting the lions share. It would make far much more sense to build in other parts of the valley and such a scale of building would then be absorbed without the impact it would have on one particular place. - Greenbelt is there for a reason, to protect our land, there is plenty of brown belt that should and could be used before destroying the beauty of our countryside. Once the greenbelt is gone it has gone forever. There is no logic on ruining our greenbelt when there are other areas that can be used.		-
1114	Kathleen	mawdsley			Object	We object to sheer scale of what is proposed for edenfield which would radically alter character of village. - -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1117	Shona	Campbell			Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposed building of houses in Edenfield that would radically change the character of the village. Edenfield is a desirable place to live, this will not be so if the proposed amount of houses are built here. The time scale is totally unacceptable because of the disruption, pollution, safety, noise this would cause for the residents. - - Edenfield already has too many parked cars, many parking in illegal places making it very dangerous for other road users and pedestrians, this is impacted by the amount of traffic through the village. the amount of traffic that would result with such a grand scale development during and after building would bring the village to gridlock, which it is when there is something on the bypass/M66 causing cars to come through the village, which is more often than not. - - Our doctors and dentists in Rawtenstall and Ramsbottom are already full as are our schools oversubscribed. If the rest of Rossendale were to have their fair share of new builds the impact and volume would be absorbed. Bacup and Whitworth are also within easy access of the Motorway network as are Haslingden, Helmshore and Waterfoot. - - Before Greenbelt is lost forever should Brownbelt not be used for building upon? Should it not be People before profit not the other way round? - - This plan is not sustainable.		
1119	Chris	Ross	-		Object	I have been a resident of Edenfield for over 20 years. - I realise that you are obliged to find sites to enable the fulfilment of the requirement for housing numbers in the Borough, and that a majority of people would object to any proposals "in my back yard" , but the impact upon the village of Edenfield would be catastrophic, and would change this place beyond recognition. - To impose a 50% increase in the existing housing numbers with all that entails in respect of the provision of infrastructure, schools etc , which would have to be funded by the Borough, together with the loss of more Greenbelt land, would be something I could not have envisaged when settling here in 1995. - Your proposals also reflect the greed of the previous landowners, who were only too willing to sell their assets to property developers. - I am sure that my feeble objection will have no impact whatsoever upon the outcome of this matter, but I am sure also, that I reflect the feelings of the majority of people here who's lives will be changed forever. -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1120	David	Clements	-	Edenfield (HS2.71) plus Helmshore	Object	<p>I wish to object to the application as presented in the Local Plan for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Significantly increased Danger of Flooding: We were flooded in Meadow Park, Irwell Vale on Boxing Day 2015 when nearly 3 feet of water entered our Bungalow. This was the result of ground and surface water from surrounding areas, Edenfield and Helmshore, not being able to get away because of the high levels of the Rivers Ogden and Irwell flowing through the Village. - Many developments in recent years in the higher reaches of the River Irwell and River Ogden, particularly the River Ogden in Helmshore, have exacerbated this situation. Very little has happened in the area in the past 2 years since the Floods to resolve potential flooding following heavy rainfall. With the proposed massive increase in housing in Edenfield, where water flows down the hills and through the porous railway embankment and into the bottom of the valley, plus more developments in Helmshore, and the resultant effects that brings, it is imperative that all new developments within the Rossendale Valley ensure that measures are taken to ensure that land and properties downstream do not suffer from inadequate removal of ground and surface water that these developments automatically bring; plus of course the additional pressure on the sewerage systems which are inter linked. Practical, robust and well maintained drainage systems need to be developed to ensure all are safe from flooding within the Valley. - - Edenfield (HS2.71): The local infrastructure around Edenfield in terms of Roads, Doctors, Dentists, Schools etc is currently totally inadequate and therefore for a massive expansion in housing as currently proposed will mean that existing and new residents will not have the support services that are required. - - Helmshore has similar infrastructure problems and Schools in the area already have classes that are full. - - Increase in Traffic: We understand a number of key junctions within the Valley are being reviewed. This is far too simplistic. - We currently travel through Edenfield on a regular basis at varying times of the day and it is currently very difficult because of the parking and the narrowing of the road at either end of the Village to drive through without any disruption. With the current very significant expansion in housing being proposed in Edenfield this will make a bad situation intolerable. - Helmshore also has traffic flow problems and the “mini roundabout junction” at the crossroads of Helmshore Road and Broadway is already very dangerous. - Within the Valley currently if ever there are Roadworks or an Accident the consequential knock-on effects and delays on the A56 / M66 and surrounding ‘alternative’ roads in Edenfield, Haslingden, Rawtenstall etc are significant, with the resultant ‘Gridlock’. Similarly within other areas of the Rossendale Valley such as Bacup, Waterfoot, Crawshawbooth etc there are significant delays on all roads, particularly at busy times. To increase the housing stock within Rossendale as proposed, will just exacerbate an already very difficult situation. - - Public Transport / Parking: While those travelling are encouraged to use Public 		All included under Section 8.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Transport the current services available fall well short of what is required. In addition currently there is far too little parking facilities to encourage those who travel out of the area to use Public Transport services as either part or the whole of their journey. - - Air Pollution: Currently with existing road problems there is too much slow moving and stationary traffic. With a significant increase in housing and hence the population as proposed, and the resultant increase in traffic problems, the Air Quality is going diminish even further with even more slow moving and stationary traffic, making a bad situation even worse. - - Doctors: There are already inadequate resources in the area and it is currently very difficult to get a GP appointment when required. With significant increases in the population and requirement for these services both existing and new residents will suffer even more. - - Dentists: For many years there has been a shortage of NHS Dentists in the area with problems trying to recruit more, so that many residents have already been forced to seek 'Private Services'. If given there are these problems with the current population in the area, for which a solution has not been found over many years, what is going to happen with significant increases in the population? - - Schools: A number of expansions to existing Schools has taken place in recent years particularly in the Edenfield area in order to respond to increasing demand for places, with unfortunately the consequential loss of some previously existing facilities for the Children. Massive increases in development in the area will mean these resources, currently struggling, will not be able to cope with these proposed increasing numbers. - - Green Belt / Conservation Areas: The Local Plan proposes changes to both the Green Belt and Conservation Areas: It is very important that these areas which were set up to protect and benefit local communities and residents are maintained and are not altered in order to allow further housing developments. - - - David Clements - Meadow Park, - Irwell Vale.</p>		
1121	NICOLA	ROSS	-		Object	I do not object to their being more housing in Edenfield but not on this scale. a 50% increase to existing housing numbers is excessive and to lose so much of our Greenbelt land is totally unacceptable.	-	
1123	Peter	Daggett	Na		Object	I have great concerns with this development. Due to the enormity of this plan. - Removing green belt land for this amount of homes and the developing of new infrastructure To accommodate them, will radically change the character of edenfield village.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1124	Pauline	Clements	-	Edenfield (HS2.71) and Helmshore	Object	<p>I wish to object to the application as presented in the Local Plan for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly increased Danger of Flooding: We were flooded in Meadow Park, Irwell Vale on Boxing Day 2015 when nearly 3 feet of water entered our Bungalow. This was the result of ground and surface water from surrounding areas, Edenfield and Helmshore, not being able to get away because of the high levels of the Rivers Ogden and Irwell flowing through the Village. - Many developments in recent years in the higher reaches of the River Irwell and River Ogden, particularly the River Ogden in Helmshore, have exacerbated this situation. Very little has happened in the area in the past 2 years since the Floods to resolve potential flooding following heavy rainfall. With the proposed massive increase in housing in Edenfield, where water flows down the hills and through the porous railway embankment and into the bottom of the valley, plus more developments in Helmshore, and the resultant effects that brings, it is imperative that all new developments within the Rossendale Valley ensure that measures are taken to ensure that land and properties downstream do not suffer from inadequate removal of ground and surface water that these developments automatically bring; plus of course the additional pressure on the sewerage systems which are inter linked. Practical, robust and well maintained drainage systems need to be developed to ensure all are safe from flooding within the Valley. - Edenfield (HS2.71): The local infrastructure around Edenfield in terms of Roads, Doctors, Dentists, Schools etc is currently totally inadequate and therefore for a massive expansion in housing as currently proposed will mean that existing and new residents will not have the support services that are required. - Helmshore has similar infrastructure problems and Schools in the area already have classes that are full. - Increase in Traffic: We understand a number of key junctions within the Valley are being reviewed. This is far too simplistic. We currently travel through Edenfield on a regular basis at varying times of the day and it is currently very difficult because of the parking and the narrowing of the road at either end of the Village to drive through without any disruption. With the current very significant expansion in housing being proposed in Edenfield this will make a bad situation intolerable. - Helmshore also has traffic flow problems and the “mini roundabout junction” at the crossroads of Helmshore Road and Broadway is already very dangerous. - Within the Valley currently if ever there are Roadworks or an Accident the consequential knock-on effects and delays on the A56 / M66 and surrounding ‘alternative’ roads in Edenfield, Haslingden, Rawtenstall etc are significant, with the resultant ‘Gridlock’. Similarly within other areas of the Rossendale Valley such as Bacup, Waterfoot, Crawshawbooth etc there are significant delays on all roads, particularly at busy times. To increase the housing stock within Rossendale as proposed, will just exacerbate an already very difficult situation. - Public Transport / Parking: While those travelling are encouraged to use Public 		All comments incorporated under section 8.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						Transport the current services available fall well short of what is required. In addition currently there is far too little parking facilities to encourage those who travel out of the area to use Public Transport services as either part or the whole of their journey. - - Air Pollution: Currently with existing road problems there is too much slow moving and stationary traffic. With a significant increase in housing and hence the population as proposed, and the resultant increase in traffic problems, the Air Quality is going diminish even further with even more slow moving and stationary traffic, making a bad situation even worse. - - Doctors: There are already inadequate resources in the area and it is currently very difficult to get a GP appointment when required. With significant increases in the population and requirement for these services both existing and new residents will suffer even more. - - Dentists: For many years there has been a shortage of NHS Dentists in the area with problems trying to recruit more, so that many residents have already been forced to seek 'Private Services'. If given there are these problems with the current population in the area, for which a solution has not been found over many years, what is going to happen with significant increases in the population? - - Schools: A number of expansions to existing Schools has taken place in recent years particularly in the Edenfield area in order to respond to increasing demand for places, with unfortunately the consequential loss of some previously existing facilities for the Children. Massive increases in development in the area will mean these resources, currently struggling, will not be able to cope with these proposed increasing numbers. - - Green Belt / Conservation Areas: The Local Plan proposes changes to both the Green Belt and Conservation Areas: It is very important that these areas which were set up to protect and benefit local communities and residents are maintained and are not altered in order to allow further housing developments. - - -		
1125	Marylyn	McKell	-		Object	I am particularly concerned about school places in the village if this plan is implemented. The two schools in the village are, I understand full now, so where will perhaps up to 700 or 800 new children go, two more new schools? Also the traffic, the plan would generate hundreds more cars on local roads, is there sufficient capacity, I doubt it.		I am not very good with computers so I am grateful to the Residents Association for enabling me to make these comments.
1126	Milan	Puhar	-		Object	Your proposals would make Edenfield look like a Concentration Camp minus barbed wire and search lights.		-
1129	ALAN	DUCKWORTH	-	THE DESTRUCTION OF EDENFIELD	Object	NO DOCTORS SURGERY AND NO PLANS.I HAVE LIVED HERE FOR OVER 40 YEARS AND WAS TOLD YEARS AGO INFRASTRUCTURE WAS EXHAUSTED WITH EVEN THE SEWERS FULL NOW YOU WANT DOUBLE THE HOUSES BY BUILDING ON GREENBELT LAND DO NOT PRETEND THAT THIS WILL BE SOCIAL HOUSING EITHER THERE IS PLENTY OF BROWNBELT LAND THROUHOUGHT THE BOROUGH .		COMMON SENSE ,PLEASE TRY AND USE IT

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1130	Janet	Smith	-		Object	I am a resident of the village and strongly object to the scale of this proposal which I believe will have a number of adverse affects. Not only will it change the character of the village and overwhelm it, but traffic congestion will become worse affecting air quality and increase the risk of accidents. There will be a knock on effect on traffic congestion through Ramsbottom at peak times which is already bad. - - I also do not feel that there is sufficient infrastructure to support such a huge increase such as schools, post office, health services, and bus services. - - This is a greenbelt site used for recreation, exercise and relaxation purposes and provides an area of beauty, rest and relaxation not only for villagers themselves but also visitors to the area. The lovely views from the surrounding hills would be diminished.		-
1131	Victoria	Smith	-		Object	I was a resident of the village for a number of years. My mother and brother still live there. I live locally and visit regularly. I was very shocked to learn of this proposal and after discussing this with my mother we share the same concerns as follows: - - I strongly object to the scale of this proposal which I believe will have a number of adverse affects. Not only will it change the character of the village and overwhelm it, but traffic congestion will become worse affecting air quality and increase the risk of accidents. There will be a knock on effect on traffic congestion through Ramsbottom at peak times which is already bad. - - I also do not feel that there is sufficient infrastructure to support such a huge increase such as schools, post office, health services, and bus services. - - This is a greenbelt site used for recreation, exercise and relaxation purposes and provides an area of beauty, rest and relaxation not only for villagers themselves but also visitors to the area. The lovely views from the surrounding hills would be diminished. -		-
1132	Samuel	Smith	-		Object	I am a resident of the village and object along with my family to the scale of this proposal which I believe will have a number of adverse affects. Not only will it change the character of the village and overwhelm it, but traffic congestion will become worse affecting air quality and increase the risk of accidents. There will be a knock on effect on traffic congestion through Ramsbottom at peak times which is already bad. - - I also do not feel that there is sufficient infrastructure to support such a huge increase such as schools, post office, health services, and bus services. - - This is a greenbelt site used for recreation, exercise and relaxation purposes and provides an area of beauty, rest and relaxation not only for villagers themselves but also visitors to the area. The lovely views from the surrounding hills would be diminished. -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1133	Timothy	Ashworth	-		Object	I am a regular visitor to Edenfield as I have family who live there. Having been made aware of the development proposal for village and having discussed it with my family I share concerns as follows: - I strongly object to the scale of this proposal which I believe will have a number of adverse affects. Not only will it change the character of the village and overwhelm it, but traffic congestion will become worse affecting air quality and increase the risk of accidents. There will be a knock on effect on traffic congestion through Ramsbottom at peak times which is already bad. - I also do not feel that there is sufficient infrastructure to support such a huge increase such as schools, post office, health services, and bus services. - This is a greenbelt site used for recreation, exercise and relaxation purposes and provides an area of beauty, rest and relaxation not only for villagers themselves but also visitors to the area. The lovely views from the surrounding hills would be diminished. -		-
1135	Jennifer	Ashworth	-		Object	This is a huge miscalculation surely of houses proposed!! This would ruin the whole heritage of our village, our tradition, and the neighborhood. We are not in a position to build 50 more house let alone that amount!!! This is due to existing parking, amenities etc, I hugely object. Itll be a very sad day if this happens, a very sad day.		-
1137	Sarah	Hunt	-		Object	I object to the proposal as it is much too large a scale for our village the area simply could not cope the facilities are not there we only have two schools which are both full no doctors surgery or dentist and the roads are already at full capacity it would completely destroy the character of our village which is a beautiful place to raise a family.		No
1138	Darren	Done	-		Object	It's to large a scale for the area		No
1147	Angela	Fisher	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposed for Edenfield which would significantly alter the character of the village.		-
1148	Heather	Murphy	-		Object	I do not wish this green belt of land to be taken for housing.		-
1150	Abbie	Knowles	-		Object	I have concerns regarding the proposal in relation to the impact it will ultimately have on the village, including its character, increased traffic, and impact on local amenities (especially schools).		As a resident living in the village I strongly object.
1151	Martin	Knowles	-		Object	I object as it will radically change the character of the village		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1155	Susan	Openshaw	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		Notwithstanding the fact that the scale of the proposals are disproportionate to the current village environment the environmental impact, the lack of additional essential resources to support such an increased population in the area, schooling, medical facilities etc should also be taken into account. - - The current entry and exit routes into the village are already frequently congested and with heavy quarry and wind farm traffic which the road structure cannot sustain frequent repairs are needed. This situation will substantially worsen with a 50% addition to the housing stock in the area. - - The narrow roadway through the village with roadside residential parking a necessity due the existing cottage style terraced properties (the vast majority without any parking facilities) creates many difficulties for traffic currently and would be compounded with the addition of the proposed number of houses. This would create an increased traffic and pollution issue and a safety risk. - - Existing shops in the village already suffer as lack of the ability to attract passing traffic who cannot park and many have been lost to the village over the years. The risk to such businesses as currently remain should not be disregarded. - - The precise need for additional housing needs to be taken into account with regard to the proposed locations e.g. accessibility, proximity to shops, work and services. The relevance of any housing stock likely or proposed to

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
								<p>be built needs to be seriously considered vis a vis the needs of the Rossendale Borough population as many current houses within the village have remained for sale on the market for some considerable time indicating that this is not necessarily an area in which local people either want to, or can afford to, live and the demand within the Edenfield area for this number of additional houses should be seriously called into question</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1156	Jordan	Openshaw	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village		Notwithstanding the fact that the scale of the proposals are disproportionate to the current village environment the environmental impact, the lack of additional essential resources to support such an increased population in the area, schooling, medical facilities etc should also be taken into account. The current entry and exit routes into the village are already frequently congested and with heavy quarry and wind farm traffic which the road structure cannot sustain frequent repairs are needed. This situation will substantially worsen with a 50% addition to the housing stock in the area. The narrow roadway through the village with roadside residential parking a necessity due the existing cottage style terraced properties (the vast majority without any parking facilities) creates many difficulties for traffic currently and would be compounded with the addition of the proposed number of houses. This would create an increased traffic and pollution issue and a safety risk. Existing shops in the village already suffer as lack of the ability to attract passing traffic who cannot park and many have been lost to the village over the years. The risk to such businesses as currently remain should not be disregarded. The precise need for additional housing needs to be taken into account with regard to the proposed locations e.g. accessibility, proximity to shops, work and services. The relevance of any housing stock likely or proposed to

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
								be built needs to be seriously considered vis a vis the needs of the Rossendale Borough population as many current houses within the village have remained for sale on the market for some considerable time indicating that this is not necessarily an area in which local people either want to, or can afford to, live and the demand within the Edenfield area for this number of additional houses should be seriously called into question
1159	Doris	Springhall			Object	The increase in housing proposed would have a cataclysmic effect on village and residents of Edenfield. Its scale is not proportionate to good town planning which should be measured and have a beneficial effect. The plan should be evolutionary rather than dramatic which a 50% increase in domestic dwellings would be.		The plan needs a radical taking into account how it affects the character of the village and impinges on current residents.
1161	Angela	Welsh	-		Object	I am contributing to this consultation on the Councils Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that the proposal is for the Council to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt to allow it be built upon. Having considered the proposals set out in the plan my objection to them is based upon their scale which is simply too large. If carried out the character of the village would be ruined beyond recognition.		-
1163	Amelia Frances	Welsh	-		Object	I am submitting my objection to the Local Plan based upon the proposed scale of the land identified for development and building around Edenfield. The proposed removal of such a huge amount of the greenbelt would alter the villages character and put too much strain on the road (and other) local infrastructure.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1164	gerard	Fisher	-		Object	I am not against development in Edenfield, I believe a responsible increase in housing could be a good thing. However a potential increase of 489 houses in a village of only 900 houses is irresponsible and would change the character and quality of life in the village for the worse. To increase the village size by 50% would mean a new school would have to be built to support the 2 already oversubscribed and small schools in the village. New developments of this size would bring over 900 extra cars into the village where parking is already a problem due to the old housing stock which does not have off road parking. Also new developments are built with profit first, meaning they also have little space given over to parking, driving round any new development will show how cramped and tightly packed the houses are. In summary I don't think Edenfield can cope with this many new houses and it would change the village irreparably for the worse		No
1165	Wendy	Philbin	-		Object	I object because I feel that the infrastructure of the village could not cope with such a large number of houses over such a relatively short period.		I am very grateful to the Residents Association for helping me make my comments as I am intensely busy at the moment with some private business.
1167	Bob	Saggerson	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is planned, which I feel will overwhelm the infrastructure of the village, making life for existing residents much worse.		No
1168	Tim	Reid	-		Object	I object to the scale of what the Council is proposing. in my view if implemented this would completely change the village for the worse.		-
1169	Michael	Trofimczuk	-		Object	There is currently too much traffic especially heavy vehicles servicing Scout Moor Quarry. Releasing this land from Green Belt will only add to the almost intolerable situation.		-
1170	Micheala	Burton	-		Object	Scale of what the council is proposing in which i object. Which in my view would compleatly change the carator ofthe village		-
1176	Diana	Brooks	-		Object	Traffic density in Edenfield has increased relentlessly in recent years and it is hard to believe that the roads or the residents could bear the strains brought on by increasing the size of the village by over fifty percent. Schools, health care and much other infrastructure is lacking for plans of this magnitude.		-
1180	Joanne	Lovick	-		Object	I object due to the sheer scale of the proposals as Edenfield would change dramatically and would not have the same village character as a result		No
1183	Annabel May	Welsh	-		Object	I am wishing to participate in this online consultation with regard to the Councils Local Plan, specifically relating to the proposals set out relating to Edenfield. - - I am particularly concerned with regard to the greenbelt land identified in the plan to be built upon. The scale of the proposed plans goes too far in my opinion and would have a detrimental affect on the character of Edenfield village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1186	Len	Hawarth	-		Object	I wish to object to the removal of the green belt land for the construction of so many dwellings. - There are brown sites that could be utilised first and the environment will be very effected with so many more vehicles we also do not have the facilities such as schools employment opportunities or other things - We have more environmentally possibilities of flooding due to wind farms this could make matters even worse. -	-	
1187	Anne	Partington	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village	-	
1188	VALERIE	CARROLL	-		Object	THE PROPOSED BUILDING OF 489 HOUSES WITHIN EDENFIELD IS RIDICULOUS, THERE IS NOT THE SCHOOL CAPASITY FOR SO MANY HOUSES ALSO THE TRAFFIC IS ALREADY OVER LOADED AT CERTAIN TIMES OF THE DAY. THE VILLAGE BECOMES A TRAFFIC JAM WHEN AN ACCIDENT OR WHEN THE BYPASS IS CLOSED NOW , SO IF MORE RESIDENTIAL TRAFFIC IS HERE THEN WE WILL BECOME A REAL DANGER TO ALL THE PUBLIC TRAVELLING THROUGH AND LIVING HERE. MORE HOUSES MEANS MORE POLLUTION AND MORE WASTE, AND A GREATER RISK TO OUR SAFETY. (MORE CRIME) WE DON'T HAVE THE POLICEING CLOSE ENOUGH ALREADY . NO, NO, NO, NO, NO MORE HOUSES KEEP OUR VILLAGE A VILLAGE AND NOT A TOWN!!!!	-	
1191	Suzanne	Crompton	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village	-	
1193	Robert	Lord	-		Object	Although I and my family live in Helmshore we regularly visit Edenfield to meet with parents, my sister and nieces and nephews. My parents also regularly come to Helmshore to collect our two children from school. We then have to collect them from Edenfield early evening. The traffic congestion particularly at school out time and the evening rush hour is bad now but would become impossible if over 400 houses were to be built in Edenfield resulting in hundreds more schoolchildren coming out of school and up to a 1,000 more cars on the roads. - Also we love visiting Edenfield because of it's beautiful green spaces compared to our now built up Helmshore. It would be a great shame to lose this green belt	-	
1194	Elizabeth	Dalby	-		Object	I am objecting to the number of properties you are considering building. This would not only radically change the size/look of our village but what about the required schools, doctors, dentists, parking etc. These are all already an issue.	-	
1195	Philip	Dalby	-		Object	I am objecting to the total number of properties you propose to build. This is meant to be a village and no thought seems to have been made in respect of our already over subscribed schools, doctors, dentists, parking etc. These are all already an issue of concern.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1196	Jonathan	Dalby	-		Object	I am objecting to the proposed new build. Our 'village' would be no longer a 'quaint village' but just an extension of Ramsbottom/Stubbins. No thought seems to have been given to the increased number of school places that would be required, doctors, dentists, parking etc. These are all already an issue.		-
1197	Brian	Langrish	-		Object	The proposed developments and change of land usage would cause an unacceptable change of character to Edenfield..The sheer scale of the proposals would have a grossly detrimental effect and is out of proportion. The parking and traffic in the village is already reaching unacceptable levels and the road infrastructure would not support the proposed increase in population and the associated increase in vehicular traffic.		-
1198	Matthew	Dalby	-		Object	I wish to object. There will be no such thing as a village in a few years time if such numbers of new homes are built on our fields. We are meant to be 'a village' NOT 'a town'.		-
1205	Andy	Darcy	-		Object	I object to scale of what is planned and because it will change the village so much and in particular I am concerned about the volume of traffic which will be generated onto the viage's already crowded roads. -		I am exceptionally busy at the moment and am grateful to the Residents Association for enabling me to make my comments in time.
1207	Simon	Hill	-		Object	This scale of development is not appropriate or necessary in Edenfield. The village would be totally changed, character would be lost. There is not the infrastructure to cope with this volume of new properties. Green belt was created for a reason. These reasons are just as valid today and should be respected.		These plans are to make up numbers required by central government. They are not relevant to the needs of Edenfield or Rossendale.
1209	Ben	Hope	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for our village which would alter it's character frankly beyond recognition.		-
1210	Tim	Hope	T S Hope & Co Chartered Accountants		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of he village.		-
1211	Christian	Avery	-		Object	I am objecting to the sheer scale of what is proposed for the Edenfield Village. It would no longer be a village with another 489 houses built. The impact this would have on the roads, local nurseries, schools, dentist's & health centre's. We moved to Edenfield 12 months ago as it is a relatively quiet village, this wouldn't be the case.		Please re-consider these plans.
1214	Nicola	Foster	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1215	Elizabeth	Murray	-		Object	I feel that building such a large number of houses within edenfield would negatively affect the village. It has no infrastructure to support such an influx of people, the local schools are overstretched, there are no doctors or dentist and those in ramsbottom and rawtenstall unable to take on more people. It will endanger the children of the village by increasing the vehicles using the already crowded roads.		-
1216	Susan	Crook	-		Object	I object to the scale of the proposal which would radically alter the character of the village of Edenfield - The traffic would be a major problem, it is already gridlocked at rush hour on the M66 and traffic routes are challenging through the small village. Parking would also be impossible particularly for residents outside their property. The infrastructure which is in place could not cope with the additional population particularly schools and health services. Whilst I appreciate the need for development and housing although will it be really "affordable" the scale is too great for such a small village		As above
1217	Ann	Durie	-		Object	I object to these proposals on the grounds that the sheer scale of the plans is too large when account is taken of the current size of Edenfield, and would radically alter the character, not only of the village but of the surrounding area.		-
1219	Simon	Paintin	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed. This would change the fabric and character of the whole village. The resources are not there to support this volume of new properties and residents. Schools are already stretched and roads too busy. - -		-
1220	Nigel	Stacey	-		Object	I object to these proposals on the grounds that the sheer scale of the plans is too large when account is taken of the current size of Edenfield, and would radically alter the character, not only of the village but of the surrounding area.		-
1221	Barbara	Fisher	-		Object	I object to the large scale of the Proposals. The number of new homes seems excessive for the size of our village. The character of Edenfield would be fundamentally altered. - It seems unfair that Edenfield is being singled out as the main development area for Rossendale, and it would be better if the development was shared out in a more even way. - The extra vehicles would be problematic as parking etc. is already at a premium and extra hundreds of cars coming and going particularly at rush hours would not be desirable. - Local amenities are also fully stretched now, a new estate on the scale planned could probably fill either of the existing primary schools twice over. Existing schools are already full. - There is no doctor or dentist in the village and local doctors in surrounding areas are already fully subscribed.		-
1225	Judith	Turner	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which could radically alter the character of my village. We have only two small primary schools and no provision for doctors surgery. No post office and roads that are already busy.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1226	Craig	Duxbury	-		Object	Edenfield simply could not cope with the influx of traffic, the only two schools are already over subscribed and other public services are stretched to breaking point.	-	
1227	lisa	Mounfield	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically change the character of the village.	-	
1229	Mark	Mounfield	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.	-	
1230	Xanthe	Langrish	-		Object	I object to the proposed removal of green belt land and building of a disproportionate number of houses this will destroy the character of Edenfield. Place a strane of existing infrastructure and make it a less desirable place to live.	-	
1231	Isabella Elizabeth	Lpftouse	-		Object	I object to the plan because of the drastic effect it would have on the character of the village.		I am very grateful to the Residents Association for enabling me to make my comments online.
1234	Anya	Mounfield	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.	-	
1235	Natasha	Bardney	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		A ruin to the local village and the reason e moved here.
1237	Andrew	Willenbrook	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.	-	
1238	Earnest Joseph	Lofthouse	-		Object	I object to the plan because of the drastic effect it would have on the character of the village.		I am very grateful to the Residents Association for enabling me to make my comments online.
1239	Neil	Binns	-		Object	I object to the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield for the following reasons: - - It would radically alter the character of the village - - The existing infrastructure around Edenfield would not cope with the additional number of residents - - New development should be spread around Rossendale on brown field sites - - All brown field sites should be used up before any green field development should be considered	-	
1240	Rebecca	Simpson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield as it will dramatically alter the character of the village. This number of dewllings is not appropriate as the village does not have the road infrastructure or services ie, doctors, dentist etc needed.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1245	Janice	Adams	-		Object	I am objecting to the number of houses proposed for Edenfield. I understand that there is to be some building but the sheer scale of the numbers proposed would impact on the village dramatically. - - On Exchange Street at the moment parking is so bad that the emergency services are not able to get through if needed. So if building was to go ahead on the scale you propose the extra cars that this would give rise to (approx. 2 per household. an extra 489 houses would mean approximately an extra 1,000 cars) would be impossible to accommodate. The infrastructure in the village is such that only 1 vehicle at a time can pass along Market Street as cars park on both sides. A large influx of vehicles would lead to massive congestion. - - The village would lose its character and the schools and other vital services would not be able to cope with the increased volume. - - At the moment we do not have a crossing person for Edenfield Primary on Market Street and there does not seem that one is going to be appointed in the near future. Therefore the increase in traffic volume could potentially cause an accident resulting in a child being injured. - - I am not against new houses being built in the village but the volume proposed is excessive. Due to the size of the village it would double the vehicles and inhabitants.		-
1248	Stuart	Fisher	-		Object	I object to the scope and extent of this proposal for Edenfield as it would permanently change the character and fundament of the village. I was born here and have lived 62 years of my life here. - - I understand the need for more housing both here and nationally, and do not object to more housing per se, but this proposal concentrates Rossendale's share too heavily in one place. - - As planners you have a duty to all of your existing residents in addition to your duty to make new housing available to those in need of accommodation. - - Additional housing needs to be spread more equitably throughout the borough.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1249	Leslie	Adams	-		Object	My objection is with the number of houses proposed for Edenfield. 489 extra houses would result in doubling the size of the village and a potential 1000 extra vehicles. Given that most houses have at least 2 vehicles each. - - The Village would lose its character, and whilst I appreciate that new houses must be built. I feel that the sheer size of the proposal would not be sympathetic to the village environment. - - 1000 extra cars would impact enormously on the congestion in the village. At the moment only 1 vehicle at a time can pass along Market Street as cars are parked on both sides. and the school on Market Street currently has no crossing person so a large increase in vehicles would result in possible accidents occurring. - - Exchange Street is currently virtually impassable as cars are parked on both sides. Any Emergency vehicle would really struggle to get through. So the street would not be able to cope with any extra traffic that the building work would incur let alone the extra residents vehicles. - - The drains on Market Street flood in severe weather. Would the drainage system cope if the village doubled in size? - - Edenfield infrastructure is not built to withstand a potential 100% increase		I do not have objections to new homes being built in Edenfield but please be sensible we are only a small village.
1256	jean	partington	-		Object	we object to the sheer scale of what is proosed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the illage		-
1259	Stephen	Wilcox	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposal for Edenfield which would radically alter the charactor of the village. It is obvious that no thought has been given to the inforstructure of the village, ie roads, extra cars, the local schools are at bursting point already.		-
1261	Katy	Hayhoe	N/a		Object	Although development and expansion of settlements is expected within urban areas, I consider the 489 houses proposed under this consultation to be excessive for within a single plan period for the area of Edenfield. This would significantly affect the rural settlement feel of the village and have impacts on the wider infrastructure such as roads and schools. Parcels of the land allocated are also used for light recreation and have been for many years. With the development of these houses, where would this open space be? Although we are surrounded by countryside, for the general residents it's the pockets of 'flat' open space that are used the most. - - It does feel that Rossendale are trying to fit a large proportion of their housing targets in this area (at the edge of their planning boundary), due to the proximity to the M66 and Manchester. I can understand this as it is a desirable area, but without a joined up plan of how this large number of houses would work, I feel it would end up being a network of 'noddy boxes' cramped into fields that would ultimately create a unattractive area. - - To expand Edenfield in such a dramatic way would turn a rural village into a small town. - - I don't oppose all development as we do have to be forward thinking and understand the housing need, but this excessive number surely can't happen within the proposed timescales you are consulting on.		Poor mapping data provided at the consultation events! - - Unclear and convoluted way to find this consultation comments section. If you were not used to the internet then you would certainly struggle!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1263	Gareth	Hayhoe	N/a	HS 2.17	Object	<p>Although development and expansion of settlements is expected within urban areas, I consider the 489 houses proposed under this consultation to be excessive for within a single plan period for the area of Edenfield. This would significantly affect the rural settlement feel of the village and have impacts on the wider infrastructure such as roads and schools. Parcels of the land allocated are also used for light recreation and have been for many years. With the development of these houses, where would this open space be? Although we are surrounded by countryside, for the general residents it's the pockets of 'flat' open space that are used the most. - - It does feel that Rossendale are trying to fit a large proportion of their housing targets in this area (at the edge of their planning boundary), due to the proximity to the M66 and Manchester. I can understand this as it is a desirable area, but without a joined up plan of how this large number of houses would work, I feel it would end up being a network of 'noddy boxes' cramped into fields that would ultimately create a unattractive area. - - To expand Edenfield in such a dramatic way would turn a rural village into a small town. - - I don't oppose all development as we do have to be forward thinking and understand the housing need, but this excessive number surely can't happen within the proposed timescales you are consulting on.</p>		Poor consultation plans for people to read at the events - - Poor means of accessing this survey page

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1264	Heidi	Moran	-		Object	Dear Sir or Madam - Please note my urgent concerns and objection to the above plan: - Irwell Vale and Meadow Park have suffered from serious flooding over the years. I have lived in Meadow Park since 1973. During this time flooding occurred on many occasions to various degrees, BUT the incidence and severity of the floods has increased dramatically over the past 6 years. Very little has been done to protect us since the last huge flood on Boxing Day 2015. - Major causes of flooding during heavy rain are: - 1) Ground and surface water from the hills overwhelm the low lying area of Irwell Vale and flow into the rivers Ogden and Irwell which meet in the village run through Meadow Park. Developments in the surrounding higher situated villages of Helmsore and Edenfield have added to the strain placed on this area. - 2) As stated, the rivers Irwell and Ogden meet in our village and overflow, causing serious flooding in the Village and on Meadow Park. - 3) It has emerged that the houses on Meadow Park have been built on a Flood Plane. It appears,, the Council has given Planning Permission to the developers at the time, who build 28 houses on a designated Flood Plane. - Can we on Meadow Park now ask Council not to add insult to injury by further increasing the risk of our houses being flooded? - Further to the Flood Risk in the area, the general infrastructure in Edenfield cannot accommodate the added strain on - > traffic congestion - > air pollution - > nurseries - > parking problems - > shortage of facilities and amenities i.e. doctors / dentists / schools / shops / children's play areas - and, last not least, more changes to a Green Belt and Conservation Area. - We need to protect and nurture our local communities for the benefit of the residents, our children and the future. - - Heidi Moran - Meadow Park - Irwell Vale -		No.
1268	Michelle	Daggett	-		Object	I object to the scale of the proposed developments within Edenfield, they would result in a massive change in character of the village		-
1280	John	Callaghan	-		Object	I object because such a plan if implemented would radically change the character of the village. Also how are our roads to accommodate possibly a thousand more cars and will there need to be a new school or even two more schools.		I am not very good with computers and am grateful to the Residents Association for enabling me to make my comments online.
1282	Paula	Entwistle	-		Object	I feel this will spoil the village, traffic is already bad going through EDENFIELD VILLAGE, also parking is a concern. Schools could not cope with the massive influx of children. There is no Doctors or Dentist to cope with the extra people.		-
1284	Margaret	Callaghan	-		Object	I object to the plan because such a plan if implemented would radically alter the character of the village. Also how are our roads to accommodate possibly a thousand more cars and will there need to be a new school or even two more new schools?		I am not very good with computers and am grateful to the Residents Association for enabling me to make my comments online.
1285	Trevor	Kenyon	-		Object	I don't feel the infer-structure couldn't cope with this amount of extra housing plus using brown fill seems a better option		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1286	Natalie	Chapman	-		Object	The building of these homes will spoil the greenery that is lovely about Edenfield and makes it different from all the other built up areas which if allowed to go ahead Edenfield will turn into.... the traffic on the roads through the village is already I feel an issue and the school are already full and Edenfield children struggle to get in to there village school.	-	
1287	Beckie	Farnworth	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed to Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.	-	
1288	Michael	Brindle			Object	I am strongly objecting to the scale of the proposals is such that it will completely change the character of the village detrimentally.		I think a scale of these proposals will be extremely detrimental to the village of Edenfield. It will completely spoil the environment, cause increased pollution, damage the local amenity for residents and completely overwhelm the local infrastructure including the road system in and around the village.
1289	Susan	Farnworth	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.	-	
1292	C	Thomas	-		Object	The proposed plan to build around 400 new homes in Edenfield, should be rejected or significatly amended. - - The plan would increase the number of homes in the village by a considerable margin and would have siginicant adverse impact on the existing community. - - Current infrastructure, schools and roads as examples are l'll equipped to cope with the extra demands which would be placed on them. - - Developer profit should not be put above the impacts on the village or wider community. Development would be better served in areas with brown field sites and or better access and amenities	-	
1293	Roy	Cain	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.	-	
1295	Zoe	Kenyon	-		Object	I am learning to drive and feel the traffic is bad now so building these extra house will only make this worse. Edenfield is a lovely village,extra house will spoil our countryside.	-	
1297	Hannah	Ratcliffe	-		Object	We object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. - The proposition to more than double the size of Edenfeild village with new housing developments would not improve the economic, social and environmental condition of the village. - Currently the village benefits from a close 'ribbon' layout along the main road, Burnley road- market street and bury road. This maintains the open character views of moorland and hills to both sides of the road which enhances the rural position and environment.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1304	Judson	Smythe	-		Object	This proposal would radically alter the feel of this quintessential English village. To go ahead with the changes would be to disregard the very reason residents enjoy living here.		Edenfield has village life at its core, please rethink this bizarre undertaking.
1309	Holly	Kenyon	-		Object	I strongly object!!! As a Student, I've learnt about the damage of getting rid of green belt lands. By building more houses you'll be getting rid of all the fields and the woods. From living at my house for 20 years now I have seen plenty of wildlife wander through the fields, such as foxes, rabbits, birds, squirrels and deers. I witnessed a deer with its offspring a few weeks ago and if you go ahead with this planning permission you will destroy their natural migration pattern. The village itself would not be able to cope with an increase of population, there's not enough room in the schools and not enough jobs. Not to mention doctors! Edenfield will no longer be a desirable place to live as it will be overcrowded. The price of my parents house will decrease due to the overlooking of properties which you plan on building which is unfair and thoughtless. I have noticed that there are plenty of houses for sale in Edenfield so why would you build more unnecessary houses? I feel very strongly about building on green belt lands as there is not enough around and we need to be looking after our planet in every way we can, by chopping down the thousands of trees you will be contributing to climate change!		I strongly object!!! As a Student, I've learnt about the damage of getting rid of green belt lands. By building more houses you'll be getting rid of all the fields and the woods. From living at my house for 20 years now I have seen plenty of wildlife wander through the fields, such as foxes, rabbits, birds, squirrels and deers. I witnessed a deer with its offspring a few weeks ago and if you go ahead with this planning permission you will destroy their natural migration pattern. The village itself would not be able to cope with an increase of population, there's not enough room in the schools and not enough jobs. Not to mention doctors! Edenfield will no longer be a desirable place to live as it will be overcrowded. The price of my parents house will decrease due to the overlooking of properties which you plan on building which is unfair and thoughtless. I have noticed that there are plenty of houses for sale in Edenfield so why would you build more unnecessary houses? I feel very strongly about building on green belt lands as there is not enough around and we need to be looking after our planet in every way we can, by chopping down the thousands of trees you will be contributing to
1312	David	Potter	-		Object	Sheer size of proposals will result in Edenfield losing village character it has, together with traffic chaos when there is enough through traffic already		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1315	Lindsay	Stringfellow	-	BLO OHW	Object	This expansion will totally destroy our village, we haven't got the schools, services or roads to cope with the footfall.		-
						Submitted on 09/10/17: I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale is far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of the village.		
1316	Dorothyann e	Ashton	-		Object	Object to withdrawal of green belt land for property development		-
1317	Kieran	Langrish	-		Object	I object to so much being built in a small village of Edenfield which would ruin the village life and ruin the environment around. We have a lot of bird life the jays are returning an eagle was spotted this year by a few people woodpeckers. Too many houses would ruin this on area.		We should not be going into green belt land when there is plenty of brown and other land that can be used. We already have too much traffic on the by pass, this will only make things worse for traffic. The village itself would not cope with extra traffic through & our local infrastructure is not up to it.
1318	Laura	Tattersall	-		Object	Object to building houses on green belt land.		-
1320	Shaun	Ashton	-		Object	Object ro houses build on green belt		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1322	Janice's	Tyms	-		Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village, it is a village not a town! Rossendale does not have the infrastructure in place, not enough schools, health care, the current roads struggle to support the current traffic on our local roads, The amount of extra traffic through Edenfield will be huge 2 x cars per new property!!! We already have poor roads that are continually patched up.The Bypass is already a very busy part of the road and as traffic comes down Manchester/Blackburn Road towards Edenfield I already find it very difficult to get across the road As a bus user to work, public transport is inadequate and already struggles at peak time to get through Edenfield due to current levels of traffic. . You will be destroying beautiful green sites and the character of this small village. We have no police presence in Rossendale, our bins are not always collected on time, how will the council cope with this?. Down Exchange St, there is a sex offenders hostel/ unit, not a suitable place to build any new houses. There are plenty of houses for sale in Rossendale without building more, from 2 bedrooms to more luxury homes.We live in an area of high and likely flooding throughout the year for many current houses this will just add to the problem as the council don't keep the streets and drains clear at the moment.</p>		<p>The council must seriously reconsider and not allow the plans for these houses to go ahead. I urge you to walk from Ramsbottom, Irwell Vale, Helmshore or Turn and ending up in Edenfield, it's beautiful, amazing, something the people and the council should be proud of, once you build on the proposed sites, you can't go back, you destroy the area and the lives of the current villagers. We have small village schools where the children who attend receive the best education in an environment enriched by their village surrounding. I strongly object to these building proposals. Do not make Edenfield just another "commuter" town. If these houses are built it will mean higher council tax for all Rossendale residents in the future. How will the council pay for any changes to infrastructure? Crime rates will rise, more nice cars and houses to target. As the residents of these new houses and current residents get ill and unwell who/ how will this care be paid for/ provided. Our nearest A and E is Blackburn or Bury, our walk in centre at Rawtenstall is no longer available for that purpose. Finally, please please leave our beautiful village and surrounding areas alone, please don't destroy them.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1324	Peter	Borkus	-		Object	<p>1) The sites are too large and will destroy the character of the village. In effect "urbanising" a community that has generally retained a rural character. The community has developed over a few hundred years. The size of the sites would double the size of the community overnight. 2) It is obvious that since the previous consultations of 2015 when these sites were not even considered to be removed from " Green Belt " that the Council has bowed to pressure from National developers to release larger plots of " Green Belt " land , and i am concerned that you will be recommending the removal of these areas to the Government. - As the land in question has already been purchased by the developers " At Risk " they are obviously confident that this will be the case. - How can decisions made in 2015 just be ignored - the Government has reduced the number of houses required since that date. - " A desirable place to live " is not a pre- requisite for the development of " Green Belt " land . The purpose of designating " Green Belt " land in the first place is to safeguard it - to stop development! - This land also provides an environmental buffer zone between the by-pass and the existing development. - 3) There is insufficient local amenities to sustain the increased community i.e School size,Doctors etc. 4) The developments are not sustainable:- 95% of the new residents would not work in the Rossendale area i.e a satellite estate for Greater Manchester with the corresponding car useage and pollution. - A development of say 200 houses with 2/3 cars on plot produces 400-600 car movements. The sites earmarked combined will have a greater density. - 5) Public transport :- Buses only serve the Bury - Rawtenstall axis. As stated in 4) above the vast majority of the new residents would work in Manchester - with no public transport links. Even with a new road link to the A56 / M66 (Which the developers would probably offer to contribute to the costs as an obvious incentive to the Council) would not alleviate the traffic issues that will develop. - The main road through Edenfield at present gets highly congested through the day compounded by heavy goods vehicles such as quarry vehicles.</p>		The percentage of " Green Belt " land being proposed for release in Edenfield alone is disproportionate to the percentages for other areas. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1326	Elizabeth	Moorhouse	-		Object	Although I don't live in Edenfield, I work in the village looking after primary school aged children. I live on the main road that run from Haslingden to Edenfield and from my house I see the A56. The A56 is a major road that allows traffic to bypass Edenfield. This road is on a regular basis at at slow to standstill in the mornings and frequently during the day. This has a significant effect on the road through Ewood Bridge and Edenfield as drivers try to avoid the delays on the A56. Residents in Edenfield park cars on the main road on both side which makes the road single file to traffic. There are also issues with school traffic and at the moment no crossing person at the primary school. Cars frequently go through the give way sign at the lights without stopping to allow traffic who have right of way. These issues put children and their families as well as residents at risk. - Edenfield is a village with narrow pavements there is one zebra crossing, at the opposite end of the village to the school. There is no doctors or post office. The local businesses struggle due to the lack of parking. The schools are full. Residents live in Edenfield and Ewood Bridge for the beautiful location and views not to look at housing estates and gridlock roads. - Please allow Children, their families and friends to enjoy all the beautiful and wonderful things that Edenfield has. Don't take it away by building more houses.		-
1328	Jacqueline	Booth	-		Object	We object to the impact and the scale of what is proposed. This would have a significant and detrimental effect on the village and wider community.		-
1329	Gaynor	Brady	-		Object	I am concerned about the impact on the village the proposed number of properties will have. Particularly in terms of traffic into the site and through the village. It is not obvious how such a large number of properties could be accessed without a big impact on existing residents. - I understand that additional housing is required in the area but am not convinced that this high increase in population would be sensible. Both the local schools are full so it would be essential for additional places to be provided early in any development. - Another area for concern would be drainage. There is already considerable run off onto the Market street area from the hills to the east of Market Street, the land where the development is proposed has a high water table already, additional building could seriously exacerbate the issue. -		I hope that consultation with local residents will continue throughout the planning process to enable villagers to ask questions and express concerns as things develop.
1332	Vincent	Brady	-		Object	I am not opposed to the building of additional homes in Edenfield, but I do object to the large number of houses proposed for this relatively small area, The impact on the local schools would be significant, drainage is a big cause for concern as the proposed building land currently becomes water logged very easily. Parking along Market Street is already an issue so an increase in houses would increase the volume of traffic further. It is a small, linear village with a large number of terraced properties which do not have access to private parking. I feel this issue would need to be addressed when considering any future development.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1333	James	Cassell	-		Object	Poor planning is creating havoc within our local communities. Building additional houses is not an issue provided proper infrastructure is considered and services can support the additional population. - Merely taking chunks of land and putting as many houses on site as possible only contributes to social friction. 489 houses are proposed in a village of only approx. 900, an increase of over 50% - this is ludicrous. - Traffic and parking would be a huge concern with potentially 1000 extra vehicles on village roads. The two schools would not cope with the influx of children and as there are no plans for additional GP and dental services the already under pressure services would not cope resulting in more people using 'walk in' centres and A& E services which ultimately puts the NHS under more pressure which everybody knows is a local and national problem. - One of the biggest tensions in our communities is created by bad planning - shared drives, lack of car parking around properties and streets and clearly the number of vehicles is not going to decrease. - Clearly planners should be visionaries and not live in a world of denial trying to justify bad decisions and policies. - I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and will create more problems for the whole area. - - I personally would like planners and local politicians to come out of their cocooned existence and come out and see what real families want and need in their communities and realise that bad decisions today ruin lives for decades to come.		-
1335	Robert	Booth	-		Object	We object to the proposed development in terms of scale and the impact in the community.		Build on brownfield areas first.
1342	Catherine	Stockdale	-		Object	I object to the proposed number of houses planned to be built in Edenfield. We, quite simply, do not have the infrastructure to host such a build. Market street itself is full of parked cars belonging to existing residents. Driving through the village now is difficult at times. At a meeting at the community centre, the housing company stated that the traffic situation wasn't "their problem" and was the council's Highways divisions problem. A very poor attitude to have towards both community and council		This doesn't seem to have been thought through properly, from a practical and realistic point of view, more from a point of greed
1344	Paul	Jones	-		Object	I object to the scale of this project and the adverse affect it will have on traffic in the area. We do not have the infrastructure in the village to accommodate the influx of people and before that construction workers. - The village becomes gridlocked whenever the bypass has a problem, what will it be like firstly with the vehicles associated with building the houses and then the traffic created by the those living in the houses - Our cellars already shake when HGVs travel up Market Street, how will they cope with the traffic created by what us proposed. Finally this proposal will ruin the appearance and feel of what is a lovely village		The scale of this proposal is obscene, we just can't understand why so many houses so quickly

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1350	Andrea	Elson	-		Object	I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of what is proposed for Edenfield would radically alter the character of the village. Not to mention the increase in traffic which is already too much for the existing roads that lorries use and damage. Rush hour traffic is horrendous through our village and in a valley like this we don't have room for massive housing estates. Property value would decrease and the countryside would be ruined.		No
1351	Nathan	Walsh	-		Object	I object to the quantity and size of the proposed developments. The plans would alter the character of the village and extra pressure on the local schools.		-
1356	Cathryn	Walsh	-		Object	I object to the building on greenbelt land in Edenfield because it will drastically alter the countryside character of our lovely village.		-
1357	Paula	Rose	-		Object	The proposed site needs to be retained as protected green belt area. Traffic congestion in the village would be a massive problem affecting the quality of village life to all residents.		-
1358	Julie	Brindle	-		Object	I am strongly objecting to the scale of the proposals is such that it will completely change the character of the village detrimentally. I think a scale of these proposals will be extremely detrimental to the village of Edenfield. The proposal is to large for the village increasing it by nearly 50%. This will completely spoil the environment, increase pollution,overwhelm the local infrastructure including the road system in and around the village.		Just because there is land does not mean it should be developed for houses, the greenbelt areas help to define Edenfield as a village.
1366	Elizabeth	Murray	-		Support	I object to the scale of the proposed sites and their impact on Edenfield and surrounding area. Whilst I generally welcome development in the area, suitable additional infrastructure is needed to minimise impact on / expense of the quality of life of established, long-standing residents. - This is especially the case with roads within the village; to / from village to main routes, especially going to and from Manchester.....the latter is bad enough as it is!		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1370	Jane	Hartley Jacques	-		Object	I object to the size of the project and what is being proposed for Edenfield which will alter the character of the village. Recently far fewer houses were overturned as unsuitable for the village. - The road through the village and down Bury road to the motorway is busy and around 800 -1000 new cars, based on the number of planned new houses. This is unrealistic for such a confined road in rush hour. Most people will go to work outside Rossendale where the well paid jobs are, such as Manchester. To plan otherwise is unrealistic. - Most of the building will take place on greenbelt land. This has always had a protected status from building. - There are no current plans for infrastructure. What plans are there for Drs, hospitals, schools, transport, roads throughout Rossendale for the extra homes? The plan is supposed to be sustainable but it cannot be if it does not take into account the basics of community. What are the plans for social care for those needing support? This may need to be worked out with other councils, but still need planning, also hospital services. - What kind of houses will be built on the green belt of Edenfield? Will affordable housing be built? Will only affordable housing be built, or social housing? - There is a reference to transport using buses, cycling, walking and the East Lancs. railway. Buses are constantly being cut due to shortage of Council Funds. This is unlikely to get any better. When using the Heritage Railway as a commuter line, this line is owned by the East Lancs Railway. How could it be used as a commuter line and how many £millions would it take to upgrade? Where would this line go to? How are people expected to cycle and walk to their place of work if this is some place away? To put this in as an option is unrealistic. It is in there to look good and tick boxes. Not because people will do it. - I also note the land allocated for the new houses go right up to the bypass. They will be right next to the path of heavy traffic such as HGVs and buses and numerous cars. There will be many with deisal engines and particulate exhaust and pollution.Plus maybe other pollutants?? How will that affect building for families and children so near the bypass? Has any health risk assessment been done? - I attended the consultation day in Edenfield Community Centre. I did not see any record of numbers attended, nor of comments and responses.		-
1377	Bev	Jenner	-		Object	We object to the plans for edenfield village. The plans would significantly change the character of the village. - It would also mean an increase in traffic on market street- we are in the process of buying a property here. The proposed changes will have a huge effect on the quality of our lives- as we have moved to be close the open space for our health.		Schools and doctors are already full. How can this be justified?!
1385	Deborah	Binns	-		Object	The scale of these plans is very disturbing. There is already heavy traffic on the road and the village could not cope with the additional pressures on resources such as schools and parking. Green Belt should be held as sacred. There is plenty of brownfield sites locally that should be developed if housing is an issue.		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1390	J. Philip	Dunne	-		Object	The proposals are too extensive and utterly out of scale for the Edenfield village character and community. There is no consideration given as to how and where access traffic would be accommodated. If from Market Street this would create an impossible burden on an already growing traffic and parking problem in a village already suffering from present traffic at times. It needs to be remembered that the vast majority of existing linear terraced development along the only main thoroughfare, Market Street, has little or no available land for residents' safe and convenient parking needs. To summarise: - 1. Village character. - 2. Road safety and traffic flow.		No.
1393	Kay	Fletcher			Object	Firstly I object about the land which is being removed from the 'green belt'. Greenbelt land is so important to this country and its slow reduction will never be reversed and can completely change the dynamics of the surrounding area. This green belt gives the area its character and its attraction for many to come and live in the village of Edenfield. - - The main road running through Edenfield is a very busy road with commuters, school traffic, business and quarry vehicles racing down the road. Parking for many residents is at the side of the road and this can be clogged due to the sheer number of cars. The two local school in the area are already oversubscribed and we do not have a doctors or dentist in the village. What on earth would happen if the proposed building took place!! - - To massively increase the number of houses in the area is of huge concern, obviously, due to the complete change in the village this will bring with extra residents and traffic and putting extra strain on the facilities in Edenfield and the nearby areas. There are no plans to increase the doctors or dentist numbers locally and also where are the children going to go to school? Edenfield will become a small town and loose its village identity and become just another clogged faceless and stretched area, losing its appeal for many. While many people are not opposed to having small increases in housing, this development is far too large for the area and will cause many problems. - -		- Once an area is ruined and loses its character it can never be regained, nobody expects to live in a village, but to flood a small area with hundreds of families is ludicrous and not increasing facilities/parking etc, will cause no end of stresses.
1395	Brian	Gorrie	-		Object	I object to these proposals mainly on the grounds of the potential impact, with regards to road safety, it would have on our already congested village streets. It would also put a strain on our local schools. Last but not least, it would have an immense visual impact to the overall character of the village.		No further comments.
1407	Ian	Stringfellow	-		Object	These developments would swamp the village of Edenfield's infrastructure causing traffic chaos. - I object to the enormous scale of the proposed developments for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village.		-
1412	Jack	Stringfellow	-		Object	I object to these proposals on the grounds of the huge increase in vehicle traffic volumes on the already overcrowded roads and the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1413	Anthony	Robertson	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of the proposals . Our area is popular BECAUSE it is Greenbelt . The overcrowding to the area will be impractical and not functional for anyone . there has been no mention of the need for the infrastructure being built to cope with the volume of people and the traffic . There has been no consideration to the existing noise pollution ; air pollution, and filth and danger created by the Quarrying and its heavy vehicles ripping through our villages . building more will be intolerable increase the danger ; noise ; air pollution and filth and cause chaos to the traffic as it is already hard enough trying top get children to school and then get to work . years of this will will be impractical and not functional for the community . when new residents then arrive it will still be chaos with traffic ; increase of crime ; increase in damage to the already abandoned poor condition of the roads . this is unacceptable . The proposals will irreversibly ruin the peace ; condition , and character of the area .		I am outraged at the existing disregard by the council and lack of effort put in to the upkeep of the local area . What will be done to support the council tax payers when further use of the area by industrial vehicles and a hugely increased population to the area exponentially degrades the roads ; sense of safety/security ; pollution ; rubbish on the streets, and public transport is not restored ? - - 1 . road sweepers only sweep certain streets when ours needs doing . we pay for this - - 2 heavy vehicles could go the other direction to the motorway through Rochdale where there are more roads . ours are only one main road through the villages which is dangerous especially for our children . they are also constantly aggravating because of the noise and filth aand continued contribution to road damage on existing very poor road conditions . - which we pay for . - 3 we need a more practical supply of public transport for people especially for work and companies are only removing service to us . what will be done to rectify this now as we need it now not because of a huge volume of proposed residents ? how will the scant service serve them ? - - 4 If the area loses its appeal because of its Greenbelt , and becomes more 'Towny' and unkempt will our council tax reduce ? we have reduce refuse collection - which we pay for but no reduction in council tax - will there be further reductions as there will be double the population to collect from ?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1415	Simon	Parker	-	Edenfield all areas	Object	The proposed building of homes in Edenfield would cause the village and surrounding area to be in gridlock. The roads through and around Edenfield are currently most difficult to use at most times of the day and at the start of school and end of school they are even worse. Edenfield has not got the capacity for any more houses. The roads are not capable carrying any more traffic	-	
1418	kristina	forrest	-		Object	I OBJECT TO THE SHEER SCALE OF WHAT IS PROPOSED FOR EDENFIELD WHICH WOULD RADICALLY CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE, ALSO THE VILLAGE CANT COPE NOW WITH THE VOLUME OF CARS THAT DRIVE THROUGH LET ALONE HUNDREDS MORE.	-	
1422	Sam	Pearson	-		Object	I object to the Councils Plan for Edenfield 100% !! - You are asking the government to remove large areas of land around the village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on - The Greenbelt protection was for a reason .. Why do you forget this? - Also the scale of the plan is far to large. It would ruin Edenfield and the village couldn't cope with it. It is already congested enough!! With not enough facilities to accomodate any more - Sam Pearson	-	
1423	Christopher	Higginbotham	-		Object	I object to the size of the proposed project, this would have an adverse effect on the whole of the village of Edenfield. I object to the change of use of the land from greenbelt to building land.	-	
1428	Howard	Hulme	-		Object	Objections as to scale of proposed redevelopment, which is out of proportion for Edenfield Village as it is currently, the character and nature of the village would be much transformed and for the worse.	No	
1434	D. Margaret	Dunne	-		Object	The scale of the potential development is unacceptable in Edenfield, a village of character. There are already serious traffic problems, brought about by increasing traffic flow along Market Street, negotiating a narrow ribbon road. The terraced houses which make up much of the present housing have nowhere other than the roadway of Market Street to park. Therefore access is already difficult and dangerous. The local community character of village life would be destroyed by these proposals.	No.	
1439	Antony	Wild	-		Object	This is a village which needs infrastructure, not a dormitory estate. Therefore any plan should include amenities, particularly, recreation areas, additional shops, schooling, and a larger community hall for the elderly etc.. - - As most village dwellers are low paid, any new build should be affordable (<£80000), - - As the village is already suffering from traffic problems, the development should have access from the link road (Via Eden Avenue area and the road to Haslingden. It will also be important to include new off street parking for those currently parking on the High Street. - - You have an opportunity to create employment in the village by including modern workshop units, since future environmental considerations will make commuting undesirable..		What happened to the Green Belt and using up Brown Field sites first (instead of sanctioning M&S and the myriad of other supermarkets)? - -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1443	SCOTT	LEEMING	-		Object	I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED BUILDING OF 489 HOUSE IN EDENFIELD VILLAGE, DESTROYING THE GREENBELT	-	
1445	VICTORIA	MANNING	-		Object	I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED BUILDING OF 489 HOUSES IN EDENFIELD VILLAGE, DESTROYING THE GREENBELT AND CREATING CONGESTION TO ROADS THAT ARE ALREADY OVER CAPACITY	-	
1449	Amanda	Thomas	-		Object	Edenfield is a small village with amenities and facilities appropriate to its size. The sheer scale of the development which is proposed would destroy the character of the village and the access to green space that residents enjoy. There are no proposals for facilities to deal with the proposed increase in population such as schools and road improvements.	-	
1450	Carol	Mosses	-		Object	I am not against house building but; - - It should not go ahead without the necessary planning and funding and organisation to implement support services for the area, including educational, medical, transport and environmental consideration. - - There should also be an agreed, controlled and enforced mix of affordable housing.	-	
1451	Margaret	Leeming	-		Object	The proposed actions would totally ruin the village atmosphere and drastically increase congestion.	-	
1456	Paula	Fahey	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would totally change the character of the village.	-	
1459	Laura	Turner	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. I also object to building on green belt.	-	
1460	Peter	Unsworth	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of our village. I am also opposed to building on greenbelt	-	
1468	Melanie	Goedhart	-		Object	Edenfield Village will be changed from a country village into a sprawling housing estate. Greenland should be left as Greenland otherwise what makes this area so beautiful will be destroyed. - The traffic is currently busy and this amount of extra housing will cause gridlock around the roads leading to the M66 and the by pass. - Travel times to Manchester have doubled since I moved into the area 20 years ago. - - Parking on the main rd in Edenfield is already an issue for the current residents with cars parked on both sides of the rd. - The Rostron Arms has even installed a paying car park! - There are not enough schools or GP surgeries to accommodate such a large amount of new houses. - - I am amazed and appalled that this new building development is even being considered	-	
1472	Ralph	Cirne	-		Object	A total lack of infrastructure and the amount of traffic generated by this housing scheme is my problem. Please don't tell me that another set of traffic lights will be the answer. You only have to look at Haslingden Rd in Rawtenstall to know that they just cause more delays and inconvenience for all concerned.	No.	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1476	Simon	Kaden Smith	-		Object	i am worried about a number of issues with this proposed development. Firstly, the amount of traffic that the proposal will create. The village already has alot of traffic whenever there is a problem on the bypass and this development will only exacerbate the traffic issues in the village. I fear we will end up like Nuttall Lane/Whittingham Drive ins Ramsbottom with just one road in and out to a huge amount of properties. Secondly, the proposal to build on greenbelt is only going to make the air pollution around here even worse. Living close to the bypass I already worry about the air quality with that number of vehicles and the greenbelt actively helps to protect us against the dangerous CO2 emissions. There are plenty of brownfield sites in the area that should be developped and yet you are taking the easy option of offering greenbelt to developpers. - Finally, there is no infrastructure in Edenfield to support this influx of residents and they will all have to use cars to travel to the dentist, school or doctors- again contributing to a increase of traffic on the roads. - - I have looked at the plan which is supposed to be for the borough of Rossendale and ask why has Edenfield been targeted? Share the development and make it a borough wide plan rather than an Edenfield plan. -		-
1477	James	Cryne	-		Object	Hello - - I object to the sheer scale of the plan and the number of houses which would radically alter Edenfield as a village. - - Schools - Traffic - Parking - - Traffic and parking are already terrible, busy and dangerous for children.		-
1480	Emeline	Cryne	-		Object	I object to the scale of this development and the detrimental effect that it will bring on traffic, parking and the local schools. Edenfield is a small village which already suffers from poor parking and bad traffic, please don't make it worse.		-
1490	Brendan	Howarth	-		Object	I object to the proposals for Edenfield and the impact they would have on the community and infastructure.		-
1492	Graeme	Conway	-		Object	I believe that the scale of the development proposed for these sites would change the nature of Edenfield as a place to live and would increase the traffic on surrounding roads, which are busy already, and this would lead to increased risks for personal safety.		-
1509	karen	embrey	-		Object	I object to the sheer scale of what is proposed for Edenfield which would radically alter the character of the village. The local infrastructure would not cope with the increased volumes in traffic, school children and health care facilities. Parking is already at maximum capacity in the village		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1511	ANTHONY	FARRELL	-		Object	I take my three grandchildren to school in Ramsbottom from their house on Blackburn Road, Edenfield and I notice every morning and afternoon, how very busy Market street is through the centre of Edenfield. The cars are parked on both sides of the road and often traffic has to wait if a bus or large vehicle is travelling through the village. With school children crossing the road to Edenfield CE School near the traffic lights at the junction of Blackburn Road and Bury Road this is also an additional cause for extremely busy traffic. - To have so many houses, as suggested in this ill thought out plan. built in an area which already is suffering from over capacity, in terms of traffic, street parking and school places seems a recipe for disaster in terms of the environment. - Has anyone form the council visited the village during the morning rush hour, during the day and during the afternoon school run? It seems from this plan, not to be the case. I suggest someone in authority from the council takes several visits to assess the situation in the village centre. - The scale of the plans are too large and would ruin the character of this village, which serves as a major route between Rochdale and Blackburn and Rochdale and Haslingden and Rawtenstall. - It also acts a a major route between Ramsbottom and Rawtenstall and Bury and Rawtenstall. Although there is a nearby bypass, many motorists find it more convenient to commute through Enfield, rather than round it using the by.-pass. - I strongly object to this proposal on behalf of myself and the future of Edenfiled, my three grandchildren. - A. Farrell		No
1513	Stefan	Mann	-		Object	I strongly object to the scale of what is proposed for a small village which currently struggles with its poor infrastructure as it is. The village does not want all these new houses and many of us use our beautiful green belt areas.		-
1514	Sarah	Mann	-		Object	I strongly object to the scale of what is proposed for a small village which currently struggles with its poor infrastructure as it is. The village does not want all these new houses and many of us use our beautiful green belt areas.		-
1516	Anne Margaret	Holt	-		Object	Our local village will not be able to cope with this new addition of houses resources are already stretched. once the land has been taken you can not rebuild land!!!!		-
1518	Gabrielle	holt	-		Object	Edenfield is a small village and will not be able to cope with the increased traffic, resources such as schools, doctors, dentists and local hospitals are at their full capacity. once you take land you can not get it back!!!!		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1519	James	Fisher	-		Object	I was brought up in Edenfield having been born at Rossendale Hospital in 1977. Although I left the village in 1995, I return regularly each year to visit family and friends. I recently heard of the Taylor Wimpey development plans for Edenfield and wish to object. My objection relates to the fact that it would transform the village to be unrecognisable effectively creating a small town. I cannot see how the road network, schools and other amenities would cope with the intended change, not to mention the environmental aspects. I understand that the proposals include the redesignation of green belt land to building land and would result in housing being built very close to a major road. These houses would no doubt be designed and built to attract families but those families would in fact be putting their children at risk due to the now well known health risks of living close to a busy road. - Therefore, rather than destroy a beautiful landscape and put generations of children at high risk of asthma and other long-term conditions, I urge you to reconsider the plans, opting instead for the existing brown field sites elsewhere in the valley or maybe consider redevelopment of the hundreds of empty properties that are available to you elsewhere.		-
1526	Stephen	Mellish	-		Object	Whilst I'm all in favour of development, this many houses in Edenfield is not sustainable, as a local governor at our primary school we have extended and are always full each year, there is no way we can fit any more children in! - - In addition the roads are not capable of taking the additional traffic, it's already a rat-run going through Edenfield, increasing this by several hundred cars will only impact things further. - - As a resident of Meadow park, we have been flooded several times part of this is run off from the hills above us, building on this land will only make these matters worse.		-
1530	Joshua	Coulson	-		Object	I object to the scale of this application, this would mean a radical change to the character of the village.		-
1532	Morgan	Rothwell	-		Object	The sheer scale of this development would radically change the character of the village.		-
1533	G	Scranage	-		Object	We object to the sheer size of the project to build 489 homes, (more than 50% of the present number of houses) which would cause over crowding, traffic congestion and ruin the village as we know it. - - This proposal has upset a lot of residents & would be a tradgerdy! - - Yours faithfully Mr G Scranage		-
1534	Irene	Lomax	-		Object	It will ruin the village life, it cannot cope with increase in traffic		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1541	Vanessa and Mike	Pitrick			Object	<p>I write about the Council's local Plan and how it will affect not only Edenfield but the surrounding villages that you have to drive through, walk and live in that are right next to Edenfield.</p> <p>I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our villages from the greenbelt so that it can be built on. These are the areas I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan:</p> <p>land off Exchange Street - Edenfield land off West Market Street - Edenfield land off Blackburn Road - Edenfield land West of Moorlands Vieww - Edenfield.</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin not only the character of the village but the surrounding areas leading to and from Edenfield. I live in Shuttleworth - address above and Whalley Road connecting and leading up to Edenfield is already far far too busy ... I have nearly been knocked down by speeding cars many times over the years I have lived here What on earth will happen if you get this planning through??? As we know each household now has at least 1 car with some having 2 ... all the traffic, all the people, pollution and waste and that's not to mention facilities 1 butchers shop and 1 bakery and then there is safety. It really is outrageous to have a beautiful village ruined - it would no longer be a village. There are not enough schools or jobs for everyone and also the transportation is shocking - X35 Bus has just stopped - X44 Bus stopped a few years ago It just does not make sense at all.</p>		
1543	A	Casey			Object	<p>With regard to the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield, Land off Exchange St Edenfield, Land west of Market St Edenfield, Land off Blackburn Road Edenfield and Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield. I object very strongly to this development. It is awful to think it is using Greenbelt land. Once this Greenbelt is used it can never be regained. As well as that objection, I strongly, very strongly, object to extra housing in Edenfield. The roads cannot take any more traffic, the Schools are full, the drains are old and should not be put under extra strain.</p> <p>With regards to the roads they often are completely at a standstill already, the road through Edenfield is the only road that goes through to the Motorway connection at the top of Walmersley brow. After Rawtenstall the road through Edenfield carries all the traffic to the Motorway and to Bury. Cars park on both sides of the road and the roads each side of the village are more often than not single lane. Using a pedal cycle is currently dangerous but if the traffic is increased it will be suicidal. Please, please do not build extra houses in Edenfield.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1555	David	Casey		SHLAA16263, SHLAAA16262, SHLAA16256, SHLAA16255	Object	<p>I wish to object very strongly to the proposed developments: "Land off Exchange St Edenfield, Land west of Market St Edenfield, Land off Blackburn Road Edenfield and Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield". '</p> <p>The nature of this tiny hamlet will be overwhelmed and turned into something of the form of dormitory town. Its character as a contributory part of a tourist area will be lost forever.</p> <p>More importantly, the roads are already inadequate under the heavy usage that's grown up over the years. The councils are already under pressure and are clearly unable to maintain the narrow roads. Scores of Potholes go unrepaired for months, even years.</p> <p>Traffic is already congested and at certain times of the day, the narrowness of the roads, especially the A56, is a danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other car users especially as cars regularly park on foot paths and if they don't then the roads become single lane which they do in places anyway, despite cars on pavements. Worst still, the area suffer~ from an already heavy usage of HGV s which are frightening in the already congested roads. The A56 has already become it car park throughout most of the area that will be affected, including to the south. It is dangerous!</p> <p>Furthermore, imagine the congestion in Rawtenstall as this and Haslingdon will be the nearest motorway access in both direction; Manchester to the South and to the towns to the North. It is already problematic entering Rossendale at certain times 'and this will become much much worse.</p> <p>Even the bypass and Motorways are not up to the task, they already suffer heavy congestion to the north and south.</p> <p>What about the other services? Sewerage, drainage etc, will all be under pressure.</p> <p>NO NO NO, not only will this degrade the area but is dangerous, crazy! Who will benefit? Certainly not the existing Rossendale residents nor their families. Only the developers and investors will be beneficiaries and possibly the immigrants from other areas.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1556	Ingrid	Battersby			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan: land off Exchange St/ Edenfield land west of Market St. Edenfield land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. I also object as Green Belt should be sacrosanct.</p>		
1557	Nicholas	Battersby			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan: land off Exchange St/ Edenfield land west of Market St. Edenfield land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. I also object as Green Belt should be sacrosanct.</p>		
1558	Michael	Battersby			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan: land off Exchange St/ Edenfield land west of Market St. Edenfield land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village. I also object as Green Belt should be sacrosanct.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1573	M	Hoyle			Object	<p>2. Housing allocation site HS71</p> <p>A large percentage of the housing allocation seems to be focused in the southwest of Rossendale especially in the Edenfield area, with over 406 houses proposed. The large scale of the development goes against the recommendation in the site reports in the SHLAA document (SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271) and in Green Belt Review. These include: - Both the Green Belt proposal and SHLAA recommend housing on the sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 should be low density. However, all the proposed areas have a density of 30 dwelling per hectare that is above the recommended Government Guidance is 18 dwellings per hectare</p> <p>The Landscape study recommends that site SHLAA 16262 land to the west of Market Street is inadequate for a major housing development as it would have an impact on the linear settlement of the village.</p> <p>Rossendale Council has failed to support the use brownfield sites. It has failed to identify brownfield sites in the Edenfield area or in the borough in general. Rossendale Council has taken the easier option of identifying Greenfield site, which are preferred by developers over the more difficult Brownfield sites. Planning Inspectors guidance does require LA to look into all brownfield sites before amending the green belt in area (Local Government Ass and Plan Advisory service document 2017 - Cheshire East Council). Rossendale Council seem to have failed to consider this requirement and only considered the easier higher yielding Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Rossendale Council should reconsider including the above sites in draft Local Plan, Evidence and information from various documents has shown that sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 are not suitable for large scale housing developments, resulting in negative impact on surrounding countryside and community.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1577	Rebecca	Hoyle			Object	<p>2. Housing allocation site HS71</p> <p>A large percentage of the housing allocation seems to be focused in the southwest of Rossendale especially in the Edenfield area, with over 406 houses proposed. The large scale of the development goes against the recommendation in the site reports in the SHLAA document (SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271) and in Green Belt Review. These include: - Both the Green Belt proposal and SHLAA recommend housing on the sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 should be low density. However, all the proposed areas have a density of 30 dwelling per hectare that is above the recommended Government Guidance is 18 dwellings per hectare</p> <p>The Landscape study recommends that site SHLAA 16262 land to the west of Market Street is inadequate for a major housing development as it would have an impact on the linear settlement of the village.</p> <p>Rossendale Council has failed to support the use brownfield sites. It has failed to identify brownfield sites in the Edenfield area or in the borough in general. Rossendale Council has taken the easier option of identifying Greenfield site, which are preferred by developers over the more difficult Brownfield sites. Planning Inspectors guidance does require LA to look into all brownfield sites before amending the green belt in area (Local Government Ass and Plan Advisory service document 2017 - Cheshire East Council). Rossendale Council seem to have failed to consider this requirement and only considered the easier higher yielding Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Rossendale Council should reconsider including the above sites in draft Local Plan, Evidence and information from various documents has shown that sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 are not suitable for large scale housing developments, resulting in negative impact on surrounding countryside and community.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1578	G	P			Object	<p>2. Housing allocation site HS71</p> <p>A large percentage of the housing allocation seems to be focused in the southwest of Rossendale especially in the Edenfield area, with over 406 houses proposed. The large scale of the development goes against the recommendation in the site reports in the SHLAA document (SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271) and in Green Belt Review. These include: - Both the Green Belt proposal and SHLAA recommend housing on the sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 should be low density. However, all the proposed areas have a density of 30 dwelling per hectare that is above the recommended Government Guidance is 18 dwellings per hectare</p> <p>The Landscape study recommends that site SHLAA 16262 land to the west of Market Street is inadequate for a major housing development as it would have an impact on the linear settlement of the village.</p> <p>Rossendale Council has failed to support the use brownfield sites. It has failed to identify brownfield sites in the Edenfield area or in the borough in general. Rossendale Council has taken the easier option of identifying Greenfield site, which are preferred by developers over the more difficult Brownfield sites. Planning Inspectors guidance does require LA to look into all brownfield sites before amending the green belt in area (Local Government Ass and Plan Advisory service document 2017 - Cheshire East Council). Rossendale Council seem to have failed to consider this requirement and only considered the easier higher yielding Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Rossendale Council should reconsider including the above sites in draft Local Plan, Evidence and information from various documents has shown that sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 are not suitable for large scale housing developments, resulting in negative impact on surrounding countryside and community.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1579	C J	Hoyle			Object	<p data-bbox="904 97 1742 140">2. Housing allocation site HS71</p> <p data-bbox="904 140 1742 528">A large percentage of the housing allocation seems to be focused in the southwest of Rossendale especially in the Edenfield area, with over 406 houses proposed. The large scale of the development goes against the recommendation in the site reports in the SHLAA document (SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271) and in Green Belt Review. These include: - Both the Green Belt proposal and SHLAA recommend housing on the sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 should be low density. However, all the proposed areas have a density of 30 dwelling per hectare that is above the recommended Government Guidance is 18 dwellings per hectare. The Landscape study recommends that site SHLAA 16262 land to the west of Market Street is inadequate for a major housing development as it would have an impact on the linear settlement of the village.</p> <p data-bbox="904 528 1742 847">Rossendale Council has failed to support the use brownfield sites. It has failed to identify brownfield sites in the Edenfield area or in the borough in general. Rossendale Council has taken the easier option of identifying Greenfield site, which are preferred by developers over the more difficult Brownfield sites. Planning Inspectors guidance does require LA to look into all brownfield sites before amending the green belt in area (Local Government Ass and Plan Advisory service document 2017 - Cheshire East Council). Rossendale Council seem to have failed to consider this requirement and only considered the easier higher yielding Greenfield sites.</p> <p data-bbox="904 847 1742 1011">Rossendale Council should reconsider including the above sites in draft Local Plan, Evidence and information from various documents has shown that sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 are not suitable for large scale housing developments, resulting in negative impact on surrounding countryside and community.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1580	R J	Barlow			Object	<p>2. Housing allocation site HS71</p> <p>A large percentage of the housing allocation seems to be focused in the southwest of Rossendale especially in the Edenfield area, with over 406 houses proposed. The large scale of the development goes against the recommendation in the site reports in the SHLAA document (SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271) and in Green Belt Review. These include: - Both the Green Belt proposal and SHLAA recommend housing on the sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 should be low density. However, all the proposed areas have a density of 30 dwelling per hectare that is above the recommended Government Guidance is 18 dwellings per hectare</p> <p>The Landscape study recommends that site SHLAA 16262 land to the west of Market Street is inadequate for a major housing development as it would have an impact on the linear settlement of the village.</p> <p>Rossendale Council has failed to support the use brownfield sites. It has failed to identify brownfield sites in the Edenfield area or in the borough in general. Rossendale Council has taken the easier option of identifying Greenfield site, which are preferred by developers over the more difficult Brownfield sites. Planning Inspectors guidance does require LA to look into all brownfield sites before amending the green belt in area (Local Government Ass and Plan Advisory service document 2017 - Cheshire East Council). Rossendale Council seem to have failed to consider this requirement and only considered the easier higher yielding Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Rossendale Council should reconsider including the above sites in draft Local Plan, Evidence and information from various documents has shown that sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 are not suitable for large scale housing developments, resulting in negative impact on surrounding countryside and community.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1581	H P	Barlow			Object	<p>2. Housing allocation site HS71</p> <p>A large percentage of the housing allocation seems to be focused in the southwest of Rossendale especially in the Edenfield area, with over 406 houses proposed. The large scale of the development goes against the recommendation in the site reports in the SHLAA document (SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271) and in Green Belt Review. These include: - Both the Green Belt proposal and SHLAA recommend housing on the sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 should be low density. However, all the proposed areas have a density of 30 dwelling per hectare that is above the recommended Government Guidance is 18 dwellings per hectare</p> <p>The Landscape study recommends that site SHLAA 16262 land to the west of Market Street is inadequate for a major housing development as it would have an impact on the linear settlement of the village.</p> <p>Rossendale Council has failed to support the use brownfield sites. It has failed to identify brownfield sites in the Edenfield area or in the borough in general. Rossendale Council has taken the easier option of identifying Greenfield site, which are preferred by developers over the more difficult Brownfield sites. Planning Inspectors guidance does require LA to look into all brownfield sites before amending the green belt in area (Local Government Ass and Plan Advisory service document 2017 - Cheshire East Council). Rossendale Council seem to have failed to consider this requirement and only considered the easier higher yielding Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Rossendale Council should reconsider including the above sites in draft Local Plan, Evidence and information from various documents has shown that sites SHLAA16262, SHLAA16256 and SHLAA 16271 are not suitable for large scale housing developments, resulting in negative impact on surrounding countryside and community.</p>		
1583	S	Mc Kenzie			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>land off Exchange St. Edenfield land west of Market St. Edenfield land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1618	Andrew	King			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>land off Exchange St. Edenfield land west of Market St. Edenfield land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		
1625	D	Warren		Alderwood House (SHLAA16261)	Support	<p>Email received 05/10/17: My client has a site in Edenfield which he would like to be considered in the Local Plan revue. The site is Alderwood which is just off Market Street and would be suitable for 20/25 houses. I know the plan is in the process of being reviewed. Is it still possible to have this site considered.</p> <p>Letter received 12/10/17: Dear Sir, I would like you to consider the site within the grounds of Alderwood House in the local planning revue. We have applied before for some development and we would be in support of the plan. Yours sincerely</p>		
1626	Ronald	Hinson			Object	<p>I write concerning the Council's Local Plan and its impact upon the rural community of Edenfield. The proposals contained within the plan include the removal of 'Greenbelt' land from the immediate area of Edenfield to facilitate the building of 489 houses.</p> <p>I wish to object to this plan on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site allocation & issues with additional car movements. Edenfield is already suffering from large numbers of cars and lorries travelling through the village which would be exacerbated by new housing development • Use of Green Belt when there remain significant areas of brown land undeveloped <p>Yours faithfully</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1641	Bob	Crawford			Object	<p>I write to object to the development of the above parcels of land within Townsendfold and Edenfield on the basis of the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •At a high level the core strategy plan maked reference in the 2010 consultation of the importance of the development of a rail commuter link to Manchester and the current core strategic objective number 1, SO1-makes reference to public transport improvements; •Both of these aspects therefore have to be considered vital to the sustainable development of the area; •By developing the land parcel within Townsendfold/Edenfield we immediately reduce at best or even potentially remove any future option for the communication corridor alongside the M66 to be able to accept a tramline or trainline enhance commuter system; •This strategic level error also does not support other strategic objectives such as S07-enhancement/protection of natural environment- we destroy the natural environment by developing houses on greenbelt land-removing soil/habitat/biodiversity which is vital to the ecosystem should we build on these landbanks; •We also do not include narrative that states we will deliver "no net loss of biodiversity" in the acceptance criteria for developments-therefore the commitment to such aspects in the plan is simply not strong enough or indeed well aligned between strategy and implementation plans; and •The plan states that we have 122 hectares (2008)-which is obviously not been fully developed in the period. The document states states some 300 brownfield sites have been considered but many have significant constraints (no details are supplied),which I consider to be insufficient information; and •By way of background I work for a business that deals with Sustainable Development (SD) and if we accepted such aspects without bringing new ideas and innovation to such projects on how to overcome the constraints, we would have no business. <p>I would suggest that the Council fully address such aspects in relation to the brownfield area before any amount of area of greenfield land is considered-no matter what pressure is on to provide additional affordable homes.</p> <p>I would equally suggest that the issues indicated with the current housing stock be tackled-even if it means private business money to improve the energy/carbon/quality aspect of the stock before more affordable homes are built. It is simple too easy to build more and not face the problem, head on. There are businesses out there that would consider funding and delivering such projects should the Council seek dialogue.</p> <p>I hope the feedback is considered in a positive light. It it not meant to be any criticism of the Council in any way.</p> <p>But to deliver ecological development of human ecosystems an approach known as the "Stadt-schaft principle" is best practice and I would recommend</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						that the Council consider such within the current approach to SD. Red, amber, green type assessments for SD as exhibited within the plan do not go far enough-even at outline levels. I am afraid to say I am unable to accept your development proposals.		
1685	Leslie A	Scott			Object	I write about Rossendale Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are proposing to ask the government to remove large amounts of land from the Greenbelt around the village so that it can be built on. The areas listed below are of particular concerned about and are covered by your Reference HS2.71 on the site map which accommodates the plan. Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield. Land west of Market Street, Edenfield. Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield. Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield. I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of which is proposed is far too large an area and would ruin the character of the village.		
1686	Raymond	Rideough			Object	I write concerning Rossendale Council's Local Plan and wish to express my concerns on these proposals and how it will have a detrimental affect on the village of Edenfield and it's residents. You are proposing to ask the Government to remove an extensive amount of land from the current greenbelt protection around the village for building development. The areas listed below are of particular concern and are covered by your Reference HS2.71 on the site map which accommodates the plan. Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield. Land west of Market Street, Edenfield. Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield. Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield. I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of which is proposed is far too large an area and would destroy the character of the village and the surrounding district. I trust the concerns of residents will be considered when a decision is made on this issue.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1687	Norma P.	Rideough			Object	<p>I write concerning Rossendale Council's Local Plan and wish to express my concerns on these proposals and how it will have a detrimental affect on the village of Edenfield and it's residents. You are proposing to ask the Government to remove an extensive amount of land from the current greenbelt protection around the village for building development. The areas listed below are of particular concern and are covered by your Reference HS2.71 on the site map which accommodates the plan.</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield. Land west of Market Street, Edenfield. Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield. Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield.</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of which is proposed is far too large an area and would destroy the character of the village and the surrounding district.</p> <p>I trust the concerns of residents will be considered when a decision is made on this issue.</p>		
1743	H	Warrington			Object	<p>I am writing to object to the council's local plan and how it will affect edenfield.</p> <p>The sites I am concerned about are covered by ref HS2.71 on the site map i.e land west of Market Street, land off Exchange Street, land off Blackburn Road, land west of Moorlands View.</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and will ruin the character of the village. To propose an extra 400 etc homes in Edenfield is ludicrous</p> <p>Traffic and parking are already a problem in the village which will only become a lot worse. Also there are no GP surgeries or dentists locally and only 2 primary schools for the children.</p>		
1753	Angela	Raw			Object	<p>I write about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are proposing to ask the government to remove large amounts of land from the Greenbelt around the village so that it can build on it.</p> <p>The areas listed below are the ones I am particularly concerned about and are covered by your Reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street Edenfield Land west of Market St Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield</p> <p>I object to those proposals on the grounds that the scale of what is proposes is far too large and would ruin the character of the village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1757	Chris	Whiting			Object	<p>I would like to raise the strongest objection possible with regard to the proposed developments in Edenfield, Ref HS2.71. I feel this proposed development is completely out of place within this small linear rural village. It will completely swamp the existing community and destroy the character of the village. There is no provision or even mention of the effects of the increased traffic onto Market Street or where a new school and health facilities would need to be sited.</p> <p>This is a poorly thought out plan lacking in any insight into the needs of the local community and I suspect an expedient political option to obviate the need for more considered and constructed options.</p> <p>I am a resident of Crawshawbooth and am not, therefore, writing from a 'NIMBY' point of view.</p>		
1760	Angela	Moss			Object	<p>I write about councils local plan and how it will affect edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map. Which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield land west of Market Street, Edenfield Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield</p> <p>I strongly object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would have a catastrophic effect on this tiny village.</p> <p>The roads through the village can barely cope now as they are very narrow especially at the Edenfield school strs snf sll of Market Street with residents already parking on both sides of the road. The traffic coming from Rochdale, the quarry, etc. make for very hazardous conditions. When the motorway/bypass is closed because of an accident this additional traffic also comes through the village. Including HGVs, petrol tankers, buses etc.</p> <p>We as residents must be given consideration, the infrastructure simply cannot cope even now and 500 extra homes means at least 800 or more cars using the roads to get to work and children to school.</p> <p>We have no doctors here. Schools are already full. When the bad weather comes snow ice etc. We are always way down the list with gritting, salt bins are almost non-existent.</p> <p>The council and government have a duty of care towards the people who already reside in this village and must consider all of the above when making any further decisions.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Support	<p>3. LAND WEST OF MARKET STREET, EDENFIELD (ALLOCATION HS2.71)</p> <p>3.1 Taylor Wimpey are the legal owner of a 12.5 Ha Green Belt site west of Market Street, Edenfield.</p> <p>3.2 The site was submitted to the Council's call for sites process in June 2016 and this was followed with the submission of a Development Statement in September 2016, which is attached at Appendix 1.</p> <p>3.3 The site (SHLAA Ref: 16202) is now proposed as part of large housing allocation Site HS2.71 which covers 26 hectares of land across four individual sites. The combined allocation has an indicative capacity of 451 which accounts for 12.5% (or 1/8) of all the allocations in the Borough, indicating its importance to the delivery of the plan. This is also reflected in Policy HS3, which we address on the next page.</p> <p>3.4 It must also be noted that this allocation will be important for the delivery of the type of aspirational family housing in Rossendale which is currently lacking, and this will serve to improve its Council Tax profile and increase receipts.</p> <p>3.5 The attached Development Statement and evidence submitted to date have demonstrated that this is a sustainable and deliverable site in accordance with the NPPF, which is capable of delivering up to 273 units, commencing within the next 5 years. Indeed, Taylor Wimpey own the site outright and therefore there will be no delay in converting the land sale. This will allow the development arm of the business to promote a full application as soon as practically possible post adoption of the Local Plan and its removal from the Green Belt, assuming a separate master planning process, SPD or Design Code is inserted into the site allocation policy.</p> <p>3.6 We do not dispute the Council's assessment in Table 1; albeit it is suggested that the site area is corrected, as the Taylor Wimpey land measures 12.5 Ha not 9.12 Ha.</p> <p>Evidence Base – Market Street, Edenfield.</p> <p>3.16 We now provide comments on the evidence base documents that assess the Edenfield site including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt Assessment, November 2016, • Lives and Landscape Assessment, July 2015, • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Stages 1 and 2), May 2017, and • Sustainability Appraisal, May 2017. <p>Green Belt/ Landscape Assessment</p> <p>3.17 The Council commissioned a Green Belt Assessment (prepared by LUC in November 2016) and Landscape Assessment (prepared by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects in July 2015) as part of their evidence base for the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>3.18 Whilst we agree with many of the findings of these two documents, we express concern with some of the conclusions in relation to the Land West of Market Street, Edenfield.</p> <p>3.19 Randall Thorp have provided a comprehensive rebuttal statement which provides commentary on the findings of these two reports, which can be found in Appendix 4. The Randall Thorp report should be read in conjunction with these representations, and the key findings are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site provides a weak contribution to Green Belt purposes 1 and 3, rather than a moderate contribution as concluded in the 2016 Green Belt Assessment. • The potential level of harm caused by the release of the site from the Green Belt, in accordance with the 'Framework for assessing harm' at Table 4.2 of the Assessment, should be 'low'. This differs from the findings of the Green Belt assessment which suggests 'medium'. • The Landscape Assessment's conclusion that the site 'is not suitable for development on landscape grounds' is incorrect. When taking into consideration the broader context of the site in landscape terms as well as proposed mitigation measures, the site is entirely acceptable in landscape terms. The Assessment should therefore conclude that the Market Street, Edenfield site is 'suitable for development with appropriate mitigation'. <p>3.20 Accordingly, this rebuttal reinforces the Council's conclusions that this is a sustainable and deliverable site with limited landscape and Green Belt landscape terms and provides further justification for its allocation within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment- Stages 1 and 2 (May 2017)</p> <p>3.21 The site was assessed in the SHLAA under site reference 16262. Whilst we fully agree with the overall conclusions that the site is suitable, achievable and developable in the medium to long term, we have a few comments in relation to some of the findings. The Council already consider this site a suitable housing allocation, however, in our view, the site actually performs even better in certain categories of the SHLAA as explained below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Assets- whilst the site does adjoin the Grade II Listed Building of Edenfield Parish Church, the scoring of the site as red in this category does not allow for consideration of detailed design matters. Whilst it is appreciated that the remit of a SHLAA is for a highlevel assessment of constraints, further information has been provided in the form of the Development Statement which confirms that this Listed Building has been taken into consideration as part of an Illustrative Masterplan. As such, when taking into consideration design matters and the illustrative masterplan, the site should not score red in the heritage assets section. • Landscape Value- as noted previously we disagree with the findings of the 2015 Landscape Assessment, which have fed through to the SHLAA noting a 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>'high landscape impact' and therefore scores red in this regard. The Randall Thorp report (Appendix 4) explains in detail the broader landscape context and landscape mitigation measures which can be implemented on site, concluding that it is suitable for development with appropriate mitigation. In light of these findings, the site will not have a high landscape impact and should not be scored as red in this category within the SHLAA.</p> <p>3.22 We also consider that the site should have been scored higher in the ecological value and recreational value sections, which are currently amber. This relates to a more general observation that the scoring methodology and scope of the SHLAA does not allow for detailed considerations such as masterplanning and proposed design/mitigation.</p> <p>3.23 The Illustrative Masterplan illustrates how the existing public right of way does not pose a constraint on site, on the contrary it can be well-integrated into development proposals. Additionally, the Development Statement attached at Appendix 1, which the Council are in receipt of, concludes that there are no ecological constraints preventing the development of the site and that appropriate mitigation will be provided where necessary.</p> <p>3.24 To conclude, whilst we agree with the overall findings of the SHLAA that the site is suitable, achievable and developable, the comments above further demonstrate this. Accordingly, the evidence base fully supports the Council's decision to allocate this site for housing.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal (May 2017)</p> <p>3.25 The Council have commissioned a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Rossendale Local Plan- Reasonable Alternatives report in May 2017. A general point to note is that the SA does not make it clear exactly where the sites assessed are located. There is no accompanying map and the site names do not always correlate with the descriptions in the SHLAA. It is therefore unclear and hard to establish exactly which sites are being assessed. It is therefore requested that the Council provide further clarity on this matter, which would aid in commenting further on the findings of this SA.</p> <p>Conclusions on Market Street, Edenfield Site</p> <p>3.26 Overall, Taylor Wimpey are wholly supportive of the Edenfield allocation and are committed to the comprehensive masterplanning process, subject to the comments and queries raised above on Policy HS3 and the evidence base.</p> <p>4. CONCLUSION</p> <p>4.1 Overall, Taylor Wimpey fully support the Edenfield allocation (HS2.71) subject to the comments and suggestions made above, which note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall housing requirement should be increased to take account of economic aspirations and to provide flexibility to accommodate any unmet need generated by the adjacent authorities in Greater Manchester; • The Council should consider allocating additional sites, both as long-term 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

reserve sites to provide some headroom in their overall supply, and smaller short term sites to boost 5 year supply, given the current shortfalls;

4.2 This representation has shown that the site is deliverable and developable in line with the NPPF, and has also demonstrated its importance for housing delivery in Rossendale, representing over 7.5% of the total allocated dwelling numbers (with the wider Edenfield Allocation contributing 12.5%) and will make a significant contribution to 5-year supply.

4.3 Taylor Wimpey have been promoting Edenfield for a year and will continue to work alongside the Council and other respective land owners to demonstrate that it can begin delivering in the next 5 years.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Support	<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>1.1 This representation is prepared by Turley on behalf of our client Peel Holdings (Land & Property) Limited (hereafter “Peel” or “our client”). It provides comments to Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) in respect of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan (July 2017) (‘DLP’) which is currently the subject of public consultation.</p> <p>1.2 This document relates exclusively to the promotion of land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield, as a development opportunity. It should be considered in conjunction with the overarching representation submitted by Turley on behalf of Peel.</p> <p>Draft Rossendale Local Plan</p> <p>1.3 As set out in the overarching representation submitted, Peel has continuously and historically engaged with the plan-making process for Rossendale. This has included the submission of detailed representations to the previous Core Strategy and the draft Lives and Landscapes DPD (since withdrawn), including Development Frameworks that set out the development potential at four sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden (allocated in part) • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall (allocated in part) • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield (allocated) • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield (not allocated) <p>1.4 Peel welcomes the progress which has been made on the emerging Local Plan and supports, in principle, the proposals for development within it. In particular, Peel strongly supports the allocation of land at Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden, Haslam Farm in Rawtenstall, and Blackburn Road in Edenfield, which include some or all of three of the sites previously put forward (as above).</p> <p>1.5 It is noted, however, that additional work is required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is capable of meeting the full development needs of the Borough. Additional land will need to be allocated for residential development, above that which has been identified in the DLP.</p> <p>1.6 This opportunity is being taken to make representations in relation to the sites previously identified by Peel as capable of accommodating development in the Borough that have not been put forward in the DLP for allocation and/or Green Belt release. Peel is preparing updated Development Frameworks which will promote and justify its landholdings within Rossendale. Matters addressed below and in the overarching representation which directly affect its landholdings will be discussed in detail in each Development Framework.</p> <p>Additional Site Allocations</p> <p>1.7 In the context of the need for the Rossendale DLP to allocate additional land for development, Peel wish to reiterate the development opportunities at each of the four sites previously identified, as well as proposing a further</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>potential site at Rossendale Golf Club.</p> <p>1.8 These sites can each provide a deliverable housing development site in sustainable locations adjoining existing settlements. Initial reviews of site constraints and opportunities, landscape and highways have indicated that there are no significant barriers to development.</p> <p>Development Frameworks</p> <p>1.9 Further site appraisals are being undertaken to inform updated Development Frameworks which will be provided to the Council in due course.</p> <p>1.10 The updated Development Frameworks will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide analysis of the site constraints and opportunities. • Where relevant provide details of the findings of further technical assessment (such as highways, flood risk, ground conditions). • Consider the key principles for development of the site. • Present a proposed site layout plan illustrating development parcels, access, landscaping, etc. • Comment on the economic benefits of development. • Address comments / observations made within the recently published evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. <p>Proposed Development Opportunities</p> <p>1.11 In advance of the full Development Frameworks, the individual site representations are submitted providing initial reviews of the development opportunities.</p> <p>1.12 The Sites are represented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield (this document) • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield • Land at Rossendale Golf Course, Helmshore <p>1.13 This representation relates to land at Blackburn Road and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2: A description of the site and its location • Section 3: Details of the consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA)2 and a review of the planning policy context including the Draft Local Plan • Section 4: A Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review • Section 5: Concluding comments <p>1.14 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan</p> <p>2. Opportunity Site</p> <p>Site Description</p> <p>2.1 The land at Blackburn Road is located approximately 0.7 km miles north of Edenfield Village Centre (see below). It extends to around 2.2 ha (5.4 acres) and is broadly rectangular in shape, comprising an open field in the north and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>a mature wooded area in the southern part of the site.</p> <p>2.2 The site is located to the west of Blackburn Road which forms part of the eastern site boundary along with existing residential properties. The A56 dual carriageway forms the western boundary to the site beyond which lies open fields.</p> <p>2.3 A small group of houses are located to the immediate south east of the site, comprising a short row of terraced houses fronting Blackburn Road; and a small, inward facing cul-de-sac of modern houses.</p> <p>2.4 Church Lane bounds the site to the south, with the Grade II* listed Edenfield Parish Church and graveyard located on the opposite side of the Lane. To the north the site is bound by an open field</p> <p>Local Facilities</p> <p>2.5 The site is located within easy walking distance of Edenfield Village Centre (approximately 8 minutes walk) which has a number of services and amenities including a butcher, bakery, chemist, post office and two public houses. The town of Rawtenstall is 3.5 km north east of the site and includes a wide variety of traditional town centre uses including supermarkets, national banks and building societies, dentist, high street chemist and a number of restaurants and bars.</p> <p>2.6 Edenfield Church of England Primary School is located around 50m south west of the site on the opposite side of Blackburn Road. The closest High School to the site is Haslingden High School, located approximately 1.9 km; there are 4 other secondary schools within 5 km of the site.</p> <p>2.7 There are bus stops located on Blackburn Road, c. 300 m north and 225m south of the site respectively. These stops are served by the half hourly 482 and 483 bus services, which connects Edenfield with Bury in the south and Burnley and Bacup in the north. There is a Metrolink station in Bury (c. 9 km south of the site) which connects to the wider Greater Manchester tram network. The site is also well connected to both the local and national highway, with the A56 0.5 km from the site which connects to the M66 (2 km) and in turn the M62 and M60 (15 km).</p> <p>3. Planning Policy Context</p> <p>Consideration in SHLAA</p> <p>3.1 The Draft Local Plan evidence base includes the 2017 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which aims to identify the land supply for housing within the administrative boundary of Rossendale within the next 15 years (2017 – 2032).</p> <p>3.2 The Site, along with adjoining land to the north, is promoted in the SHLAA (Site Ref 16256). The SHLAA Site Assessment confirmed that it is a viable and achievable site for up to 63 homes in the medium term (6-10 years). Peel consider the site could accommodate 65 dwellings.</p> <p>Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management DPD</p> <p>3.3 The Draft LP Part 2 was withdrawn. The plan did not propose to release</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>this site from the Green Belt; representations made by Peel in response to that Plan challenged that proposal.</p> <p>Saved Policies</p> <p>3.4 As the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management DPD” (LP Part 2) was not taken forward by Rossendale BC, in relation to site allocations and designations, the Proposals Map and Saved Policies remain relevant as part of the development plan.</p> <p>3.5 The Proposals Map identifies the Site as outside the Urban Boundary (Policy DS1) and Site Context in the Green Belt (Policy DS3).</p> <p>3.6 However, Policy 1 of the Core Strategy states that the Urban Boundary defined in Local Plan Saved Policy DS1 and the Green Belt boundary defined in Saved Policy DS3, will be reviewed and where necessary amended in the Site Allocations DPD. The reviews would take into account criteria set out in Policy 1 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where small scale selective rounding off of Green Belt boundaries would promote sustainable development opportunities. • An extension/amendment to the urban boundary would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment. <p>3.7 Core Strategy Figure 15 identifies Edenfield as an area for Green Belt review.</p> <p>Rossendale Draft Local Plan</p> <p>3.8 As discussed in the overarching representation, the Draft Local Plan (DLP) recognises that some release of Green Belt land will be required to meet the housing requirements and the NPPF requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites (DLP, page 12).</p> <p>3.9 The evidence presented in the DLP indicates that 4,425 dwellings will need to be delivered over the period to 2034. Considering the under provision of 425 dwellings since the adoption of the Core Strategy and the potential land supply from non- Green Belt sources of 2,907 dwellings, there is a significant gap of approximately 1,518 dwellings.</p> <p>3.10 The DLP proposes areas for release from Green Belt, allowing for a delivery of a further 715 dwellings. It is therefore evident that the Green Belt releases proposed by the DLP need to be more than doubled - to accommodate 1,518 dwellings - if the emerging Local Plan is to be found sound.</p> <p>3.11 In relation to this Site specifically the DLP identifies this as one of four parcels of a larger site allocation for housing development under Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations, identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Site HS2.71 ‘Land between Blackburn Road and A56’, site size 2.09ha, 63 units, delivery in 1-5 years. <p>3.12 The other three parcels identified under allocation HS2.71 would yield an additional 388 homes, bringing a total of 451 new homes that could be delivered as result of this allocation. All four sites are identified as having a 6-</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>15 year delivery time frame.</p> <p>3.13 This allocation would bring the Site within the Urban Boundary and effectively remove it from Green Belt. Policy SD2: Urban Boundaries directs all development within such boundaries ‘except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area.’</p> <p>3.14 The DLP notes the NPPF requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites that can meet housing needs. It recognises that some release of Green Belt land will be needed to meet this requirement (page 12) and a Green Belt review⁴ forms part of the evidence base for the DLP.</p> <p>3.15 As above, it is clear that there is a significant gap between the housing land supply identified in the DLP and the demand, which cannot be met by non-Green Belt sites alone.</p> <p>3.16 This housing allocation HS2.71 is wholly supported by Peel. The following section considers this in greater detail.</p> <p>4. Green Belt Appraisal</p> <p>4.1 The Site is currently designated as Green Belt. A Green Belt review⁵ (GBR) forms part of the evidence base for the DLP which has informed the plan’s proposed removal of the Site from Green Belt along with land to the south (Site Ref. HS2.71).</p> <p>4.2 The strategic purpose of this area of Green Belt is to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall in the north/ north west, from Edenfield to the south.</p> <p>4.3 The Site sits to the north of Edenfield village centre, and to the west of development along Blackburn Road. It corresponds with the southern part of GBR Parcel 39, see below.</p> <p>Figure 4.1: P39 (Site location indicated)</p> <p>4.4 The GBR rates the contribution of the land parcel to the five Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>4.5 It is important to note at the outset that there are very clear and accepted exceptional circumstances which justify the release of significant amounts of land from the Green Belt to meet Rossendale’s housing and employment needs. All land within the current Green Belt, fulfils at least some aspects of Green Belt purposes. As such, it will not be possible to meet the identified housing needs of Rossendale without some impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.6 It is also important to note when considering what land to release from the Green Belt to be clear that the “golden thread” which runs through plan making and decision taking is the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF confirms this at paragraph 84 when it states that “...when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development...”. In considering the release of land from Green Belt it is therefore essential to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>consider what releases of land will achieve sustainable development while minimising the impacts on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p> <p>4.7 The GBR identifies that the parcel plays a moderate role as, although urbanising features are limited and there is a sense of openness, the A56 dual-carriageway detracts from this openness in parts.</p> <p>4.8 It is considered that the Site can be released from Green Belt for development without compromising this purpose. Parcel 39, along with the parcels P44 and P43 to the south respectively, would extend the developed area of Edenfield within the clearly defined boundary of the A56. Open countryside areas would remain surrounding the settlement to the west, north and east, checking unrestricted sprawl.</p> <p>Purpose 2 - To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>4.9 The GBR considers that the role of P39 in this respect is weak. It notes that the settlements of Edenfield and Helmshore at this point are more than 2km apart with limited intervisibility. It notes that the parcel, along with neighbouring parcels, forms part of the settlement gap but it is not of critical importance and does not play an essential role in preventing the merging or erosion of the visual and physical gap between these settlements.</p> <p>4.10 Peel supports this assessment and is in agreement that the development of this land does not have an important role in preventing towns from merging.</p> <p>Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>4.11 The GBR found a sense of encroachment within the parcel as a result of the visual influence of the adjoining settlement edge to the east, and the presence of the A56 dual-carriageway which defines the western boundary, as well as a small row of terrace houses on the eastern boundary. The parcel contains areas of open agricultural land and displays some of the characteristics of the countryside. However, it is a narrow parcel located between the settlement edge and a large road; consequently it lacks a strong and intact rural character. For these reasons its contribution was considered moderate.</p> <p>4.12 This assessment is supported by Peel; the Site itself sits between the development along Blackburn Road and the A56, in an area which is not of rural character.</p> <p>Purpose 4 - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p> <p>4.13 The GBR recognised that P39 did not make any contribution to this purpose. As, in practice it would have little to no intervisibility with the historic settlements of Ramsbottom and Rawtenstall Town Centre. The openness of the land within the parcels was not considered to be important to setting or historic significance.</p> <p>4.14 Peel agrees with this assessment.</p> <p>Purpose 5 - Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>derelict and other urban land</p> <p>4.15 The GBR notes that all parcels make an equally significant contribution to this purpose.</p> <p>4.16 The DLP proposes to optimise the re-use of brownfield sites to meet development needs and in doing so support ongoing urban regeneration.</p> <p>4.17 As noted above, and in the overarching representation, the supply of deliverable brownfield land is insufficient to deliver the number and type of new homes and employment land required. As such, the extent of urban regeneration which can be achieved is not enough to meet Rossendale's sustainable growth needs and must be accompanied by development on Green Belt land. Exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt release have been proven through the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. The release of land from the Green Belt will not therefore undermine this purpose.</p> <p>Degree of Harm and Mitigation</p> <p>4.18 The GBR concludes that in proposing the release of this parcel for development there would be a 'Medium' degree of harm to the Green Belt. It notes that its release 'would not relate well to the existing settlement form and would introduce an element of sprawl to the north-western edge of Edenfield and along the B6527 (Blackburn Road). However, it is considered that the strategic release of the neighbouring parcels P44 and P43 to the south, before parcel P39 may not be perceived as sprawl as the development would be contained by a strong boundary (the A56), which would limit the potential for future sprawl. The planned release of parcel P44, P43 and P39, in that order, could be perceived as the main block of settlement within Edenfield growing incrementally north and filling the gap between the A56 and the linear settlement along Market Street. This could create a stronger Green belt boundary and settlement edge.'</p> <p>4.19 The intentions of this proposed mitigation are understood and it is noted that the DLP allocation requires a masterplan approach to be taken, which is discussed earlier in this document.</p> <p>Green Belt Appraisal Conclusion</p> <p>4.20 The strategic purpose of this area of Green Belt is to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall in the north/ north west from Edenfield to the south (with Ramsbottom/ Bury urban area beyond).</p> <p>4.21 The site does not perform a strategic Green Belt function. Its development would not result in encroachment into the wider countryside which surrounds Edenfield. The A56 effectively separates the village from the more open countryside to the west and is a prominent urban feature.</p> <p>4.22 It would not result in urban sprawl or lead to the merger of separate settlements and would not reduce the gap between existing settlements. It would not have a significant impact on ongoing urban regeneration. In fact by providing for good quality family housing including elements of aspirational housing the development of this land would support the ongoing economic</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>regeneration of Rossendale, and that the proposed boundary will provide a long term defensible Green Belt boundary – built development to the east; Church Lane to the south; the A56 to the west; and a field boundary to the north that can be strengthened with additional landscaping.</p> <p>4.23 It is considered that this Site is suitable for development and is in a highly sustainable location. Its release from the Green Belt will therefore contribute to a sustainable pattern of development which makes the most of proximity to nearby highway infrastructure. There are therefore clear exceptional circumstances to justify its release from the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.24 Peel strongly supports the allocation as proposed in the DLP.</p> <p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>5.1 In relation to Peel’s land interests in the Borough, this document concerns one of four sites which have been subject of previous Development Frameworks and representations in the context of the Local Plan development. Updates to these frameworks will be provided to RBC in due course, setting out a clear vision and proposals for the development of these sites.</p> <p>5.2 This representation provides an initial review of the development opportunity at Blackburn Road, Edenfield, including details of the site and its location, consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA) and planning policy; and a Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review which forms part of the evidence base to the DLP</p> <p>5.3 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted for residential development.</p> <p>5.4 The site is within the HS3: Edenfield DLP housing allocation, proposed for release from Green Belt. Peel is preparing an updated Development Framework to illustrate the development opportunity. Peel is committed to working with the other landowners within the allocation as required by the policy and in order to achieve quality in placemaking.</p> <p>5.5 Peel strongly supports the designation of land at Blackburn Road as a housing allocation.</p> <p>Appendix 1 Please see appendix</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1769	Ian	Trippier			Object	<p>i am writing about the Councils Local Plan and how it will affect EDENFIELD!</p> <p>i understand that you are proposing to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land from the Greenbelt around the village so it can be built on. The areas listed below are the ones i am particularly concerned about and are covered by your Ref HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land west of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield</p> <p>i object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of what is proposed is far too large and would ruin the character of the village.</p>		
1778	Leila	Whittaker			Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposals of the Council's Local Plan to remove large tracts of greenbelt land around our village for the purpose of building on.</p> <p>I am against the changing of the face of our village of Edenfield, particularly as regards the areas covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan, namely land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield, land west of Market Street, Edenfield, land west of Moorlands View, Edenfield, and land off Exchange Street, Edenfield .</p> <p>I object on the ground that the scale of the plans are far too large and, quite frankly preposterous - given that the character of the village would be ruined for ever.</p> <p>I hereby say NO TO THE Council's Local Plan, and wish to record my objection MOST STRONGLY.</p>		
1780	G & A	Pilkington			Object	<p>I am writing about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield, I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amount of land around the village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the area about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site may which accompanies the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land off Exchange Street - Land west of Market Street - Land off Blackburn Road - Land west of Moorland View <p>ALL IN EDENFIELD.</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the ground that the scale of the plans are far too large for our village and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1782	Jennett	Caldwell			Object	<p>I write about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield - Land west of Market Street, Edenfield - Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield - Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield <p>I object to these proposals because of:</p> <p>a) The scale of the plans are too large, and would alter the character of the village</p> <p>b) We already have problems with heavy traffic and cars with the road not able to cope with the amount coming through.</p> <p>c) By reducing the greenbelt and removing trees etc. the air quality will be affected.</p> <p>d) The infrastructure of the area has been there a long time e.g. Victorian era, and will not cope with the huge amount of houses suggested.</p> <p>E) We have two small excellent schools but they would not cope with extra influx of children, and the quality of their education would be reduced.</p> <p>F) We have no post office, GP services and dentists. Not everyone has transport and local bus services are very poor.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this and I hope more discussions will ensue.</p>		
1783	M	Jones			Object	<p>I am writing about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the Government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the 'Greenbelt' so that it can be built on.</p> <p>The areas about which I am particularly concerned are covered by ref. HS2.71 on the site map that accompanies that Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> : land off Exchange Street Edenfield : land west of Market Street Edenfield : Land off Blackburn Road Edenfield : Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the Plan are FAR TOO LARGE and if carried would ruin the character of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1784	Renee	Shepherd			Object	<p>I am writing to you about the Council's Local Plan, and how it will affect our village. I hear you are planning to ask Government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Green Belt so it can be built on. I am most concerned about the area's which are covered by Ref. HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land off Exchange Street Edenfield - Land west of Market Street Edenfield - Land off Blackburn Road Edenfield - Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield <p>I object to the proposals, that the scale of the plans are far too large and would spoil and ruin our lovely village. I have lived here most of my life, and I hope to stay forever, but not if you build here.</p> <p>The schools cannot take any more children, and the village does not need more traffic on its roads from the extra cars from the houses if where built in our village.</p>		
1786	R	McDonald			Object	<p>I am writing in regard to the Council's Local Plan in respect of the proposed building of housing on greenfield land, Ref. HS2.71. This relates to the plan and site map HS2.71 which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land off Blackburn Road, Edenfield - Land off Market Street, Edenfield - Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield - Land off Moorlands View, Edenfield <p>These proposals are far too large for a village the size of Edenfield, please think again.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1794			The Methodist Church		Not Applicable	<p>1.0 Introduction</p> <p>1.1 We are pleased to submit, on behalf of our client The Methodist Church, representations in relation to the Rossendale Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation (July 2017).</p> <p>1.2 The Methodist Church are promoting land off Exchange Street in Edenfield for residential development. The Development Statement now provided at Appendix A demonstrates how land off Exchange Street represents an available, suitable, achievable and deliverable site for housing. Reference is also made to the fact that this site, along with land to the immediate north, has been identified as a Draft Housing Allocation in the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>1.3 These representations relate to the Council's calculation of development needs and associated land requirements, and set out The Methodist Church's views on the Council's preferred spatial strategy, with reference made to relevant evidence base documents where appropriate.</p> <p>2.0 Response to Individual Policies</p> <p>2.1 We set out below our comments in relation to some of the draft Policies contained within the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt</p> <p>2.2 The Policies Map 2017 (Regulation 18) confirms the intended Urban Boundaries following the proposed revisions to the Green Belt boundary. It is clear that Green Belt release is necessary of Rossendale is to be able to fulfil its development requirements during the plan period and The Methodist Church are fully supportive of the new boundary as it relates to the settlement of Edenfield.</p> <p>2.3 From a Green Belt release perspective, the A56 represents a clear and logical Green Belt boundary preventing further encroachment. With reference to the Green Belt Review, this parcel of land has also been identified as making a weak contribution towards the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and is the only parcel considered suitable for release around the perimeter of Edenfield.</p> <p>2.4 Other elements of the Evidence Base also support the release of Green Belt land in Edenfield, in particular the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) prepared by Lichfields (December 2016). The SHMA clearly points towards the need to accommodate housing growth in the south of the borough and specifically in Edenfield. Affordable Housing needs are also particularly acute in this area of the borough, with Tables 8.2 and 8.3 of the SHMA confirming that the Helmshore & Edenfield sub area has the highest proportion of both existing and newly formed households unable to purchase market housing.</p> <p>2.5 There is insufficient land available within the existing settlement boundary of Edenfield to accommodate this affordable housing need and indeed there is</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>a lack of available and deliverable brownfield opportunity sites across the borough as a whole to meet the overall housing requirement during the plan period. Exceptional Circumstances therefore exist, in line with paragraph 83 of the NPPF, to justify the release of Green Belt in the Borough for development.</p> <p>2.6 The Urban Boundary now proposed around Edenfield is therefore considered to be eminently logical and soundly based as it is fully supported by and responds to the findings of the evidence base, in particular the Green Belt Review and SHMA.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations</p> <p>2.9 The Methodist Church fully support the inclusion of Land off Exchange Street as a Housing Allocation under Policy HS2 (Ref: HS2.71). The identification of this site, along with the land to the north, responds to the need to deliver additional housing in the south of the borough and in Edenfield in particular as identified within the evidence base. However it is considered that this parcel of land is capable of accommodating around 90 dwellings, rather than the 70 dwellings identified in Table 1 and an amendment is requested accordingly.</p> <p>2.10 Footnote 11 to Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework confirms that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing can be delivered within the next 5 years. Land at Exchange Street can be considered deliverable in this context and the reasoned justification for this is now provided.</p> <p>Available</p> <p>2.11 The Exchange Street site is under single ownership. This Statement confirms that the landowner is supportive of development of the site for residential dwellings. The land is not subject to any ransom strips or any covenants that would restrict its development for new housing.</p> <p>2.12 As such, these representations confirm that the site is available.</p> <p>Suitable</p> <p>2.13 The settlement benefits from a range of local facilities and services, as well as frequent public transport connections to nearby higher order settlements. New housing development in the village would help to sustain the existing local community and facilities.</p> <p>2.14 What is more, the site is considered the most suitable site on the edge of Edenfield to deliver new housing. Its close proximity to the village centre means it is within a more sustainable location than other potential housing sites in the south or east of the village, maximising opportunities for new residents to use existing village facilities and provide a boost to the local community. The site is also located in a less sensitive location in terms of landscape impact and the future durability of the Green Belt, as confirmed in the Green Belt Review.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Achievable</p> <p>2.15 The site is not covered by any statutory biodiversity or landscape designations, nor are there any technical factors that would automatically prevent development of the site.</p> <p>2.16 To further confirm the deliverability of the site, a Development Statement has been produced that justifies the inclusion of Land at Exchange Street as a Housing Allocation under Policy HS2 (as part of the wider Housing Allocation ref: HS2.71) and this is provided at Appendix A to this representation.</p> <p>2.17 In addition, CBO Transport have provided specialist highways advice relating to the development of the site for housing and this concludes that the local highway network is capable of accommodating the intended level of housing. This note can be found at Appendix B to this representation and it relates to land at Exchange Street only.</p> <p>3.0 Land at Exchange Street, Edenfield</p> <p>3.1 The Methodist Church are promoting land off Exchange Street for residential development. Further details relating to the site are provided in the Development Statement at Appendix A.</p> <p>3.2 The Development Statement confirms that the site has the capacity to deliver around 90 dwellings. It provides confirmation that the site is available, suitable, achievable and deliverable.</p> <p>3.3 The site forms part of a wider Housing Allocation and The Methodist Church have already begun to work with the other landowners, Taylor Wimpey and Peel Holdings, to ensure that the whole allocation is brought forward in a comprehensive manner. The Methodist Church fully intend to continue working closely with the adjoining landowners, Rossendale Council and other key stakeholders to ensure that the wider allocation is brought forward in the correct manner.</p> <p>3.4 The site is therefore well placed to make a contribution towards the need for additional housing identified Edenfield and Rossendale as a whole. Accordingly, The Methodist Church submit that land off Exchange Street, and indeed the wider parcel of land identified under Draft Policy HS3, is fully justified to be released from the Green Belt and should remain as a Housing Allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Appendix A: Exchange Street, Edenfield – Development Statement October 2017</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The site comprises predominantly greenfield land, with the buildings and grounds of Chatterton Hey care home in its north west corner. The site lies to the immediate north west of the settlement of Edenfield and is surrounded by man-made features on all sides. It is in close proximity to the services and facilities in the centre of the village and would represent a sustainable and logical extension to the existing settlement.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Purpose of this Document</p> <p>This document provides an overview of the technical constraints and opportunities presented by the site and demonstrates that the site is available, suitable, achievable and can therefore be considered deliverable and well placed to contribute towards meeting future housing needs in Rossendale.</p> <p>It demonstrates how with regard to relevant technical and design considerations, the site is able to accommodate approximately 90 dwellings. The remainder of this document is structured as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Location and Description • Planning Context • Green Belt Assessment • Sustainable Location • Deliverable Site • Design Principles • Summary and Conclusions <p>2. SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION</p> <p>The Site</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street (“the site”) lies to the immediate north west of the village of Edenfield. The site comprises part brownfield/ part greenfield land and extends to approximately 5.3 hectares. In the north west corner of the site is a complex of approximately 4 buildings which make up the Chatterton Hey care homes which are managed by the Langley House Trust. A belt of dense woodland surrounds the Chatterton Hey complex. The rest of the site comprises approximately 4.4 hectares of un-used greenfield land.</p> <p>The site is accessed via Exchange Street to the east, which connects to Market Street in the centre of the village. A single lane road extends from the end of Exchange Street providing access to Chatterton Hey care home and this forms the north eastern and northern boundaries of the site. A designated public right of way also runs along this road.</p> <p>To the east of the site, on the other side of the access road, is Edenfield Recreation Ground, east of which is built development comprising a mix of commercial and residential properties fronting onto Exchange Street and Market Street. To the north of the site are pastoral fields and beyond these the A56 dual carriageway.</p> <p>The western boundary of the site is formed by a belt of established woodland, beyond which runs the A56 dual carriageway in a north-south direction.</p> <p>To the south east and south, the site abuts existing residential properties along Eden Avenue, Oaklands Road and Woodland Road. A wooded ditch runs along the southern boundary of the site, to the rear of the adjacent houses and gardens.</p> <p>The site is predominantly grassland, with existing trees and hedgerows mostly limited to the southern boundary around the watercourse, the woodland in</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>the westernmost part of the site and the woodland around the care home. The main part of the site forms a relatively flat plateau before dropping away in the west towards the care home and the A56.</p> <p>Surrounding Area</p> <p>Edenfield is located in the south of the Borough. It is approximately 2 kilometres to the north east of Ramsbottom, and approximately 4 kilometres to the south of the built up area of Helmshore, Haslingden and Rawtenstall. It lies to the east of the M66 which ends at the village and continues northwards as the A56 dual carriageway. The village lies within the Rossendale Valley, with the land rising in the east up to Scout Moor and in the west up to Holcombe Moor. The main built up area of Edenfield lies to the immediate south of the site. The A56 dual carriageway lies to the west of the site, beyond which are further agricultural fields and the River Irwell. To the north of the site are pastoral fields and ribbon development along Market Street leading north out of the village.</p> <p>The Chatterton and Strongstry Conservation Area is located on the other side of the A56 from the site. It is wholly screened from the site by virtue of the dual carriageway and the dense woodland along the site's western boundary. There are no listed buildings or other designated heritage assets on or adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The site lies only approximately 200 metres from the centre of the village. It is therefore easily accessible to the range of local shops and services within Edenfield. This includes several pubs and takeaways, a bakery, a butchers, a barbers, a pharmacy, a newsagents, Parish Church and cricket club. Edenfield Church of England Primary School is located approximately 750 metres walking distance from the site on Market Street. An equipped children's play area and recreational open space (including football pitches) are located adjacent to the site on Exchange Street, both within 200 metres walking distance. Further detail about the proximity of the site to local services and facilities is contained in Section 5.</p> <p>The dwellings adjacent to the site to the south, along Eden Avenue, Oaklands Road and Woodlands Road are a mix of detached, semi-detached and mews properties. These are predominantly two storeys, although there are some bungalows along Eden Avenue.</p> <p>The existing dwellings are a mix of materials including red brick, stone and clay tile roofs.</p> <p>Photos of the site and surrounding area</p> <p>3. POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>Adopted Development Plan</p> <p>The currently adopted Development Plan for the area comprises the Rossendale Core Strategy (2011-2026) which was adopted in November 2011.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>The site is located within the designated Green Belt which tightly surrounds the existing settlement of Edenfield.</p> <p>Emerging Rossendale Local Plan (2019-2034)</p> <p>The Council are currently progressing a new Local Plan (2019-2034) in order to take account of up-to-date evidence on the Borough's growth needs as required by the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework').</p> <p>The Council recently published several evidence base documents prepared to inform the emerging Local Plan. Those of most relevance to the site are considered further below.</p> <p>The regulation 18 consultation of the Draft Local Plan identifies land off Exchange Street as part of a wider housing allocation under Policy HS3. This policy sets out that the site, as part of a wider 26-hectare parcel, has the potential to deliver residential development within the plan period. The accompanying Policies Map 2017 identifies the site, as part of a wider parcel under Housing Allocation HS27.1, capable of delivering 451 homes, of which 70 and be delivered on land at Exchange Street.</p> <p>Extracts from Policies Map 2017</p> <p>Evidence Base</p> <p>Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) December 2016</p> <p>A Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has been produced to provide up-to-date evidence on housing need in the Borough. The SHMA December 2016 was published in June 2017. It recommends that the objectively assessed housing need (OAN) for Rossendale over the upcoming plan period 2014 – 2034 is between 265 to 335 dwellings per annum (dpa).</p> <p>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)</p> <p>The Council also published an updated SHLAA (May 2017) in June 2017. Land off Exchange Street (the site) is identified in the SHLAA under reference SHLAA 16263, having been promoted by the landowner through the Call for Sites exercise. The SHLAA anticipates the site as having capacity for 70 dwellings. The site is identified as being available with no known legal or ownership constraints and both suitable and achievable for housing development. The overall conclusion of the SHLAA was that the site is developable in the medium to long term (within 6 to 10 years, or after 10 years) with the following justification:</p> <p>"The site is available now and can become suitable for development provided that the vehicular access is improved, the potential landscape impacts are mitigated, the woodland area is preserved and the character of the local area is maintained or enhanced. The development is considered viable and considered achievable in the medium to long term."</p> <p>The SHLAA considers the potential constraints to development on the site. The rest of this Statement goes on to provide further detail of these constraints and confirms the achievability of the site, thereby demonstrating there is nothing that would preclude development of the site in the short</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Green Belt Review</p> <p>A review of the Green Belt within the Borough has also been undertaken. The site is assessed as part of wider parcel of land (identified under Parcel ref: 44) which includes the recreation ground to the east, and extends further south than the site to include a wooded strip of land between the A56 and the properties on Oaklands Road.</p> <p>Crucially, the Green Belt Review (GBR) assesses the site as having the potential for release from the Green Belt. It is assessed as making the following contribution towards the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 80 of the Framework.</p> <p>The findings of the GBR are considered in more detail in Section 4.</p> <p>4. GREEN BELT ASSESSMENT</p> <p>The site is currently within the Green Belt which tightly surrounds the existing settlement of Edenfield. A Green Belt review, undertaken in July 2017 to inform the emerging Local Plan, concluded that the site is potentially suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Rossendale Draft Local Plan has gone on to identify a 26 hectare parcel of land, including the Exchange Street site, to the north west of Edenfield, for release from the Green Belt. This section considers the findings of the Green Belt Review in more detail and demonstrates that the site makes an overall limited contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt such that it represents a suitable release for residential development.</p> <p>Paragraph 79 of the Framework establishes that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.</p> <p>Paragraph 80 states that Green Belt serves five purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2. To prevent neighbourhood towns merging into one another; 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>Green Belt Assessment of the Site</p> <p>As set out above, the Green Belt Review (GBR) assesses the site along with the recreational ground to the immediate east together - under the reference 'Parcel 44'. It provides the following overall assessment of the Parcel's contribution towards the five purposes of the Green Belt set out in paragraph 80 of the Framework.</p> <p>Table 4.1: Overall Assessment of Parcel 44 in GBR.</p> <p>Parcel Ref. 44</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas Moderate</p> <p>Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>another Weak</p> <p>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment Weak</p> <p>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns No Contribution</p> <p>Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land n/a*</p> <p>Overall Assessment Medium</p> <p>*all parcels are assessed as making the same contribution towards this purpose</p> <p>The GBR states:</p> <p>“This parcel is adjacent to Edenfield which forms part of the large built up area of Ramsbottom/ Bury...The A56 dual-carriageway defines the western boundary forms a strong barrier feature to prevent the possible outward sprawl of development. The northern boundary of the parcel comprises an access road and dry stone wall and does not form a strong defensible barrier to prevent the outward sprawl of development. The parcel contains little urban development, although the presence of the A56 and adjacent urban edge has weakened the rural character. Its release is unlikely to have substantial negative effect on the function of neighbouring parcels under purpose 3. Releasing this parcel is unlikely to have a substantial negative effect on the integrity of the wider Green Belt.”</p> <p>In Appendix 4.1, the GBR provides the following more detailed commentary of the assessment of the Parcel against each purpose. Having reviewed the GBR, we strongly support its conclusions in respect of the site.</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p> <p>GBR Assessment of Parcel 44</p> <p>This parcel is adjacent to Edenfield which forms part of the large built up area of Ramsbottom/ Bury. There are few urbanising features within the parcel apart from a small cluster of residencies in the north-west. The influence of these urbanising features is limited with the parcel displaying a sense of openness. However, the A56 dual-carriageway defines the western boundary and detracts from the sense of openness in parts.</p> <p>Rating: Moderate Contribution</p> <p>Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>GBR Assessment of Parcel 44</p> <p>This parcel is adjacent to Edenfield and lies directly between Edenfield and Helmshore. At this point the settlements are more than 2km apart with limited intervisibility. The parcel, along with neighbouring parcels forms part of the settlement gap but it is not of critical importance and does not play an essential role in preventing the merging or erosion of the visual and physical gap between these settlements.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Rating: Weak Contribution</p> <p>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>GBR Assessment of Parcel 44</p> <p>There is a sense of encroachment within the parcel as a result of the visual influence the adjoining settlement edge to the east and south and the A56 dual-carriageway which defines the western boundary. The majority of the parcel comprises open farmland and a recreational grounds, it displays some of the characteristics of the open countryside but lacks a strong and intact rural character.</p> <p>Rating: Weak Contribution</p> <p>Purpose 4: To Preserve the Setting and Special Character of Historic Towns</p> <p>GBR Assessment of Parcel 44</p> <p>Digital analysis, based on bare earth height data, indicates that this parcel is theoretically visible from the historic settlement of Ramsbottom. In practice, this parcel has little to no intervisibility with this historic settlement. The openness of the land within the parcel is not considered to be important to its setting or historic significance.</p> <p>Therefore, any new development that took place within the parcel is considered unlikely to affect the special character of this historic settlement.</p> <p>Rating: No Contribution</p> <p>Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p> <p>GBR Assessment of Parcel 44 All parcels make an equally significant contribution to this purpose.</p> <p>The following extract of the GBR demonstrates that Parcel 44 is one of only three sites in Edenfield that are assessed as having the potential for release, all of which lie to the east of the settlement between the existing development and the A56 dual-carriageway.</p> <p>The subsequent identification of this parcel of land as a Housing Allocation can therefore be fully justified.</p> <p>Plan 2: Extract from Green Belt Review showing Parcel 44 having the potential for release.</p> <p>The GBR identifies how, in contrast to Parcel 44, land to the east of Edenfield makes a strong contribution towards Purpose 1 of the Green Belt (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large builtup areas) due to limited urbanising features and a strong sense of openness in this area. Several of the parcels to the east of Edenfield were also assessed as having a greater role to play than Parcel 44 in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment (Purpose 3). This is in view of their relationship with the large area of rising open countryside of Scout Moor and Dearden Moor to the east which have distinctive moorland landscape characteristics.</p> <p>The other two parcels identified as having the potential for release (Parcel 43 and 39) lie to the immediate north of the site, and comprise the wider area of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>land between the built development along Market Street to the east and the A56 dual-carriageway to the west.</p> <p>The GBR then describes how: “The planned release of parcel P44, P43 and P39, in that order, could be perceived as the main block of settlement within Edenfield growing incrementally north and filling the gap between A56 and the linear settlement along Market Street. This could create a stronger Green Belt boundary and settlement edge.”</p> <p>Mitigation Measures For those parcels identified as being potentially suitable for release in Green Belt terms, the GBR also provides an overview of some potential mitigation measures which could be incorporated into development to minimise effects on the wider Green Belt. For Parcel 44, the following potential mitigation measures are suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development within the parcel should be restricted to appropriate and attractive small scale and low-density housing. • New properties should be a maximum of two storeys to minimise the negative impact on the openness of the adjacent Green Belt land. • The belt of mature woodland along the western boundary of the parcel should be retained and enhanced to preserve the visual screen of the A56 and to help screen any new development from Green Belt land to the west. • The existing line of trees should be retained and a framework of new planting along the northern boundary should be developed to soften the appearance of any development from the adjacent Green Belt land to the north. • A new dry stone wall should be built along the minor road which defines part of the northern boundary of the parcel. <p>The Green Belt Review demonstrates that the site makes the most limited contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt when compared with all other Parcels assessed around Edenfield. From a review of the evidence base, it is apparent that Parcel 44 represents the most immediately suitable and sensible site for release from the Green Belt in the short term and therefore its identification for release in the Draf Local Plan is fully justified.</p> <p>5. SUSTAINABLE LOCATION A wide variety of services and facilities are available within a short walking and cycling distance of the site and as a result it is considered to be an entirely sustainable location for new housing.</p> <p>Shops and Services The site is within an easy walking distance of a range of local shops and services being only 200 metres from the centre of the village. Here, a number of amenities are available at the Exchange Street/ Market Street/ Bury Road junction.</p> <p>The site is approximately 1500 metres away from facilities within nearby</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Stubbins, including The Village Chippy and Stubbins Tandoori. It is approximately 3 kilometres from the centre of Ramsbottom which provides a greater range of facilities including a Morrisons supermarket and Tesco Superstore. The centres of the larger settlements of Haslingden and Rawenstall are both approximately 5 kilometres away, just a 20 minute journey via a frequent bus service from the village.</p> <p>Ref: Name of Facility Distance from Site (metres)</p> <p>1 Rostron Arms (Public House) 200</p> <p>2 Valentines Butchers 200</p> <p>3 The Village Barbers 200</p> <p>4 Sixsmith Bakery 200</p> <p>5 My Plaice Fish and Chips 200</p> <p>6 Golden Kitchen Chinese Take Away 220</p> <p>7 The Drop Off Café 300</p> <p>8 Edenfield Mini Market Convenience Store 500</p> <p>9 The Coach at Edenfield 700</p> <p>10 Morrisons Supermarket, Ramsbottom 3000</p> <p>11 Tesco Superstore, Ramsbottom (including ATM) 3000</p> <p>Community Facilities</p> <p>There are a number of community facilities within Edenfield village, including opportunities for outdoor recreation.</p> <p>Further facilities are available in Rawtenstall and Ramsbottom which are within 5 kilometres of the site.</p> <p>Ref: Name of Facility Distance from Site (metres)</p> <p>1 Edenfield Recreation Ground 200</p> <p>2 Children's Play Area 200</p> <p>3 Community Centre 200</p> <p>4 Edenfield Cricket Club 350</p> <p>5 Edenfield Parish Church 800</p> <p>6 Rossendale Golf Club 2500</p> <p>7 Ramsbottom Pool & Fitness Centre 2400</p> <p>Education</p> <p>The site is well located in relation to Edenfield Church of England Primary School which is approximately 800 m away on Market Street.</p> <p>Secondary School provision is available in either nearby Haslingden or Ramsbottom.</p> <p>Ref: Name of Facility Distance from Site (metres)</p> <p>Primary Schools</p> <p>1 Edenfield Church of England Primary School 800</p> <p>2 Ramsbottom Stubbin Primary School 1100</p> <p>3 Peel Brow School, Ramsbottom 3000</p> <p>4 Rossendale School, Ramsbottom 3200</p> <p>5 Rawtenstall Balladen Community Primary School 3500</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Secondary Schools</p> <p>6 Rossendale School, Ramsbottom 3200</p> <p>7 Haslingden High School and Sixth Form 3000</p> <p>8 All Saint's Roman Catholic High School, Rawtenstall 4500</p> <p>Post-16 Education</p> <p>9 Haslingden High School and Sixth Form 3000</p> <p>10 Rossendale School, Ramsbottom 3200</p> <p>11 All Saint's Roman Catholic High School, Rawtenstall 4500</p> <p>Plan 3: Local Facilities in Edenfield</p> <p>Plan 4: Local Facilities further afield</p> <p>Healthcare Provision</p> <p>There are a number of doctors and dentist surgeries in the local area.</p> <p>Ref: Name of Facility Distance from Site (metres)</p> <p>1 Parkhouse Dental Practice, Ramsbottom 2600</p> <p>2 Ramsbottom Health Centre, Ramsbottom 2700</p> <p>3 Bolton Street Dental Practice, Ramsbottom 2800</p> <p>4 Ramsbottom Dental Surgery, Ramsbottom 3000</p> <p>5 Fairmore Medical Practice, Rawtenstall 4600</p> <p>6 Haslingden Health Centre, Haslingden 4700</p> <p>7 Dr F W Moujaes & Partner, Haslingden 4800</p> <p>8 Rossendale Valley Medical Practice, Haslingden 4800</p> <p>Public Transport</p> <p>The site is within 400 metres of bus stops on Market Street that are served by the 482/483 service providing multiple services each hour to nearby Rawtenstall, Bacup and further afield to Burnley and Bury. The stops are also served by the 273 which provides services to Rawtenstall, Ramsbottom and Bolton and the 892 which goes to Rawtenstall, Ramsbottom, Greenmount and Tottington.</p> <p>The site is well located within walking distance of a range of local services and facilities and with access to good public transport links. It is therefore in a suitable and sustainable location for new housing.</p> <p>6. DELIVERABLE SITE</p> <p>Footnote 11 to Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework confirms that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing can be delivered within the next 5 years. Land at Exchange Street can be considered deliverable in this context and the reasoned justification for this is now provided.</p> <p>Available</p> <p>The entire site is under single ownership. This Statement confirms that the landowner is supportive of development of the site for residential dwellings. The land is not subject to any ransom strips or any covenants that would restrict its development for new housing.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>As such, these representations confirm that the site is available.</p> <p>Suitable</p> <p>The settlement benefits from a range of local facilities and services, as well as frequent public transport connections to nearby higher order settlements. New housing development in the village would help to sustain the existing local community and facilities. The sustainable location of the site, within close walking distance to the centre of the village has been considered in Section 5.</p> <p>The suitability of the site for residential development in terms of relevant physical characteristics and constraints is set out below.</p> <p>What is more, the site is considered the most suitable site on the edge of Edenfield to deliver new housing. Its close proximity to the village centre means it is within a more sustainable location than other potential housing sites, maximising opportunities for new residents to use existing village facilities and provide a boost to the local community. As described in Section 5, the Green Belt Review identifies how the site is also located in a less sensitive location in terms of landscape impact and the future durability of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Land to the east of Edenfield has a strong sense of openness and a greater role to play in checking urban sprawl and safeguarding from encroachment.</p> <p>Achievable</p> <p>The following is a summary of the technical factors associated with development of the site.</p> <p>It can be confirmed that there are no physical constraints which would prevent the site from coming forward for housing in a manner which would respond appropriately to the site's constraints and context.</p> <p>Access and Highways</p> <p>CBO Transport Consultants have been commissioned to advise on the potential for residential development at the site. The existing access to the site is currently via Exchange Street. Lancashire County Council (LCC) Highways records show Exchange Street is adopted meaning that the public highway can be extended into the site without constraint from third party ownerships. The existing carriageway width on Exchange Street is 5.5 metres which is a standard width for a residential road and would pose no constraint to the proposed development of the site. There is an existing footway along the south side of Exchange Street which provides pedestrian connectivity between the site and the village centre. This existing footway is 1.3 metres in width which is considered sufficient to serve the proposed development.</p> <p>The assessment undertaken by CBO Transport Consultants has found that a safe and suitable access can be achieved to the site to serve the proposed development of 90 dwellings.</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>Given the vegetation on the main part of the site is limited to grassland, the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>majority of habitats to be found here are likely to be common and of limited value. The existing trees and woodland do however provide opportunities for wildlife. The SHLAA states that about 1 hectare of the woodland is identified as Stepping Stone Habitat for woodland. The woodland and the majority of trees will be retained and incorporated as part of any future development. The site lies within the Impact Risk Zones of the Hodge Clough SSSI (approximately 1000 metres to the north west) and the Lower Red Lees (approximately 2 kilometres to the south west). These SSSI's are separated from the site by the River Irwell and the M66/A56 such that there is very limited connectivity between the site and these habitats.</p> <p>Overall, given the nature and location of the site, there are not anticipated to be any overriding constraints to its development in terms of ecology and development on the site can come forward in a manner which provides appropriate mitigation and biodiversity enhancements in line with local and national policy.</p> <p>Arboriculture</p> <p>Existing vegetation on the site is limited predominantly to the boundaries – with several mature trees lining the southern boundary of the site along the stream. An area of dense woodland surrounds the buildings and grounds of Chatterton Hey in the north western corner of the site.</p> <p>It is anticipated that existing trees and woodland will be retained and incorporated into the scheme and will play an important role in screening the new development from the surrounding existing properties and softening its visual impact in the surrounding area. Opportunities to enhance the green infrastructure on site will also be provided through a careful landscape led approach to design such that there will be an overall net gain in vegetation on the site.</p> <p>Landscape Character Impact</p> <p>In order to inform the preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (Local Plan Part 2), the Council commissioned the 'Lives and Landscapes Assessment' (July 2015) to appraise the landscape sensitivity of sites within the Borough. Whilst the Local Plan Part 2 was subsequently withdrawn in February 2016 to focus efforts on producing the New Local Plan, it is still considered relevant to have some regard to the findings of this Assessment as the Council's latest evidence on landscape impact.</p> <p>The 'Lives and Landscapes Assessment' (July 2015) assesses the site as part of a much wider parcel which comprises all the land between the north western edge of the existing settlement and the A56 dual-carriageway. The parcel is identified as being within the 8b Irwell Valley south Settled Valley Landscape Character Area. The Assessment divides it into 4 areas – A to D, with the site identified as 'Area D'.</p> <p>The Assessment recognises that Area D is less visible than the more open land to the north by reason of the existing vegetation. It describes how the site</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>could be 'developed sensitively and incorporated successfully into the village boundary', concluding that the site is suitable for development with mitigation.</p> <p>The site was one of the few sites in the village to be assessed as being 'developable with mitigation', with the majority of other potential housing land considered to be 'undevelopable' with regard to landscape character impact.</p> <p>Flood Risk and Drainage</p> <p>The entire site is located within Flood Risk Zone 1 with reference to the Environment Agency flood maps. Residential development would therefore be entirely acceptable in line with national guidance on flood risk. There is a watercourse running along the southern boundary of the site but this does not present a flood risk. It is anticipated that adequate drainage for the site could be designed in a manner which utilises the natural topography of the site.</p> <p>Utilities</p> <p>There are no power lines or public sewers crossing the site to act as a constraint to development. It is anticipated that residential development on the site will be able to connect to the existing utilities networks which serve the area. Further investigations and enquiries would reveal any improvement works or on site provision deemed necessary.</p> <p>A review of technical considerations has confirmed that there are no physical characteristics or other constraints that would prevent the delivery of housing at the site. Overall, it is demonstrated that the site is available, suitable, achievable and therefore deliverable.</p> <p>7. DESIGN PRINCIPLES</p> <p>An Indicative Masterplan has been produced by Broadway Malyan on behalf of The Methodist Church to demonstrate how the site could be delivered for residential development in a manner which responds appropriately to the specific opportunities and constraints of the site and integrates itself into the surrounding area.</p> <p>Context of the Surrounding Area</p> <p>The site is located to the immediate north west of the existing settlement of Edenfield. The boundaries of the site are clearly defined by the access road along the northern and eastern boundaries, and the established woodland and strong boundary of the A56 to the west. Along the southern boundary, separated from the site by a watercourse and belt of trees, are the rear gardens of properties along Eden Avenue, Woodlands Road and Oaklands Road.</p> <p>Whilst responding to the architecture of the adjacent existing development, it is important that development of the site respects the rural character of Edenfield and the edge of settlement location of the site.</p> <p>The dwellings adjacent to the site to the south, along Eden Avenue, Oaklands</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>Road and Woodlands Road are a mix of detached, semi-detached and mews properties. These are predominantly two storeys, although there are some bungalows along Eden Avenue.</p> <p>The existing dwellings are a mix of materials including red brick, stone and clay tile roofs. Older stone properties are located along Exchange Street and Market Street.</p> <p>Semi-detached Houses on Eden Avenue</p> <p>Terraced houses on Exchange Street</p> <p>Plan 5: Site characteristics</p> <p>Site Considerations</p> <p>Architects Broadway Malyan have undertaken an analysis of the physical characteristics of the site and identified the opportunities and constraints which will be important considerations in the design of the development. These are shown on the Site Analysis Plan below.</p> <p>The following physical features will be important considerations when establishing the design principles for the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees and Hedgerows. There are existing areas of woodland around the buildings of the Chatterton Hey care home and in a belt along the western and southern boundaries of the site. These trees offer important buffers to visually screen the development from the adjacent A56, the existing Chatterton Hey care home and the residential properties to the south. The woodland will also mitigate against noise from the A56. Accordingly, the existing trees on site should be retained as far as possible and integrated into a green infrastructure network. • Ecology. The trees on and adjacent to the site could provide habitats for some species, including birds and bats. The watercourse along the southern boundary could also provide some value for wildlife. These features should be retained and enhanced where possible. • Relationship with adjacent properties. The development must be carefully designed to respect the adjacent residential properties and ensure the amenity of existing neighbours is preserved. • Topography. The main part of the site forms a plateau which falls away towards the southern and western boundaries of the site. Development should be designed to work with the natural topography of the site. • Connectivity to village centre. The site is located in close proximity to the local facilities in the centre of Edenfield and good pedestrian connectivity is crucial to maximise this sustainable location. The site also presents the opportunity to relate positively to the adjacent Recreation Ground. • Relationship with Chatterton Hey care home. <p>The development must be designed to ensure compatibility with the adjacent care home.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship with wider countryside. <p>Development needs to respect and preserve the rural character of the village</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>and minimise any landscape visual or character impact ensuring strong and durable Green Belt boundaries for the future.</p> <p>Indicative Masterplan</p> <p>The design principles shown on the Indicative Masterplan and how they respond positively to the context of the site and surrounding area can be described as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing trees and areas of woodland are retained and new landscaped greenspace is proposed to soften the development ensuring a rural feel, and bolster the buffer between the new housing and existing residents to the south and the care home in the north west. This is in line with the suggested mitigation measures for the site in the 'Lives and Landscapes Assessment' (July 2015). • As well as providing character and visual screening, these areas of landscaping will also provide opportunities for ecological mitigation and enhancement and for Sustainable Urban Drainage systems including swales and ponds. • At a density of approximately 25 dwellings per hectare, the proposals are for a relatively low-density development of two-storey dwellings. This is in line with the suggested mitigation measures in the Green Belt Review (November 2016) and will soften the visual impact on the adjacent Green Belt land. • The primary access to the site forms a continuation of Exchange Street and leads into a primary route which loops through the site. This design approach helps achieve permeability in the layout. • Opportunities to maximise pedestrian connectivity are also shown on the Masterplan, with an improved pedestrian link suggested to Woodland Road helping to integrate the development with the rest of the village. • The existing access road to Chatterton Hey is retained providing a clearly defined edge to the new development and a new durable Green Belt boundary. This can be reinforced by careful boundary treatment, in line with the recommended mitigation measures of the Green Belt Review (November 2016) which envisages a dry stone wall along this boundary. • Development of approximately 90 dwellings is arranged in parcels with important frontages identified. Careful design will be essential to ensure a development which is legible, has an attractive sense of place and most of all is in keeping with and adds to the existing character of Edenfield. <p>Emerging Masterplan for the wider allocation</p> <p>Following the identification of the wider parcel of land to the north as a Draft Housing Allocation under policy HS3, a comprehensive masterplan for the whole allocation is to be produced that builds upon the principles established here.</p> <p>Pedestrian and cycle connections are to be provided to the immediate north and into the recreation area to the east in order that development of the site</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>fully integrates itself into the proposed wider allocation.</p> <p>The Indicative Masterplan demonstrates how appropriate mitigation measures can be incorporated to achieve a sensitive development which would be experienced as a natural extension to the existing settlement with limited harm caused to the wider landscape character or purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Plan 6: Proposed indicative masterplan</p> <p>8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street represents a sustainable, logical opportunity for housing development on the edge of Edenfield. It is ideally placed to contribute towards meeting local housing needs in the village and across Rossendale as a whole.</p> <p>The site is being actively promoted by the landowners and is considered capable of delivering around 90 new homes in a manner which responds positively to the context of the site and surrounding area.</p> <p>This Development Statement has demonstrated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land off Exchange Street is well related to the existing settlement of Edenfield and its development will form a natural extension to the village. • The site is in a highly sustainable location, within 800 metres walking distance to the majority of local facilities in the village centre including Edenfield Primary School, a convenience store, several pubs and a butchers and bakers. • Frequent public transport to the nearby larger settlements of Ramsbottom, Helmshore and Rawtenstall is also accessible from the site. • The Council's Green Belt Review (November 2016) has found that the site makes a relatively limited contribution towards the five purposes for including land within the Green Belt set out in paragraph 80 of the Framework. From a review of the evidence base, it is apparent this is a suitable and sensible site for release from the Green Belt. • The Council's Draft Local Plan (July 2017) has identified the site for potential release from the Green Belt (Policy HS3) and has allocated the site, as part of a wider Housing Allocation (ref HS2.71). • There are no physical or other technical constraints which would prevent the development of the site for housing. • The Indicative Masterplan establishes key design principles which would ensure the development responds positively to its context – preserving the existing woodland on site, protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents and achieving a durable new boundary to the surrounding Green Belt. The emerging masterplan for the wider housing allocation will enforce that this site is fully integrated into the development proposed to the north, building upon these key principles. <p>Land off Exchange Street represents a sustainable, logical opportunity for housing development on the edge of Edenfield. It is ideally placed to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>contribute towards meeting local housing needs in the village and across Rossendale as a whole.</p> <p>The site is being actively promoted by the landowners and is considered capable of delivering around 90 new homes in a manner which responds positively to the context of the site and surrounding area.</p> <p>It has been demonstrated that the site is eminently suitable for release from the Green Belt and should be allocated for housing in the new Local Plan. The site is available, suitable, achievable and therefore a deliverable site, capable of facilitating new homes in the short term.</p> <p>Please see appendix.</p> <p>Appendix B: Highways Note prepared by CBO Transport</p> <p>1 Introduction</p> <p>1.1 CBO Transport (CBO) has been commissioned to advise on the potential for residential development on land at Exchange Street, Edenfield. The location of the site is shown in Figure 1 and the Title Plan is shown in Appendix A. We have been to site to inspect the local road network and the access arrangements to the site.</p> <p>1.2 The land appears to have been undeveloped and forms the grounds of a large house which we understand is owned and used by the Methodist Church. We understand the site has the potential to accommodate about 90 dwellings.</p> <p>1.3 Access to the site is currently from a continuation of Exchange Street as shown on the Title Plan. Exchange Street is a residential road and forms part of an area of residential development located to the south west of Edenfield village centre. The area of residential development has two points of access to the wider highway network, via Exchange Street on the B6527 Market Street and via Eden Avenue on the A680 Bolton Road North.</p> <p>1.4 The A680 Bolton Road North links with the A56 at the junction at the north end of the M66. There is no access to the motorway heading southbound but most traffic from Edenfield heading south to Greater Manchester would use this junction. Similarly traffic heading north to Rawtenstall and the East Lancashire towns would use this junction.</p> <p>2 Accessibility of the Site</p> <p>2.1 The site is located to the west of Edenfield village centre. There are local services in the village centre which would be about a 400m walk distance to the western most parts of the site and closer to the eastern sections. There is a primary school to the north of the village.</p> <p>2.2 There are bus stops in the village centre which provide services every 15 minutes to Bury and Ramsbottom to the south and Rawtenstall and Backup to the north.</p> <p>2.3 In the context of a large village location the site is in an accessible location and suitable in transport terms for residential development.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>3 The Local Road Network</p> <p>3.1 Exchange Street runs east west from the village centre to the site access. It is a residential street with a relatively high level of on street parking. Most of this parking is associated with frontage property but it appears to be also used for parking for the village centre. Photo 1 shows Exchange Street looking west towards the site from close to the junction with Market Street. Photo 2 shows Exchange Street looking east from the site access.</p> <p>3.2 There are no waiting at any time (double yellow lines) in the vicinity of the junction between Exchange Street and Market Street meaning the on street parking does not impede traffic at the junction. The junction corner radii at the junction are relatively small and visibility onto Market Street is limited. That said the junction is consistent with the village centre environment and there have been no injury accidents at the junction in the past five years.</p> <p>3.3 At the eastern end there are footways on both sides of Exchange Street but at the western end there is only a footway on its southern side.</p> <p>3.4 Photo 2 shows the junction between Exchange Street and Highfield Road which is some 30m to the east of the site access. Highfield Road is also a residential road and provides a link to Eden Avenue which in turn provides access to the A680. Photo 3 also shows the junction between Exchange Street and Highfield Road looking south along Highfield Road. There is less on street parking on the northern section of Highfield Road but closer to the junction with Eden Avenue the level of on street parking intensifies.</p> <p>3.5 Eden Avenue is also a residential road with some on street parking. Both Highfield Road and Eden Avenue have footways on both sides of the road.</p> <p>3.6 The junction between Eden Avenue and the A680 also has tight corner radii and visibility is restricted to a degree by frontage walls and on street parking. There have however been no injury accidents at the junction in the past 5 years. There have also been no injury accidents within the residential area formed by Exchange Street, Highfield Road and Eden Avenue.</p> <p>3.7 The 30m section of Exchange Street between the Highfield Road junction and the site access only provides access to the site – there is no access to any other property from this section of road. As such this section of road has been somewhat neglected and there appears to be no footway on either side of the road and the carriageway appears to narrow as it approaches the boundary wall of the site. Photo 4 shows the site access and the access road narrowing as it passes through the boundary wall of the site.</p> <p>3.8 On close inspection however there is evidence of a former footway on the south side of the road as shown in Photo 5, where there is an old back of footway edging kerb just visible.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>3.9 This is an unusual section of road which could potentially be not or only partially adopted. To understand to what degree this could effect a future residential access to the site it was necessary to understand the extent of adoption. In this context the adopted highway details have been obtained from Lancashire County Council and these are shown in Appendix B.</p> <p>3.10 The plan shows that this section of road is adopted and that the unmaintained footway on the southern side of the road is included within the adopted highway. The line of adoption extends to the boundary wall of the site and therefore includes the section of unmaintained carriageway in front of the wall.</p> <p>3.11 The existing site access runs through a gap in the boundary wall and serves the existing buildings on the northwest corner of the site. The access track is not adopted but it does form a public footpath which runs along the eastern and northern boundaries of the site. The track and public footway extend to the north of the buildings and cross the A56 on a narrow bridge. The road over the bridge is not adopted and therefore the access via Exchange Street is the only existing connection to the public highway.</p> <p>4 Access Opportunities</p> <p>4.1 The extent of adoption on Exchange Street means that the public highway can be extended into the site without constraint from third party ownerships.</p> <p>4.2 The existing carriageway width of Exchange Street is some 5.5m wide (as measured on site) which is standard width for a residential road and would pose no constraint to the development capacity of the site. The normal assumption is that at least 100 units can be served from a residential road of this width without an emergency access (many authorities would accept a lot more than 100) and that with an emergency connection a 5.5m wide road can serve a lot more.</p> <p>4.3 There is only a footway on the south side of Exchange Street. This is not considered to represent a constraint to the capacity of the site. Even with 90 units on the site this would be a very lightly trafficked section of road and therefore requiring some pedestrians to cross the road to use the footway would not be a material road safety concern.</p> <p>4.4 The Plan in Appendix C shows the principle of extending Exchange Street into the site to provide access to a potential residential development. Footways could be provided on both sides of the road within the site with a crossing point provided in the vicinity of the site boundary to access the existing footway on the southern side of Exchange Street.</p> <p>4.5 As there are no other points of contact with the adopted highway the use of the existing access represents the most straight forward approach to providing access to the site and based on the above would not represent a constraint to the capacity of the site. The only other option would be to acquire frontage property on Eden Avenue on the southern boundary of the site and provide an access to Eden Avenue although based on the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>above analysis this is clearly not necessary.</p> <p>4.6 It would of course not be possible to provide an access to the A56 even if the western boundary of the site was contiguous with the highway boundary.</p> <p>4.7 A development of 90 units would generate about 35 trips in the peak direction during the busiest hours (out from the site in the morning and returning in the evening). There are some constraints in the local network as referenced above, including the level of on street parking on parts of the local road network and the visibility constraints at the Exchange Street / Market Street junction and the Eden Avenue / A680 junction.</p> <p>4.8 However these roads and junctions provide access to a notable area of residential development already without an identified road safety issue - there are no recorded accidents on the local roads or at the two junctions – and the level of trip generation from 90 houses is unlikely to materially change this.</p> <p>4.9 In terms of restricted visibility at the junctions is also worth noting that research presented in Manual for Streets 2 did not find a direct link between visibility provision at priority junctions and safety. It questions the view that visibility levels below current guidance levels are immediately a safety concern and notes that the where drivers and cyclists on the main road have good forward visibility to vehicles using the side road (as is the case at both these junctions) they can adjust accordingly.</p> <p>5 Photos</p> <p>6 Summary</p> <p>6.1 CBO Transport (CBO) has been commissioned to advise on the potential for residential development on land at Exchange Street, Edenfield. The site has capacity for 90 units.</p> <p>6.2 In the context of a large village location the site is in an accessible location and suitable in transport terms for residential development.</p> <p>6.3 Access to the site is currently from a continuation of Exchange Street. This section of road has been somewhat neglected and there appears to be no footway on either side of the road and the carriageway appears to narrow as it approaches the boundary wall of the site. There is however evidence of a former footway on the south side of the road.</p> <p>6.4 LCC records show this section of road is adopted including the unmaintained footway on the southern side of the road and section of unmaintained carriageway in front of the boundary wall.</p> <p>6.5 The extent of adoption on Exchange Street means that the public highway can be extended into the site without constraint from third party ownerships.</p> <p>6.6 The existing carriageway width on Exchange Street is 5.5m. This would not present a constraint to the development capacity of the site.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
						<p>6.7 The single sided footway on Exchange Street is not considered to represent a constraint to development. Even with 90 units on the site this would be a very lightly trafficked section of road and requiring some pedestrians to cross the road to use the footway would not be a material road safety concern.</p> <p>6.8 There are no other points of contact with the adopted highway. Other than the extension of Exchange Street into the site the only other realistic access option would be to acquire frontage property on Eden Avenue on the southern boundary of the site and provide an access to Eden Avenue. On the basis of the above analysis this is clearly not necessary. It would of course not be possible to provide an access to the A56 even if the western boundary of the site was contiguous with the highway boundary.</p> <p>6.9 A development of 90 units would generate about 35 trips in the peak direction during the busiest hours (out from the site in the morning and returning in the evening). There are some constraints in the local network but with a trip generation of this level these are unlikely to restrict the development capacity of the site.</p> <p>Figure 1 Site Location Appendix A: Title Plan Appendix B: LCC Adoption Plan Appendix C: In Principle Access Arrangement Appendix C: Joint Statement prepared by The Methodist Church, Taylor Wimpey and Peel Holdings in respect of Policy HS3 and associated Opportunities and Constraints Plan</p> <p>Please see appendix.</p>		
1795	S	Gorton			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on. These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land west of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1796	M	Robinson			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land west of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		
1797	P	Gorton			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land west of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		
1798	R	Sleeth			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land west of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1799	Andrea M	Sleeth			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land west of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our village.</p>		
1800	Colin	Swift			Object	<p>I write about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are proposing to ask the government to remove large amounts of land from the Greenbelt around the village so that it can be built on.</p> <p>The areas listed below are the ones I am particularly concerned about and are covered by your Reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange St. Edenfield Land west of Market St. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield Land west of Moorlands View Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of what is proposed is far too large and would ruin the character of the village.</p>		
1801	M	Jarvis			Object	<p>I write about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our beautiful village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield. Land west of Market Street. Edenfield Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield. land west of Moorlands view. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our beautiful village.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.071	Further comment
1803	P	Jarvis			Object	<p>I write about the Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our beautiful village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the plan;</p> <p>Land off Exchange Street, Edenfield.</p> <p>Land west of Market Street. Edenfield</p> <p>Land off Blackburn Rd. Edenfield.</p> <p>land west of Moorlands view. Edenfield</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans are far too large and if carried out would ruin the character of our beautiful village.</p>		
1817		Anonymous			Object	<p>I write about Council's Local Plan and how it will affect Edenfield. I understand that you are planning to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around our village from the Greenbelt so that it can be built on.</p> <p>These are the areas about which I am particularly concerned and are covered by reference HS2.71 on the site map which accompanies the Plan;</p>		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>EDENFIELD – HS2:71 – Each land parcel should be linked to provide maximum permeability in accordance with Manual for Streets and should it be brought forward piece meal it must be designed to enable future extension.</p> <p>HS2.71 (a) Land north of Blackburn Road – Access and visibility splay onto BB Road appears achievable. Design should futureproof site for further development to the north. Improvements at Pinfold junction to include signalised pedestrian provision and changes to speed limit on Blackburn Road are necessary.</p> <p>HS2.71 (b) Land south of Blackburn Road – Access and visibility splay onto BB Road appears achievable. Improvements at Pinfold junction to include signalised pedestrian provision and changes to speed limit on Blackburn Road are necessary.</p> <p>HS2.71 (c) Land east of Market Street (Mushroom Farm) – Site access between Horse & Jockey and 115 Market Street appears achievable. Consideration for existing on-street parking generated by residents of Market Street should be made and off-street parking created within the site should be provided if necessary.</p> <p>HS2.71 (d) Land north of Exchange Street – access to Market Street (north of Horse and Jockey) via land parcel (c) is required together with secondary access from Exchange Street and Highfield Road to Bolton Road North. The mini roundabout at the junction of Market Street and Rochdale Road, Bury Road will be assessed in the highway capacity study.</p>		
Number of comments					HS2.071	818		
Reference		HS2.072		Croft End, Stubbins				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.072	Further comment
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16273	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -	-	

Number of comments HS2.072

1

Reference HS2.073 Land off Wood Lane, Edenfield

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.073	Further comment
270	Stephen	Terry	-		Object	This whole plan is unacceptable as the scale of the development and the number of houses proposed would radically change the character of Edenfield village		Hi, I am a resident of Edenfield and have been horrified to find out about the development proposals to add around 500 new 'units' or homes to our village, as it will destroy the village as we know it and much of the Greenbelt land that generations of residents to Edenfield and surrounding communities have enjoyed. I also do not see any proposals to help the local schools cope with the extra influx of pupils or any plans to deal with the extra traffic this will inevitably cause. Also the ecological impact will be devastating and irreversible! With the land in question being used by Dear that I see on a regular basis as well as other wildlife such as birds of prey As well as the destruction of plants and trees that provide the community with a much need link to nature. The only reason I can see that this development is even being considered is so the council can make money off selling the land and then continue to reap the extra revenue of extra council tax payments with no consideration to the current residents of the village or the future of the community this development will destroy. Regards,

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.073	Further comment
338	Janine	Hartley	-		Object	<p>I object to the sheer scale of development proposed for Edenfield, particularly the sites mentioned above. - I understand that Edenfield has been chosen as the main site for new housing in Rossendale, due to its perceived desirability. However, this desirability is largely due to the fact that the area is not overcrowded or dominated by housing. Should these plans go ahead, this will no longer be the case. - I firmly believe that these proposed plans would have a radical, detrimental effect upon the character of Edenfield. It is a small village and simply will not cope with such a vast amount of new housing.</p> <p>Letter received 18/09/2017: I write about the Council's Local Plan. It is my understanding that you plan to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around Edenfield from the Greenbelt, so that it can be built on. I am particularly concerned about the following areas: Land south of Wood Lane Land west of Market Street Land off Exchange Street Land off Blackburn Road Land west of Moorlands View These are covered by references HS2.73 and HS2.71 in the local plan I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans is too large. If carried out, these plans would ruin the character of our village and put unmanageable pressure upon schools and health services in the area. While I understand that there is a need for additional housing in Rossendale, I feel it is unfair that Edenfield should be singled out as the primary area for this, particularly as it is such a small village, which would suffer significantly under such wide-scale change</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.073	Further comment
349	Jonathan	Casey	-		Object	<p>My objection is to the scale of development proposed for Edenfield. - I understand that the area has been singled out as the main site for new housing in Rossendale, because of the desirability of housing in Edenfield. - In my opinion, this desirability is largely due to the fact that the area is not overpopulated and has a significant amount of green belt land, which comprises unspoilt scenery. Should the proposed plans go ahead, this would be ruined. This would destroy the character of Edenfield (as it is only a small village to begin with) and would reduce the value and desirability of housing in the area. - There would also be a detrimental impact upon schools, dentists and GP services in the area, as the village simply isn't large enough to cope with such a sudden increase in its population. - -</p> <p>##### LETTER COMMENTS #####</p> <p>I write about the Council's Local Plan. It is my understanding that you plan to ask the government to remove large amounts of land around Edenfield from the Greenbelt, so that it can be built on.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the following areas:</p> <p>Land south of Wood Lane Land west of Market Street Land off Exchange Street Land off Blackburn Road Land west of Moorlands View</p> <p>These are covered by references HS2.73 and HS2.71 in the local plan</p> <p>I object to these proposals on the grounds that the scale of the plans is too large. If carried out, these plans would ruin the character of our village and put unmanageable pressure upon schools and health services in the area. While I understand that there is a need for additional housing in Rossendale, I feel it is unfair that Edenfield should be singled out as the primary area for this, particularly as it is such a small village, which would suffer significantly under such wide-scale change</p>		
642	Eileen	Hinson	-		Object	<p>My objections are based on the following: - - 1) Site location & issues with additional car movements. Edenfield is already suffering from the large number of cars and lorries travelling through it which would be exacerbated by new housing development - - 2) Use of Green Belt when there remain significant areas of brown land</p>		No
904	Rosemary	Trippier			Object	<p>there is too much traffic in the village already we dont need to add to it</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.073	Further comment
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16270	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.073	Further comment
1018	Paul	Turnbull	Turnbull Prints Ltd		Support	<p>On behalf of the land owners we support the allocation of this site for residential development. - The site, due to its location, does not serve any of the purposes ascribed to Greenbelt as outlined in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The site also already has had the the benefit of a planning permission permission for redevelopment (2004/513) which established the suitability of the site for residential use. There is acknowledged local need to see the site brought back into use. - The land owners are committed to bringing this site forward for development within the 1-5 year period, not the 6-11 year period suggested in the SHLAA. To assist in this process the land owners have already commissioned surveys and reports including: - Highways report and access design; Topographical survey; Ecological survey; Architect layout design and site masterplan - The site can accommodate between 30 and 35 units. - The site is adjacent to SHLAA site 16270. The proposed allocation of this adjoining site for development will allow for the simpler and more effective redevelopment of both sites. In particular the possibility of creating an alternative access to Edenwood Mill will give greater flexibility over the future design response to the mill site and remove one of the main constraints identified in the SHLAA site assessment . There are practical benefits in developing proposals which deal with certain technical matters which affect both sites such as drainage, access and services. It is most likely that the sites would come forward together in the 1-5 year period. - The extent of the brownfield element of the site is incorrectly shown on the proposed HS2.73 site designation. The extent of the previously developed land is much greater and includes the mill pond, outbuildings and hardstanding areas. An initial assessment of the site potential shows it can accommodate up to 30 units. The site area plan needs to be corrected to include all the PDL, and the number of units increasing to match the potential 25-30 units supported both the site area and the previous consent. A separate plan has been provided to show the correct extent of the site and has been sent via email - The site is deliverable, available and suitable for new housing and it's allocation for housing would result in new homes being built on site early in the plan period. The principle of at least 25 units on the site has already been established by the previous consent.</p> <p>Please see map in appendix.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.073	Further comment
1020	Liz	Faulkner	-		Support	<p>On behalf of the land owners we support the allocation of this site for residential development. - The site, due to its location, does not now serve any of the purposes ascribed to Greenbelt as outlined in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The site location (following the completion of the road network) means that its allocation as greenbelt is now totally inappropriate. The site also already has the benefit of a full planning permission for redevelopment of part of the site for stables. - The land owners are committed to bringing this site forward for development within the 1-5 year period. To assist in this process the land owners have already commissioned surveys and reports including: - Highways report and access design - Topographical survey - Ecological survey - Architect layout design and site masterplan - The site is relatively level, easily developed and can be accessed without any major infrastructure alterations from Wood Lane. - The site can accommodate between 17 and 25 units. - The site is adjacent to the derelict Edenwood Mill (SHLAA 16271) which has a historic planning consent for redevelopment. The allocation of site SHLAA 16270 will allow for creation of links between Edenwood Mill and the site, allowing for the simpler and more effective redevelopment of both parcels. In particular the possibility of creating an alternative access to Edenwood Mill will give greater flexibility over the future design response to the complex mill site. This benefit in delivering the wider site redevelopment should weigh heavily in favour of the site's forward allocation for development. The site can however be developed independently of Edenwood Mill if required, being accessed directly off Wood Lane. - The site is deliverable, available and suitable for new housing and its allocation for housing would result in new homes being built on site early in the plan period -</p>		
1415	Simon	Parker	-		Object	<p>The proposed building of homes in Edenfield would cause the village and surrounding area to be in gridlock. The roads through and around Edenfield are currently most difficult to use at most times of the day and at the start of school and end of school they are even worse. Edenfield has not got the capacity for any more houses. The roads are not capable carrying any more traffic</p>		
1468	Melanie	Goedhart	-		Object	<p>Edenfield Village will be changed from a country village into a sprawling housing estate. Greenland should be left as Greenland otherwise what makes this area so beautiful will be destroyed. - The traffic is currently busy and this amount of extra housing will cause gridlock around the roads leading to the M66 and the by pass. - Travel times to Manchester have doubled since I moved into the area 20 years ago. - - Parking on the main rd in Edenfield is already an issue for the current residents with cars parked on both sides of the rd. - The Rostron Arms has even installed a paying car park! - There are not enough schools or GP surgeries to accommodate such a large amount of new houses. - - I am amazed and appalled that this new building development is even being considered</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.073	Further comment
1641	Bob	Crawford			Object	<p>I write to object to the development of the above parcels of land within Townsendfold and Edenfield on the basis of the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •At a high level the core strategy plan maked reference in the 2010 consultation of the importance of the development of a rail commuter link to Manchester and the current core strategic objective number 1, SO1-makes reference to public transport improvements; •Both of these aspects therefore have to be considered vital to the sustainable development of the area; •By developing the land parcel within Townsendfold/Edenfield we immediately reduce at best or even potentially remove any future option for the communication corridor alongside the M66 to be able to accept a tramline or trainline enhance commuter system; •This strategic level error also does not support other strategic objectives such as S07-enhancement/protection of natural environment- we destroy the natural environment by developing houses on greenbelt land-removing soil/habitat/biodiversity which is vital to the ecosystem should we build on these landbanks; •We also do not include narrative that states we will deliver "no net loss of biodiversity" in the acceptance criteria for developments-therefore the commitment to such aspects in the plan is simply not strong enough or indeed well aligned between strategy and implementation plans; and •The plan states that we have 122 hectares (2008)-which is obviously not been fully developed in the period. The document states states some 300 brownfield sites have been considered but many have significant constraints (no details are supplied),which I consider to be insufficient information; and •By way of background I work for a business that deals with Sustainable Development (SD) and if we accepted such aspects without bringing new ideas and innovation to such projects on how to overcome the constraints, we would have no business. <p>I would suggest that the Council fully address such aspects in relation to the brownfield area before any amount of area of greenfield land is considered-no matter what pressure is on to provide additional affordable homes.</p> <p>I would equally suggest that the issues indicated with the current housing stock be tackled-even if it means private business money to improve the energy/carbon/quality aspect of the stock before more affordable homes are built. It is simple too easy to build more and not face the problem, head on. There are businesses out there that would consider funding and delivering such projects should the Council seek dialogue.</p> <p>I hope the feedback is considered in a positive light. It it not meant to be any criticism of the Council in any way.</p> <p>But to deliver ecological development of human ecosystems an approach known as the "Stadt-schaft principle" is best practice and I would recommend</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.073	Further comment
						that the Council consider such within the current approach to SD. Red, amber, green type assessments for SD as exhibited within the plan do not go far enough-even at outline levels. I am afraid to say I am unable to accept your development proposals.		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	HS 2:73 – Proximity of site access to J1 M66 and visibility splay requirements for actual road speed (40mph speed limit) Wood Lane are a concern. The development of the site limits the possibility of a southbound on slip road onto the M66 at J1.		
Number of comments					HS2.073	12		
Reference		HS2.074		Land east of Burnley Road, Edenfield				
642	Eileen	Hinson	-		Object	My objections are based on the following: - - 1) Site location & issues with additional car movements. Edenfield is already suffering from the large number of cars and lorries travelling through it which would be exacerbated by new housing development - - 2) Use of Green Belt when there remain significant areas of brown land		No
904	Rosemary	Trippier			Object	there is too much traffic in the village already we dont need to add to it		
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16259	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.074	Further comment
1325	Hannah	Dunne	-		Object	I object to the proposed housing development for the following reasons: - - Environment: there appears to be no consideration for the green belt and how taking this away from the local residents will impact them. Edenfield is a lovely place to live due to the fact that it is surrounded by greenery. the impact of the proposed housing will also impact the wildlife, there are deer that frequent the valley and a number of hares that have been spotted in the proposed development area. the impact of additional traffic on the area is also of concern with an increase of air pollution in an area where there are a number of primary schools and children. - - Traffic: there are already problems with the M66 highway on a weekday morning traffic has been backed up to edenfield. with 400+ houses proposed there is likely to be an unsustainable impact on the traffic. There would need to be a complete rethink on local traffic issues in the village which have not been issued as part of the plan. I cannot support this kind of pressure on the traffic and therefore the infrastructure of the villiage. - - Local Services: there are currently 2 primary schools that serve edenfield that are already over subscribed. There would need to be a rethink as to the impact of such a development on the local community and how the propsoed families would be supported. - - access to the site: there appears to be only one point of access to the housing development which raises concerns as to the traffic system in Edeneild and also access for emergency services. - -		Edenfield is nice place to live by virtue of the fact that it is a villiage. Should this propsoal go ahead then it would change the face of the village
1415	Simon	Parker	-		Object	The proposed building of homes in Edenfield would cause the village and surrounding area to be in gridlock. The roads through and around Edenfield are currently most difficult to use at most times of the day and at the start of school and end of school they are even worse. Edenfield has not got the capacity for any more houses.The roads are not capable carrying any more traffic		

Number of comments HS2.074

5

Reference HS2.075 Wavell House, Helmshore

950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16298	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -		
-----	--------	----------	------	------------	--------	---	--	--

Number of comments HS2.075

1

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
Reference		HS2.076		Land at Snig Hole, Helmshore				
449	Alexandra	Buchan	-		Object	I feel that building on this site will be extremely detrimental to the local area as it will 1) destroy land that is currently used for grazing sheep 2) will create a higher volume of traffic on an already very busy section of road 3) possibly create further parking congestion 4) may create a greater use of the pedestrian pavements for leaving rubbish bins out for collection 5) will completely ruin the outlook over this land from the surrounding buildings.		I think that the use of green belt areas for developing new housing is entirely unnecessary when there are plenty of derelict buildings an abandoned pieces of land that would benefit from redevelopment and would have a greater, more beneficial impact on the area.
524	Susannah	Penney	-	HS2.76, HS2.77	Object	Too many houses in an area of countryside already.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
572	H. Keith	Smith	-		Object	<p>The site is in Green Belt and in this sensitive location should be kept as such. - - The land is not easily developable due to access restrictions and the steepness of the site. The access sight lines off Helmshore Road will be severely restricted by the bowling club retaining wall. The access of the lane to Snig Hole is part of a bridleway and cycleway B6. - - It is public land donated by the Poritt family for the people of Helmshore and as such requires the villagers' permission. The Poritt family would not have wished that others would profit from their generosity to the people of Helmshore. - - The lane is narrow, has just this year been resurfaced thanks to LCC. The subgrade of the road is non-existent and there are very large regional distribution services under the lane. The site cannot therefore be developed sustainably. The increase of houses down this lane will endanger walkers, horse riders and children and is a Health and Safety risk to all. - - People use this lane to access the beautiful park and river walk down to Irwell Vale and beyond to Ramsbottom and Bury. It is the start of a 'country park' heritage landscape which is much appreciated by all residents of Helmshore. - - This field is part of the ambience of the place and the Holme Vale and should be the last site to be developed in Helmshore. - - Green Belt should not be released for development except in very special circumstances. These are NOT special circumstances and will only benefit a very few people who only have their own interests at heart, who do not care for their neighbours, the heritage in the village or the natural landscape that we have access to in Helmshore. -</p> <p>Letter received 23/09/2017: I wish to make the following comments which relate to the above site referred to in the current Local Plan Review. This village of Helmshore has undergone many changes in the last 30/40 years. There have been many houses built, principally on large estates on Green Field sites but outside the Green Belt. There has also been selective infilling on Brown Field Sites. The local authority has been mindful in the past of the value of the Green Belt which was created to protect the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of (historic) towns and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. In particular the tract of land known as Snig Hole Park/Holme Vale is located at the north west tip of a large section of land which comprises the Green Belt P30,31 and 42. For the residents of Helmshore it is the start of a much appreciated, unique valley which wends its way down to the hamlet of Irwell Vale. This is considered not only an asset of the village but also a place for recreation for people who live outside the immediate area. The sides of the valley (or vale) are formed initially by fields (including the land</p>		I request that the council impose tree preservation orders (TPOs) on all trees that are within and in the proximity of this site so that they are protected from felling and lopping without the council's permission. - - This to protect the parkland setting from any further wanton destruction.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>HS2.76) to the immediate north east together with the former railway cutting and the river, allotment gardens, B6214 and more fields bounding the south west side.</p> <p>Environmentally the park is framed and protected by the adjacent land, there being very little of the surrounding existing development evident due to the topography and landscaping. This is an important and valuable asset. Visually the adjoining fields are seen as very much part of the pastoral scene which is experienced the moment a visitor walks through the park gates. The park which was originally donated to the inhabitants of Helmshore by the Porritt family, together with its setting forms a distinct, identifiable whole which has been left intact for many years.</p> <p>Please refer to Google Earth screen shot Docs. 1A and 1B where the integrity of the park and its setting can be readily appreciated.</p> <p>It can also be seen how the annexation of site HS2.76 which is surrounded on 3 sides by green Belt, could be termed piecemeal development, thus initiating the erosion of the green belt which at present has a clearly defined, regular boundary. If this land is given over to housing there is very little reason why other neighbouring land would not eventually suffer the same fate. In this location it could be the thin end of the wedge.</p> <p>The residents of Helmshore must decide whether the council is acting in the best interests of the people. If they believe that the officers have not made a rational decision in promoting site HS2.76 for housing they must lobby for it to remain the green belt.</p> <p>Please refer also to photos numbered Docs 2-11 inclusive which illustrate the important part that this plot plays in the general character of the area and street scene over the space of only 2 hours on Sunday morning, 17th September 2017 I collected a sample of 52 no. signatures from walkers and passers-by See Doc 12.</p> <p>Very few people refused to sign the petition and it was noteworthy that the people who did decline gave reasons such as "it won't do any good, they (RBC) will do what they want to do" and "I haven't heard anything about it" many people who signed the petition gave the reason that "there were already too many houses in helmshore" and "it will be just more houses without the necessary infrastructure"</p> <p>The above comments not only indicate how little local people knew about the draft local plan proposals but also how passionately they felt about more land being allocated to new housing in particular with regard to site HS2.76, the senseless erosion of the Green Belt in this location.</p> <p>In recent years, due to the persistence and voluntary action of local residents spread over several years, Snig Hole Park has undergone a transformation. The childrens play area has been renewed, the football pitch drained and levelled and returfed, a riverside path complete with sculptures created and trees planted.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>Very little, if any, local authority money was used in this very expensive recreational project.</p> <p>Work carried out by Lancashire County Council in spring/summer this year on resurfacing and draining the single track lane down to Snig Hole (holme vale), which is not constructed to county highway standards, has completed this section of cycleway B6.</p> <p>It is well known that Rossendale Borough Council is very vigilant and unsympathetic towards illegal development, unapproved alterations to listed buildings etc so it seems very inconsistent that they are able to consider the piecemeal annexation of a very critical part of the green belt in this particular location. A site which could be considered part of the entrance to very important recreational area which extends all the way down the Irwell Valley to Bury.</p> <p>I submit that there are probably still more Brown Field Sites which have not been considered in other parts of the borough where redevelopment should take place as a priority not only to ensure economic regeneration but also to provide a decent environment, fit for the people who already live there.</p> <p>In their site checks for the local Plan Review RBC indicate whether the owners of the land are prepared to develop their plots and a time scale is indicated. It does not come as a surprise that owners of land in green belt welcome the change of use to housing land as the value of their land will increase beyond their wildest dreams. Their willingness to develop land in their ownership only indicates their insensitivity to the needs of their neighbours and the local community and their greed for the acquisition of personal wealth.</p> <p>I submit that the fact that an owner is willing to develop land in green belt should not influence its land use status, the release of this land for development or affirm/give credibility to its suitability.</p> <p>RBC have expressed their desire to identify 'sustainable sites' for new housing development.</p> <p>I submit that annexing Green belt land is neither desirable nor a sustainable use of land which should remain open for future generations and be considered a permanent, valuable asset for all time.</p> <p>We will not have a second chance.</p> <p>Site HS2.76</p> <p>The site is bounded on the north western boundary by Helmshore road (B6214), a single track lane leading to Snig Hole (Holme Vale) down to south western side, a public footpath to the south east, the top part of a private drive to Tor View Barn, Tor View Farm/Cottage and their access on the north eastern side and the Helmshore Bowling Green at the junction with Helmshore Road.</p> <p>The land is used for the general grazing of animals - a perfectly adequate use for good pasture. There is a small garden enclosure along part of the north eastern boundary.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>The land has bad vehicular access due to slight line restrictions uphill at the access to Tor View Farm/Cottage. The slight lines are severely compromised by the retaining wall for the bowling club/green on the northern corner of the site. Traffic proceeds both up and down the hill at a pace. There always residents cars parked on the uphill side of the carriageway which further restrict the road width at this point.</p> <p>The junction of station road/helmshore road is nearby which is also opposite the park entrance.</p> <p>Any access via the lane to Snig Hole is inappropriate as this is single track with no passing places. The lane surface was formerly unmetalled and has only a thin asphalt has been relayed this year by LCC as part of Cycleway B6.</p> <p>In any case the land is in public ownership, reserved for the use of pedestrians, horse riders and the residences that it serves. It is outside the jurisdiction of the owner(s) of site HS2.76.</p> <p>The land is regularly used by horse,riders and the residents of Holme Vale and Tor View Barn.</p> <p>There are large services present under the lane, notably a 14" (?) water distribution main, a gas distributor main and other unknown services.</p> <p>The lane is within the curtilage of the memorial park and public recreational area now under the jurisdiction of Rossendale Borough Council.</p> <p>You will recall that this land was given to the residents of Helmshore for their enjoyment in perpetuity by the Porritt family. Whilst there are probably no covenants known regarding the land's use, I doubt that the Portitts donated the land for the financial benefit (profit) of others.</p> <p>We, the residents of Holme Vale have striven to retain the stone park gate posts during the recent work on the lane. We have ensured that all 3 gate posts were retained, despite rumours that one was to be permanently removed. We lobbied RBC to ensure that at least a modicum of the stone sets were reinstated across the crossing, maintaining that these we 'part and parcel' of the original architectural character of park entrance. We think that we have achieved this without any support from RBC. We do not want the open, rural character of the land to be destroyed, nor do we wish the historic park gateposts and new setted crossing to be removed.</p> <p>The ground level within HS2.76 is high in relation to Helmshore Road. Any development with the site will be consequently at a high level and will compromise the prospect of the cottages along the north west side of the road. The prospect of the cottages along the north west side of the road. The prospect of Tor View farm/cottage/barn will also be affected.</p> <p>It must be born in mind however that the land under consideration is in the ownership of some ot those who live in this exisiting settlement. It is anticipated that there will be little objection to any change in the status of site HS2.76 or a proposed housing development as there clearly exists a bias towards the use of the land.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>Tor view cottages are well set along the crown of the sloping field. Whilst the field cannot be termed 'steeply sloping', it is by no means level.</p> <p>The land is frequently water-logged in the winter months and a suspected ground water spring issues onto the lane on the left hand side of the gated opening to the drive up to Tor view barn.</p> <p>The plot of land at the southern tip of HS2.76 is isolated by the drive up to Tor View barn. I believe that it is in a different ownership to the main field under consideration although this doesn't appear to be clear in the review. This portion has been used for poultry and latterly the grazing of ponies. The reason that it appears redundant is because the owner chooses to leave it like that.</p> <p>The construction of a menage has effectively cut this original parcel of land in two. The drive is a private drive being surfaced in mass concrete. It is not suitable for access to more than 1 no. dwelling.</p> <p>When planning permission was granted for the barn I believe that RBC insisted that a separate, independent vehicular access be created in order not to increase the traffic onto Helmsford Road at the northern point of the site.</p> <p>How is it possible that RBC can promote the development of site HS2.76 for 7 houses with identical access restrictions?</p> <p>I submit that upon consideration of the above facts site HS2.76 should not be taken out of the Green belt nor is it suitable for sustainable housing development.</p> <p>People who elect to live in the green belt do so because they value the protection that planning legislation provides. They appreciate that successive governments have attached great importance to green belts and that local authorities have a duty to plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green belt. They are also encouraged to provide opportunities to provide access, outdoor sport and recreation, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity.</p> <p>I submit that to allow the construction of new houses on this virgin site will achieve none of those things and furthermore it will undermine the very reasons why people choose to live within or adjacent to the green belt in this particular instance.</p> <p>I understand that current government policy is changing in the next year and the new housing provision required of Rossendale may be reduced thus providing an even stronger argument for this small site not to lose its green belt status.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would give the above comments serious consideration when considering the realignment of the green belt boundary.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
589	Stephen	Langridge			Not Applicable	4. HS276 Snig Hole, I can only assume that access to this site would have to be via the entrance to Memorial Park with the effect of increasing traffic flow directly adjacent to the childrens play area and the cycleway leading towards Raven Shore. Is the existing gateway be wide enough? or would that have to be 'got rid of'? Or maybe it would be a 'token' private road (as has already happened with the partial gating off of Sunnybank Road).		
593	Brian & Tess	Williams			Object	<p>We strongly object to the proposal to remove the field immediately located to the left of Snig Hole Park Gates from green belt.</p> <p>Our reasons are the following:</p> <p>Green belt is green belt and should remain so.</p> <p>The Council has a duty to protect the environment.</p> <p>The very successful children's park must be protected from additional traffic for obvious reasons.</p> <p>The Memorial Park should be honoured by not encumbering it with additional development and traffic.</p> <p>It is irresponsible to add additional traffic to a cycle way.</p> <p>Please consider that Helmshore does not need additional development. It is still bears the scars of its industrial past and the County Council has chosen to damage it further by closing the Textile Museum.</p> <p>Please consider the future character of Helmshore. Respect the green belt. Do not build on it. Do not make opportunist decisions which cannot be reversed.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
594	Colin	Mitchell			Object	<p>I consulted the draft local plan (2019-2034) with reference to the above number and I was horrified to note that part of the proposed development was my land. I had no knowledge of this and the whole thing came as a complete surprise and shock. I therefore ask that this development be withdrawn immediately until this matter is sorted out.</p> <p>I am so angry about this that I am prepared to take the matter further i.e. the courts if this is necessary.</p> <p>Even if this planning anomaly had not happened regarding my land, the fact that the development encroaches on a country park, that has had a great deal of money spent on it by local residents and is used by hundreds, especially in fine weather, would constitute a real danger to the public and a hazard especially to toddlers, mothers with prams and any small children using the park access.</p> <p>I understand that Lancashire County Council has designated this right of way as a special route for cyclists and horse riders and not an area that would have to cope with a housing development and all that that entails. With the proposed number of houses (7) there would be at least another 14/20 cars regularly using the park access and entrance.</p> <p>This parkland was given to Helmshore by the Porritt family as an amenity for the whole village to enjoy and use as a country park. It is part of Helmshore's heritage. The memorial garden is also part of this park, several hundred people attending services there each year. This therefore cannot be reduced to being a pleasant sort of access to some building site and future housing development without there being retaliation and hostility from Helmshore residents.</p> <p>Finally I require an immediate response by you, regarding the fact that my land has been included in this development without my knowledge and consent, realising that the final date for comments from residents is 6th October 2017 this becomes an urgent matter and needs your earliest response.</p>		
595	N	Ratcliffe			Object	<p>I have lived in Holme Vale for 25 years and seen the park developed into a lovely place for children. I have always been pleased that it is so well used and that many, many people walk their dogs down here.</p> <p>Despite driving very carefully and slowly up and down the lane I have had a couple of very near misses with children. One darting through the hedge and one running out from the path in front of their parents. I constantly wait for people to put their dogs on the lead. There are walking groups who go past with as many as 20-30 walkers and horses use the bridleway quite regularly. I just can't imagine any more traffic and would not like these young families and walkers to feel unsafe when it is an area specially created for recreation.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
607	Alan and Barbara	Phillipson			Object	<p>As a family we certainly object to the proposed planning HS276 the area around snig hole park to the side of Sunnybank Social Club.</p> <p>The area is a very busy area having constructed a very beautiful park for children of all ages.</p> <p>We live in Sunnybank Close which sees dozens of families not only at week-ends but every day after school, so much so there is a lot of dangerous parking at times.</p> <p>We have only just had a new crossing to make it safe getting to and from the park.</p> <p>I watched just yesterday a small low loader vehicle struggle to get between the old posts into snig hole, if any builder trucks use the only lane to and from the park children will be at risks.</p> <p>Only 3 weeks ago the Free Press made a point that a young 4/5 year old girl was unable to gain a place in a local primary school and Haslingden Health Centre is always very busy with appointments very hard to make.</p> <p>I also beleive this plot of land is Green Belt ?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
633	Peter	Wilson			Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposals contained in the "Draft Local Plan(2019-2034)" for the following reasons: -</p> <p>1) Work was carried out this year to resurface and complete the cycleway, which runs down the single track access road to Holme Vale. This is also used by pedestrians (including small children access the park area, dog walkers etc), it is also a regularly used bridle path, vehicle access for the existing residents, vehicle access for any trades/ deliveries etc. This lane is also used for the Armistice Day Parade each year. Re-positioning the green belt boundary would allow the land to be developed for housing thereby increasing the amount of traffic onto this access road which is unacceptable, and could be considered dangerous. In addition the road joins Helmshore Road within the restricted "zig zag" area of the recently installed pedestrian crossing where due to restricted visibility due to existing buildings, and parked traffic there would be added dangers to all road users and pedestrians.</p> <p>2) Should development be allowed on the land in question, there would be a substantial visual impact as the land is at some height above the access road / memorial garden etc - this would take away the "enjoyment" given to the residents of Helmshore when the land was donated by the Porritt Family - not something I feel they would want! -</p> <p>3) I am led to understand that any refuse collection would take place from the access road for any new housing - creating an unsightly blot on the environment. This was also a reason RBC abandoned plans to force all Holme Vale residents to use rubbish bins sited at the entrance to the access lane previously.</p> <p>4) there have been a number of flooding issues over recent years, and any movement of the green belt boundary allowing development has the potential further exacerbate the flooding problem for the existing properties, as less land would remain to absorb and deal with the rainfall / water run off.</p> <p>5) The likely development is a small number of houses - 7 to 8- which could quite easily be sited on other brown field sites within Rossendale and alleviate the need to move the current green belt boundary. This could also be beneficial / could become part of any regeneration plans.</p> <p>6) Government policy is changing next year, and this I believe will reduce the requirement for additional housing provision. This as a stand alone issue, give RBC the opportunity not to include the area of land within the new Green Belt area. - -</p>		-
634	Christine	Wright			Object	<p>This site is not appropriate for further housing development. It is adjacent to a park which is well used but also has NO parking space. The Memorial Gardens are also an important facility for this area. - - There is very poor vehicle access to the site. Congestion on Helmshore Rd and Broadway would be worse, causing increased risk to children travelling to the 4 schools in the area. - - The local primary schools are already over subscribed.</p>		Helmshore and Haslingden have had huge amounts of building in the last 40 years, no extra infrastructure has been added. No extra school places, shops or family facilities. - - This area can sustain no more.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
641	Geoff	Woodall	N/A		Object	<p>This development would put a great strain on the adjacent road junction from Station Rd. - - This is already a problem area for parking, especially since the re development of the park at Snig Hole. This has proved a great success and is now used by hundreds of children a week. - Parking around Helmshore road and Station road has been an issue in recent months and using the junction ,especially coming from Station Rd to turn left up the hill is often dangerous. - On top of the current situation the local residents are eagerly awaiting the re opening of the old Bridge end pub with the extra call on parking that will be brought. Currently the public are using this private car park but will soon be unable to do so putting additional strain on parking spaces. - Regarding the matter of children using the adjacent park, I feel that these proposed new houses could add to mobile and foot traffic on the lane down to Snig hole and as this is only one car wide it will be dangerous as a lot of the children involved are quite young. - Another issue is the water run off, currently this area is a field and allows water to soak in but with houses and hardstandings this will run off down towards Snig hole lane and the river where we recently had flooding issues anyway. - Given these points I object to the development.</p>		
643	Owen	Stanton			Object	<p>This site could not be more unsuitable for the proposed use. The development would create safety issues to current users of this public right of way with the very real potential for injury especially as the only means of access is frequented by children and adults with infants .As you will no doubt be aware the adjacent playground (recently refurbished and improved) is a popular location not only for children resident in helmshore but since being upgraded has drawn families and children from further afield. This has resulted in increased traffic density both vehicular and pedestrian both on the highway around the access and along the lane itself. As you will also be well aware there are also high numbers of cyclists who travel along this lane and it is also popular with horse riders . The proposal would therefore detract from a very well used local amenity , place vulnerable members of the community in risk of danger or injury . The work required to develop this site would result in noise and disruption for the nearby residents non more so than t.. he people who live in what are refered to as Snig Hole Cottages. The proposed development would most certainly destroy the ambience of the Memorial Park which is one of the prime assets of the village. It is also worth noting that the Government strongly support the retention of green belt land EXCEPT IN VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES . I do not feel the case has been made in this proposal to warrant that exception and would therefore like to register my objection to this proposal.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
655	Stuart	McDonald	-		Object	<p>Snig Hole Park Helmshore is both a Memorial Gardens of nearly 100 years and, more recently, a Country Park enjoyed by children and their parents as it is a protected environment in the sense that minimal road traffic, and occasional horse and bike traffic at weekends uses the access road. - - With the Country Park now containing a large and very well used play area for children, introducing a new housing area of approx. 7/8 houses, will bring at least that many cars and probably more. On top of that you will get visitors who will assume they can bring their cars too, especially as there is no public parking in the immediate vicinity. Visitors will, regardless on any traffic regulations, use the lane to park on and cause immediate chaos. Having additional road traffic using that access road will cause chaos and have the potential for conflict between road users and pedestrians. - Access to and from the road is uncontrolled and, being by the recently installed crossing, will bring additional chaos to an already busy Helmshore Road at virtually any time of the day or night. Adding extra traffic will only exacerbate that situation. - - The Snig Hole Park also has a Memorial Gardens that is well used by us locals at all times of year and especially so on Remembrance Sunday when it is taken over by the annual commemorative event. - -</p>		<p>Helmshore is already over populated and an infrastructure that has not been upgraded to cope with the additional populace of recent building projects in the village. - - The area in Station Road, closest to the junction with Helmshore Road, is still chaotic at the best of times and especially so when the weather is good as this attracts parents and children to the park. Regardless of the token parking restrictions, parents still park wherever they can and invariably ignore these parking restrictions as there is no one to enforce them. Introducing potentially additional traffic to that area will only make it more chaotic and, with a constant flow of children in the summer months there will be an accident. - - The landowner obviously has no care for the local community and has seen an opportunity make a profit from selling land that they are unable to, or unwilling, to cultivate or landscape. With the obvious slope of the land, both towards the lane and the main road, none of the proposed building will fit in with the current image of Helmshore as a village - traditional, local, and not too busy. As residents, whilst we accept that we live in a modern society, we don't like building something just for profit. As council, you just sign it off; we have to live with the after effects of more people, more cars, etc.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
657	Ruth	Povey	-		Object	As a life long resident of Helmshore I have always enjoyed the open spaces and country feel to the area, as it is part of the character of the village. Building houses would take away the character of the village but also create so much more congestion on roads that already struggle to cope with the through traffic and amount of expansion so far. - - Do not build at snig hole, please be considerate to all of the existing residents.		-
658	Charlotte	Lees	-		Object	I struggle to see how this site can possibly be viable and make any meaningful difference to the 'apparent' requirement for additional housing in Rossendale. It is relatively small and very sloped. - - Access to Snig Hole Park is already extremely poor, with parking on the road for people wanting to go to the park meaning that the main road is already very congested. The access is also at a busy junction. Additional housing would make this extremely dangerous, particularly for children walking to and from school, and also who are going to the park. - - It is also a beautiful area of open land which leads on to Snig hole park and then goes down to Irwell Vale. This is a cycling route to Ramsbottom which has recently been invested in, and what is proposed would make this dangerous for cyclists and walkers alike. - - It is absolutely ridiculous that anyone can think building on there is a positive thing to do for Helmshore.		-
659	Lauren	Taylor	-		Object	I don't support this application, due to the location. The area can become very congested, and with it being so close in proximity to the playground, development on this land would make the problem worse. The area is a lovely green space.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
664	Miles	Holt	-		Object	The proposed alteration of the green belt and the subsequent development of this site is an unnecessary and unacceptable situation for the residents of Helmshore. - There are several issues with the site being developed : - a) The area adjacent the site is a public space, and is enjoyed by local families. - b) Any additional traffic entering Helmshore Road from this site would cause a critical risk to pedestrian and other road users. - c) The site is surrounded by open fields and farms, and any development would cause a deterioration of the overall natural landscape and wildlife and farm animals. - d) Any additional services that would be required would add unnecessary traffic and risk to the locality. - e) The surrounding area to the site is a bridle way and part of the national cycling route. Any development of the site, with the added traffic would cause a detrimental impact to the walkers, cyclists and horse riders. - In summary, I represent the views of the overwhelming majority of residents. I haven't met one single person who supports the development of this site in any way. - It must be retained as part of the Green Belt. - The village is already full of housing, and simply cannot take any more development. It's a beautiful part of the county, and I feel I must stand up to this commercially driven initiative. - Rejecting this proposal is simply morally the right thing to do. - Please look elsewhere for this type of development, there are so many other brown field sites that need investment.		Please respect the wishes of the local residents that will be effected by the development of this site. - I just cannot believe that this site is being given consideration for a development of any kind. - Please do the right thing.
665	Julie	Darbyshire	-		Object	A high risk proposal to further develop an area so close to a very well used young children's playground. Access arrangements are totally impractical for this development.		-
668	Anne	Morrison	-		Object	We are rapidly running out of green areas in Helmshore. Every spare piece of land is being built on. The roads are very busy now due to all the new developments along Holcombe Rd and the primary schools at full. - We do not need anymore housing in Helmshore especially not on green belt areas.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
673	Rosemary	Kearney	-	SHLAA16384	Object	We strongly object to the above planning applications for a number of reasons. - - Helmshore as an area is struggling to cope providing the amenities at present with the residents there are at the moment. The local primary schools are already over subscribed and children from the area are having to attend school in other towns. - - There has been a lot of money (self funded) spent on Snig Hole play area which is a great place for children to play safely and away from the main road. If there are more houses built there, the new resident's cars will have to drive right past the area which is unsafe for children. - - The planning for Rossendale Golf Club on Greens Lane again affects local school children as Haslingden High School is located on Greens Lane. This road is already busy especially at school times and more housing will only exacerbate the situation. - - The land off Curven Edge is one of the only green grass areas that children can play on safely. Especially as the local playing fields have been fenced off on Helmshore Road. This area is known locally for holding water as a culvert flows directly under it so I would not expect it to be a good area for development.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
697	Julie	Woods	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
698	John	King	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277, hs276	Object	<p>Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
699	William	Woods	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
700	Thelma	King	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	<p>Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
733	Catherine	Palmer			Object	<p>I am writing to convey my deep concern about the proposal to build on an iconic area of Green Belt land adjacent to the Park and Memorial Gardens in Helmshore.</p> <p>This beautiful tree lined lane constitutes one of the few countryside walks now left in Helmshore that has not been ruined by modern development. The proposed site runs parallel to the single track lane recently designated as part of the National Cycle Network from Helmshore to Irwel Vale.</p> <p>There is a narrow entrance to the lane from the main, marked by historic Victorian pillars. The entrance is used by children going to the play area in the park, families with toddlers and prams, dog walkers, hikers, horses and cyclists.</p> <p>In addition, it is the only access route for 6 houses further down the lane , plus service vehicles</p> <p>The view while walking down the lane is stunning, marked by old stone walls, hedges and trees.</p> <p>On the left side (the proposed development) there is a view looking up over the field to a picturesque old farmhouse, set in natural surroundings of trees and bushes The field has always been used for grazing, mainly donkeys and sheep. Hundreds of people visit the park, and the walk because of the beauty of the scenery.</p> <p>The proposed development site is not a flat field, as indicated n the councils information, it is quite sloping - a hill in fact. The wall boundary of the field on the main road side is well over two metres in height to the surface level of the field.</p> <p>There is no viable access to the site from the single track lane due to the narrowness of the lane and its numerous users. To have access for traffic for housing would constitute a severe danger of accidents to pedestrians, including many children, bikers, horses, dog walkers etc</p> <p>In information given to the council the distance from the site to the park and play area was some distance away - in fact the site boundary on the lane is only 3 metres away - the other side of the lane in fact.</p> <p>The site would in no way constitute an easy development due to the limited access and additional traffic. The proposed yield of 7 - 8 houses appears unsustainable in any case, unless crammed in, with no space around and no viable access.</p> <p>It is quite ridiculous to think this area of Green Belt land could be developed in any case due to its proximity to the park and the country walk. Unfortunately the greed of landowners and developers is obviously a part of this.</p> <p>Surely there are lots of brown field sites in other parts of the Rossendale Valley that should be developed first rather than ruin one of the few remaining sites in Helmshore that constitutes the beginning of beautiful Green Belt land.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						I very much hope that this does not happen		
745	Paul	Scholefield			Object	<p>I would like to formally object to the proposed development of the land next to Snig Hole.</p> <p>As a local resident (X Riverside Walk) I am concerned regarding the junction at the bottom of station road opposite Snig Hole.</p> <p>Also with young children obviously using the park there is insufficient access for more cars in and around that area. Indeed a new pelican crossing has only just been installed to facilitate safer crossing into the park. Furthermore numerous cars are already consistently parked on the pavement of Station Road, blocking access etc...</p> <p>As said I would like to formally object to any proposed development of the site and trust you will consider my concerns in any review of this proposed application.</p>		
748	Christian	Frost			Object	<p>I'm writing to object about the plan for future housing in Helmshore, both at the snig hole site and the curven edge site, I have lived in Helmshore for forty two years and have seen many fields and small areas of land built on, my concerns are as follows:</p> <p>Access from the side of the Sunnybank on to the main road applies both ways – in busy times this will cause problems</p> <p>Parking – residents struggle now, not to mention when the Bridge end re-opens</p> <p>Road safety for children/pedestrians – adding extra cars to the village</p> <p>Loss of green areas in the village – Helmshore was once a lovely little village with plenty of green areas</p> <p>Drains – unable to keep up with flood water now!! Drains not cleaned for at least the last two years</p> <p>Houses built which don't suit the surrounding area – weavers dene – built in yellow and orange stone – eye sore</p> <p>We don't have any flood protection anymore, so this means that low level housing will feel the brunt of it all.</p> <p>Local amenities won't be able to keep up with the increase of people</p> <p>Roads and pathways – Helmshore's roads and pathways are in a poor state of repair, this will only become worse</p> <p>For some reason Helmshore seems to be forgotten by RBC or it seems that way, footpaths are never cleaned, drains are full of road grit from two years ago when there were dressed, trees cover foot paths making it hard for people to pass with children and buggies. Surely we should address these problems before you add to them.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
749	Fred	Barlow			Object	<p>I have been looking at the proposed plans for helmshore,holcombe road area. (1) Land off curven edge;This bit of land is the only play area this estate has,it has a culvert running under it,the land itself is infill ,the site is an old lodge belonging albion mill,it was something like 30ft.deep at the road end and I would say totally unsuitable for building on.I also believe some of the infill came from the bleach works site at Holden Wood where it was considered unfit for building on.</p> <p>(2) snig hole site;This sight has got problems with road junctions ,the river, road access ,it has parking problems connected with Sunnybank social club,it is overlooked by the bowling green.This land is also GREEN BELT land. Both sites will suffer from lack of school places,Helmshore school is full up now.The bus service is hopeless.</p> <p>I would like to object to the Plans for the above reasons.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
756	John	Simpson	-		Object	<p>1. Site location: Unnecessary removal of site from Green Belt and alteration of urban boundary when there are sufficient Brown Field sites available. RBC should be looking at the development of former commercial premises in town centres to provide flats which would be more affordable for first time buyers etc. For example, in Haslingden there are the half completed flats in the former Roebuck pub in Lower Deardengate; flats above former NatWest Bank in Lower Deardengate; former Methodist manse on Manchester Road; empty flats above property at corner of Dale Street. A recently example of conversion of former commercial premises can be seen at 176 – 180, Blackburn Road, Haslingden, where a disused antique shop has been made into three houses. -</p> <p>2. Land ownership: Not in single owner. Not all owners agreed to the submission of the site in 2016. Therefore of dubious legality to put forward the site at all. -</p> <p>3. Legal constraints/ownership issues: see above -</p> <p>4. Topography (comments): Site is not 'virtually flat' -</p> <p>5. Vehicular access: Vehicular access to site would be along narrow lane to Snig Hole from a busy junction on Helmshore, which has recently been upgraded to improve road safety for pedestrians. More traffic here would create a dangerous situation both at the junction and along the lane. -</p> <p>6. The lane adjoining the site is being incorporated into National Cycle Route 6 and is already heavily used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. An increase in traffic on the lane would have an adverse effect on this route and its users. -</p> <p>7. Ecological value: It is incorrect to say the site is not adjacent to a Biological Heritage Site. It is within a few hundred yards of the BHS at Snig Hole/Ravenshore and is connected to it by neighbouring fields and the Memorial Grounds (Snig Hole park). Nature does not recognise lines drawn on a map and the site is an important link in the Environmental Corridor that runs through Helmshore from Ravenshore via Snig Hole, Riverside Walk, former railway lines etc. No or few artificial fertilizers have been used on the field for at least 30 years which is likely to have increased its biodiversity. This is in contrast to the neighbouring Memorial Grounds, which, although part of the Environmental Corridor, have been more intensively managed. -</p> <p>8. Any housing development would have an adverse impact on the setting of Helmshore Memorial Grounds (Snig Hole park), the children's play area of which has been upgraded and is heavily used. This land was given as a memorial to men killed in the First World War and according to the deed of gift in 1925 includes the lane from Helmshore Road to Snig Hole. It would be unacceptable to take any land from the park to widen the lane or to allow the setting of the gateway at the entrance on Helmshore Road to be altered. To take land from the field to widen the lane would reduce the acreage and make a development unviable. -</p> <p>9. Constraints due to utilities: sewers, gas pipes etc. to neighbouring properties underlie the site. -</p>		<p>RBC should concentrate on the conversion of former commercial property in towns into residential properties: -</p> <p>1. High street shopping has changed with the number of supermarkets in the valley and online shopping. Towns do not need the same number of shop units. Banks etc which are closed are never going to reopen as banks and so again could be converted into apartments (at least in part, e.g. the upper storeys of the former Barclays Bank in Haslingden). -</p> <p>2. This would reduce the need to build on so much of the Green Belt as is proposed, especially if, as is alleged, central government has reduced targets for the number of new houses that have to be built. -</p> <p>3. Flats etc. would be more affordable for first time buyers, single people (one in three people in the UK now live alone) etc. -</p> <p>4. Such developments provide a realistic attempt to address the problem of the homeless, which three and four bed-roomed houses etc do not. -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
764	Chris	Aspin	Helmshore Local History Society		Object	Too near main road, children's playground and Memorial Gardens. Part of the vital green belt - alongside River Ogden. No easy access.		Helmshore has more than enough houses. More would place an extra burden of the local schools and the Health Service. More cars, more problems.
767	Suzanne	Moules	-		Object	At a time when open public spaces mean so much to local people, it seems such a shame to compromise a parcel of land so close to the park and a popular walking route, all for the sake of the building of just seven new homes. This is not a plea for more homes on the site, but for no housing development at all. - The road to the site is single-track and would have to be widened. This in itself will lead to loss of amenity. The increased traffic will be a hazard to pedestrians - particularly to the elderly and to children - and could well prove off-putting. The whole point of green spaces and parks is for the community to be able to enjoy them safely. Putting in a crossing to encourage such use is a waste of money if safety closer to the public amenity is compromised. - Dog walkers - myself included - enjoy the quiet beauty of this small but precious area. Why should it be threatened for so little gain? - Wildlife, which recognises no boundaries, thrives in this place. Does its habitat really need to be encroached upon and perhaps destroyed? - I would respectfully ask the Council to reconsider this Housing Allocation. The land in question is quite steep and therefore problematical. As it stands, it provides a green border that helps create a secluded area for public enjoyment and I urge the Council to allow it to remain as such.		-
795	Michael	Lord	-		Object	We don't need 8 more houses down a narrow lane opposite a very well used local playing area. Put these house somewhere else.		-
799	Sarah	Lord	-		Object	This is a pleasant narrow country lane, leading to countryside walks and a very nice children's play area, also the village WW1 and WW2 memorial monuments are located adjacent to this area. Adding more houses in this restricted area would ruin the surrounding area as well as creating traffic issues due to the restricted access. Helmshore only has 2 green areas left and current plans seem to be looking towards building houses on both of them.		-
831	Robert	McRorie	-		Object	Objection for the following reasons. - - Increased traffic - next to cycle path, bridleway and children's play area affecting the safety of all users of these leisure facilities. - - Noise and environmental pollution during works and also from increased traffic from the new homes. Along with unsightly bins. - - The memorial park / new play area is a recently regenerated area that has successfully attracted more children (accompanied and unaccompanied) who are the most vulnerable people in society to increased traffic which increases the risk of accidents.		I wholeheartedly object. - - There are other areas within Helmshore village where extra homes could be built that would not invite extra traffic into an area where there are numerous unaccompanied children playing en masse.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
860	Stephen	Harris	-		Object	<p>This a greenfield site at significant height over the surrounding area and close to the Memorial Gardens in Helmshore. There is concern at the likely "domination" of that area by proposed new housing. Local residents have welcomed the long-awaited redevelopment of the children's playground at Snig Hole. However, this has unfortunately led to a significant increase in traffic around the area and major parking problems along Station Road/Bowl Alley, with visitors from outside the area travelling by car to use the playground. Very recently a zebra crossing was installed outside the entrance to deal with the increased pedestrian traffic. The construction of further properties would undoubtedly lead to further traffic and increased problems with vehicles parking. People visiting the playground have now resorted to parking also outside the row of terraced houses in front of Sunnybank Social Club (and also parking illegally on double yellow lines, creating a significant traffic hazard). An elderly lady (aged 97) lives in one of these houses and it has recently become very difficult for friends to stop anywhere near her house to pick her up and take her home again as there is sometimes nowhere nearby to park. It appears there will also be increased traffic problems through the narrow gateway to Snig Hole and a potential danger to children walking through. The large stone gate posts, restricting the width, are a notable feature which could not be removed as they have clearly been in place at least since the 19th century.</p>		<p>I object in principle to the proposed use of green belt land for housing, which should be kept as green belt, as originally intended. It seems to me that there are other possibilities, such as brownfield sites, which have not been satisfactorily explored. Also, there should be greater restrictions on the number of houses proposed in any given area. There seems to be a policy of "nibbling away" every few years at the established green belt. Ultimately</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
909	Alastair	Harris	n/a		Object	<p>I have major concerns about access and egress from the plan site development. Access can either be from Helmshore Road or from the existing service road which runs through Helmshore Memorial Park and Play area (locally known as Snig Hole). - [1] Access onto Helmshore road would be onto a downhill road with limited vision, parked residents cars which restrict the roadway and a few yards from a zebra crossing and road junction. The area is already a dangerous location and this would further compound the problem. - [2] The other access would be through the entrance to Helmshore Memorial Park and play area which is dangerous for a number of reasons. The service road which is not wide enough for two cars enters Helmshore Road at a Cross Roads with a zebra crossing. It is a busy junction particularly at peak times but also is at the foot of a hill with cars, vans, lorries and cyclists often breaking the speed limit. - Light controlled junction would be a great improvement however it does not solve the problem of a narrow one car entrance from Helmshore Road into the Memorial Park and play area. - There is a heavy footfall using the road in spring summer and autumn with children accessing the play area and dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders accessing the service road which leads through to Irwell Vale. The service road is also a dedicated National Cycle track and the increase in traffic flow from the 7 house development would cause problems as most houses nowadays have an average of 2+ cars per house. - It has taken 4 years to have a zebra crossing outside the park entrance however the preferred solution would be light controlled but there are technical issues to implement this which further compounds the risks.</p>		<p>The road traffic risks cannot be understated. It has been difficult to even get the zebra crossing because there is no incident history associated with the road junction beside where the 7 house development will be. - - The site traffic during the building stage, the extra cars when it is built and the general increase in traffic will put a considerable strain on the safe entrance and exit whether to the housing development or the play park. - - The development of the play park has increased the number of parked cars and between that, the bowling green, the development of the Bridge Inn as a Café Bar and retail unit will significantly increase the parked cars in the area. - - Helmshore Road is used as a cut-through by traffic from Bolton accessing the M66 and the bypass and Station road is a cut through for traffic from and to the Grane road and Blackburn / M65. - - Further housing developments in the area at Holden Pub will increase the traffic flow in the vicinity. - - The 7 house development will not make a paradigm shift in the traffic flows but will add to the traffic congestion.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
949	Philip	Lawson	-		Object	HS2.76 is in an area opposite a newly refurbished children's play area. The only access to the play area, and to HS2.76, is along a single car width lane off Helmshore Road. The entrance to this lane is in the immediate vicinity of a newly built pedestrian crossing on Helmshore Road. Since the parks refurbishment both the vehicle and pedestrian traffic has increased substantially and families with children have first to park(no provision for this) cross the very busy main road then walk along the single width lane (no footpath along this stretch) which itself is the only access to houses and cottages already established in Snig Hole so already has traffic issues. I believe this all creates a very dangerous access particularly as there are lots of children involved. Also moving the access away from this one would still be in the immediate vicinity and add to the dangers as above.		Infrastructure in this area is struggling to cope with the already present numbers of populous in terms of schools over-subscribed, facilities being closed, roads crumbling and dangerous, links to Manchester clogged and accident prone, police presence almost non-existent, doctors and dentist numbers too high with long waiting times. Funding from central government to LCC and RBC gets cut at each review so worsening the above situation and yet these proposals plan to add another 4000 plus homes to the mix? Either funding must be provided to get us into a viable, workable borough or this plan should be abandoned until central government realises 'the north' needs funding similar to 'the south'.
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16384	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -		
964	Joanne	Smithson	-	SHLAA16384	Object	This is ridiculous. Grane road has many well documented issues with regard to traffic and you want to build more property on nearby Holcombe road?? - Where will these peoples children go to school? We already have issues with families not getting their choice of school due to oversubscription! - What little green land we have we need to preserve!		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
973	Deborah	Haworth	-		Object	I object to more houses being built in Helmshore, and specifically on green belt land. It's already difficult to get an appointment at the doctors without more residents moving in. Our schools are already over subscribed. Our roads are already busy, the roads and pavements are already a disgrace they can't cope with more strain. Helmshore is supposed to be a village, it's fast becoming a town. We need to protect our green spaces, our wildlife and our clean air. We need to reduce carbon monoxide, road traffic accidents and the happiness and wellbeing of our residents. Is all you care about money? You need to listen to the residents of Helmshore, we live here, many of us were brought up here and are already shocked by how ,ugh it has changed. I'm only 45 but have lived here all my life and I'm shocked to see just how many more people and houses have appeared. Look after our heritage, if we need more residences then convert some of the old disused buildings rather than build on our green land killing wildlife and contributing to global warming.		-
976	Gillian	Stephens	-	SHLAA16384	Object	The access to Snighole Park is very restricted. The fact that the Park is heavily used by children and adults seems a ludicrous choice for building a large amount of houses. Helmshore is already bulging to capacity. The Schools are overflowing, the commuter links are virtual at a standstill. A journey which once took twenty five minutes will now take over an hour and half. It can some mornings take over ten minutes trying to get acces to the main roads from the side roads. Helmshore has been over developed for years and I would appeal to the Council to look at other options rather than devastate a small village. Please think of future generations and what sort of outdoor life will be available to them. An example of when people make snap decisions with hugh impacts was Mr. Beaching who closed the rail links and the road chaos now in place.		Please consider the views of the local people who inevitably know their areas better than the Councillors. You cannot keep allowing one area to be built on over and over again until there is nothing left.
983	Neil	Leeming	-		Object	That junction is bad at the moment building traffic the 15 extra houses will add to it. And it is right next to a play ground with children going back and forth, plus dog walkers, cyclist,and horse riders.		by building on green belt sites you are taking away our village way of life and wildlife areas within the village.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
996	Gillian	Bower	-		Object	<p>I am very concerned about any development on this site (Snig Hole) for the following reasons: - 1) Safety of park users (zebra crossing has already had to be installed in attempt to improve safety for park users.) There is already a substantial amount of traffic using this small lane to access the properties at Snig Hole. Parents with prams, toddlers and young people would be further endangered with even more traffic. - 2) This lane has already been made into a National Cycleway, B6, and is currently used by many cyclists who would be endangered by more traffic in this area. - 3) The track is also used by many horse riders on a daily basis as a connection route to Irwell Vale. Again, the safety of both riders and horses should be paramount. There are very few off road tracks available to horse riders, therefore this route needs protecting. Perhaps RBC could provide more off road tracks for horse riders. - 4) The Memorial Park needs to be a peaceful reflective place. The land including the lane and Memorial Park was given to Helmshore by Mr Porritt of Tor Side Hall for the benefit of the Helmshore residents and not to be used as a thoroughfare or housing estate. - 5)The park at Snig Hole is a 'country' park and should not be surrounded by more concrete and buildings. Our heritage should be valued and maintained not eroded. The fields and countryside are why people choose to live in Helmshore. I personally have chosen NOT to live on a housing estate or even adjacent to one and therefore resent any thought of a build in this location. - 6) The Green Belt has been moved by RBC to accommodate development on this site. We were promised by RBC that the Green Belt would not be moved and now it has been moved and there are new lines on the Local Plan to indicate Green Belt areas to include this proposed site for building. This means that the Green Belt is being eroded with subtlety, and as a Helmshore resident I wish this to stop immediately. There should be no encroachment into Green Belt land. - 7)The site in question is very boggy and excess water runs continually onto the lane so much so that Lancs County Council have tried to address this by installing extra drains along the lane. - 8) Dustbins are stacked along the lane for collections of refuse on Fridays. These are constantly being tampered with by people visiting the park especially when they are not emptied on time. More dustbins would cause more congestion and make the entrance into the park unsightly. - Local residents, "Friends of Helmshore" have paid for the park themselves (not RBC) and people travel from far afield to visit the country park. It is therefore not appropriate that such a pleasant park be surrounded by extra dustbins and rubbish which is unsightly. I remain very embarrassed at the number of dustbins cluttering the roadsides on the way into Hasingden from Baxenden. I would not like to be further embarrassed by more dustbins along Snig Hole. - 9) A housing estate or building in this area would devalue all the properties in the vicinity especially those overlooking the site in question. One local resident recently chose their property because of its outlook on to</p>		<p>The proposed site for 160 houses adjacent to the Grane Road will also impact on our status as a village and erode into our green fields. The unused derelict buildings should be redeveloped into affordable housing to avoid the expansion of more concrete and buildings. We wish to remain a village with open green spaces, countryside surroundings and pleasant views not a built up urban sprawl. - -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						green fields and would not expect this to change. - 10) I don't think many Helmshore residents understand what RBC are planning for their village and have not been informed clearly enough about proposed changes. Viewings of the plans were not widely advertised and many people will not be aware of the proposals. -		
998	Jill	Jihkson	-		Object	Helmshore is already overdeveloped thanks to the Taylor Wimpey hideous estate on holcombe road. The roads are in a terrible state and too crowded you can't get off holcombe rd or up helmshore road. The schools are already at full capacity. There is not enough infrastructure to continually add hundreds more houses to this village. We have no train links. Just the bottle neck m66 - People need to listen to residents we have had enough we have no support from local council - Stop building in helmshore green belt before we have no green spaces left		Listen to the complaints that people are raising
999	Lindsay	Morris	-		Object	Loss of greenbelt - Inappropriate development on greenbelt land - Highway safety - Loss of visual amenity		-
1002	David	Morris	-		Object	Several of the 5 greenbelt tests have NOT been satisfied to justify the release. - 1. Purpose 3 - To assist in the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment - - this area forms an important low density semi rural buffer to the countryside and would lead to further encroachments if allowed to happen - 2. Purpose 4 - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - - the area around snig hole park contains historical important features to the village and requires sensitive protection - 3. Purpose 5 - To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of - derelict and other urban land - - the land is green and therefore would NOT assist. - - - In addition to the above fundamental reasons the site should be rejected on the following planning points:- 1. Highway safety - there is limited scope to create a safe access point into the site - 2. The immediate area has a number of conflicting road and pathway users being on the entrance to protected open space (Snig Hole Park), a national cycle way, pedestrian and horse riders. - 3. Inappropriate development in the greenbelt - -		-
1014	Geoffrey	Hallam	-	Land adjacent Helmshore Park	Object	This green land is part of the lungs of our village an open space near a park to breath in. Surely residents are entitled to have green space in their village and not wall to wall housing.		-
1019	Rachel	Dulson		SHLAA16384	Object	Helmshore is not equipped for additional homes to be built. Roads and schools are inadequate for the current population already. Current issues have not been addressed and now you are planning to throw even more people into the mix, as well as the disruption to traffic flow that building work brings. - Build us a new school, improve our roads and perhaps once that is done, redevelop the existing old buildings that are abandoned and in disrepair and then think about building new homes.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1026	sheila	whipp	-		Object	Too much development in too smaller space. Too much traffic, dustbins etc. - Spoils immediate environment and countryside park used by many. - New cycleway destroyed. - All valued by those who live in the vicinity and village (at the moment).		I would have liked the time to think all this through, and I am wondering how many others are in my position and are not even aware of your draft plan. - - I am disappointed that RBC assume that people can fill forms on computers and are computer literate. - - I haven't heard of one public meeting to attend.... and I can say that I am astute person, who is usually well informed on local matters, I read the papers and listen to local radio and I have heard nothing until someone urged me to respond quickly today. I have had no thinking time and not studied the plans in detail as I've not been informed of any consultation venues or meetings.
1060	Stephen	Davies	Resident	SHLAA16384	Object	I agree housing needs to be built. But there are no plans to support infrastructure in the area. Grane road for example has a lot of traffic issues since joining up to the M65. Another 160 homes on that road trying to get out and in to the development will be a nightmare. Also there are plenty of brown field site to build on especially in Blackburn. Helmshore is a village we pay premium prices for homes in the area to have this life style we don't not want it spoilt. Large firms/ housing contractors build quick homes cutting corners all the time. Where are the children going to go to school with all schools in the area full and some of our children already having to travel to bury for school.		We need homes but well thought out planned homes. With good investment in roads, gp surgeries, schools, parks etc. We can not keep cutting into our countryside for the sake of making shareholders rich they don't love here we do please don't have the wool pulled over your eyes for all our sakes and children's.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1243	Sarah	Rigby	-	SHLAA16384	Object	<p>Reasons for my objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The potential access point options are very poor. - The lane entrance to the park is very narrow, and is part of a new National Cycle path which is also heavily used by walkers, horse riders and park users (as it is the only access point). A zebra crossing has recently been put in place here, due to the road being too dangerous to cross as part of the cycle route. - The second access point is a steep, tight narrow bend that cannot be accessed with large or long vehicles. - The park has ran by a group of volunteers 'Friends of Snig Hole' who have spent years fundraising to ensure the park is safe for all who visit, and also remains a safe habitat for the local animals. - The plot is situated off a main road that is extremely busy. It usually has cars parked down one side and is only passable by 1 car at a time. Over the year 'Sunny Bank Social Club' which is situated on the main road hosts many weekly bowling and social events. There is no parking available at this venue as well as the park itself and visitors are resulted in parking on the nearby streets which again is a hazard to the public. - Over the last 12 months I have witnessed 'near misses' (collisions and pedestrians/children being almost knocked over). It is only a matter of time before an accident will happen in this area - lets hope it isn't a fatality! The more cars in the area with increase the chances of this happening. - Wildlife and Enviromental Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plot is situated on a steep grassy incline and is home to various wildlife species. - As a member of WWF I am well aware that both hedgehogs and water voles are endangered in the UK, both of which reside in the proposed plot.. - The water vole population dropped by 90% in 1988-1998. Their required habitat 'grassy banks along slow moving rivers, ditches, streams, lakes, ponds, canals, as well as marshland and upland. They dig burrows in steep grassy banks, which often include underwater entrances' is a perfect description of the Snig Hole plot. I was fortunate enough to witness baby water voles 'playing' in the nearby area a couple of weeks ago. In Lancashire there are many projects set up specifically to save the water vole from extinction. I have notified them of this potential planning site and they will getting in touch if the future plan goes ahead. - Any resident living in close proximity to the proposed plot will more than likely have first hand experience of the hedgehogs living in the proposed plot. - As stated above the site is situated by a river. In recent history this location has flooded and I am concerned that if any houses are built in close proximity they might be affected. - Logistical Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local primary schools are all over subscribed. With my professional connections to both schools I believe that they can not be extended in any way to cater for more children. Their perimeters are limiting which means extensions cannot be built. - Looking at Rossendale on a large map I personally feel that there are much more suitable land for planning. Building small sites of 5-7 houses in already built up, congested areas seem ludicrous as this serves the few at the 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>expense of the many. - - - When writing this statement I am speaking on behalf of many local residents who, for various reasons, cannot access the internet and do not have the capacity for formally object. WE sincerely hope you reflect on OUR concerns and make the right decision in keeping this plot as protected GREEN BELT LAND for the people and wildlife of the Snig Hole area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1244	LUKE	OMRE	-	SHLAA16384	Object	<p>Reasons for my objection - - Safety Concerns: - The potential access point options are very poor. - The lane entrance to the park is very narrow, and is part of a new National Cycle path which is also heavily used by walkers, horse riders and park users (as it is the only access point). A zebra crossing has recently been put in place here, due to the road being too dangerous to cross as part of the cycle route. - The second access point is a steep, tight narrow bend that cannot be accessed with large or long vehicles. - The park has ran by a group of volunteers 'Friends of Snig Hole' who have spent years fundraising to ensure the park is safe for all who visit, and also remains a safe habitat for the local animals. - The plot is situated off a main road that is extremely busy. It usually has cars parked down one side and is only passable by 1 car at a time. Over the year 'Sunny Bank Social Club' which is situated on the main road hosts many weekly bowling and social events. There is no parking available at this venue as well as the park itself and visitors are resulted in parking on the nearby streets which again is a hazard to the public. - Over the last 12 months I have witnessed 'near misses' (collisions and pedestrians/children being almost knocked over). It is only a matter of time before an accident will happen in this area - lets hope it isn't a fatality! The more cars in the area with increase the chances of this happening. - Wildlife and Enviromental Concerns: - The plot is situated on a steep grassy incline and is home to various wildlife species. - As a member of WWF I am well aware that both hedgehogs and water voles are endangered in the UK, both of which reside in the proposed plot.. - The water vole population dropped by 90% in 1988-1998. Their required habitat 'grassy banks along slow moving rivers, ditches, streams, lakes, ponds, canals, as well as marshland and upland. They dig burrows in steep grassy banks, which often include underwater entrances' is a perfect description of the Snig Hole plot. I was fortunate enough to witness baby water voles 'playing' in the nearby area a couple of weeks ago. In Lancashire there are many projects set up specifically to save the water vole from extinction. I have notified them of this potential planning site and they will getting in touch if the future plan goes ahead. - Any resident living in close proximity to the proposed plot will more than likely have first hand experience of the hedgehogs living in the proposed plot. - As stated above the site is situated by a river. In recent history this location has flooded and I am concerned that if any houses are built in close proximity they might be affected. - Logistical Concerns: - Local primary schools are all over subscribed. With my professional connections to both schools I believe that they can not be extended in any way to cater for more children. Their perimeters are limiting which means extensions cannot be built. - Looking at Rossendale on a large map I personally feel that there are much more suitable land for planning. Building small sites of 5-7 houses in already built up, congested areas seem ludicrous as this serves the few at the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						expense of the many. - - When writing this statement I am speaking on behalf of many local residents who, for various reasons, cannot access the internet and do not have the capacity for formally object. WE sincerely hope you reflect on OUR concerns and make the right decision in keeping this plot as protected GREEN BELT LAND for the people and wildlife of the Snig Hole area.		
1254	Sian	Davies	-	SHLAA16384	Object	Objection to loss of green spaces in Helmshore		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1276	Margaret	Turner	-		Object	<p>I wish to strongly object to development on this site - - Helmshore is a small village surrounded by green space and forests being open and accessible to all. Snig Hole park and the memorial gardens has for decades been a safe and family friendly area which has allowed multiple generations to enjoy the park, the open space and the access to pathways and bridleways. Should dwellings be permitted next to this site then local residents and the public would lose the countryside view and this would encroach on our enjoyment of such. The rural setting should not be the victim of development but should be protected. - - The village has seen many developments in the last few years and housing stock in this area has significantly increased on mostly brown field sites such as Limewood Close, Airtours and ongoing development of the Wavel and Holden Vale areas. These areas are still being developed and, as such, have not yet fully impacted on the amenities, traffic etc. We have already reached saturation point and I object to any plan looking to take our precious green field spaces. Any such development would provide limited dwellings but maximum disturbance to the children of the area and the community as a whole. - - As the numbers of residents increase this naturally has an impact on the residential amenities – doctors and schools have not increased. Helmshore residents have amenities only in the village itself and then only in one direction being Haslingden as there are no amenities on Holcombe Road (towards Holcombe Village) or Grane Road. Our schools, doctors and roads have reached capacity. - - The local residents have finally been given a zebra crossing in recognition of the fast road and need to protect children and ensure their safety entering and leaving the park. Any dwellings on this site would at least double the cars entering and leaving this zone which is inappropriate given the proximity to the park. The entrance to the park and memorial gardens is via a pair of stately stone gateposts which are part of the areas heritage and which only allow one car to pass through. It would be a travesty to demolish them meaning that a new entrance would have to be created feeding onto Helmshore Road. Helmshore Road is already a busy highway with a steep gradient making it an unsuitable road to feed into. This is coupled with Station Road opposite which is already difficult to come out of as a driver and nearly impossible to cross as a pedestrian. The local council must agree with this as the yellow lines were recently extended to grant a wider view to emerging traffic from Station Road. Further the pavement on Helmshore Road next to the proposed site is already small allowing only single access and again would cause endangerment of pedestrians should an access road be added. - - Noise and disturbance resulting from increased housing stock would negatively impact the feel of the park, memorial gardens and village as a whole. - - The council has a duty to play its part in nature conservation and this is not just with pockets of parkland but to consider the wider environment being the journey to the park and the surroundings of the</p>	No	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>park. Nature's boundaries are not hard and wildlife needs to be able to thrive. - - The high level of rainfall in Rossendale and therefore Helmshore must also be taken into account and the green fields and trees on this proposed site are currently a flood plain defence in that the rain water naturally heads down Helmshore road and into the Ogden River in Snig Hole Park. The area around the river and football pitches have always been boggy meaning that the surrounding field are doing their job of soaking up the water to allow the river not to become overfull and burst its banks. Taking away any surrounding land and trees would negatively affect the current balance of flood protection. The council has allowed bungalows to be built on Sunnybank Close and houses on Station Road which in living history have been a flood area. We continue to see water levels increase and the river in Snig Hole becoming unable to cope with the level of rain which in turn has meant the river has burst its banks. In allowing more concrete and less fields and trees on this site the natural knock on effect is less rainwater being soaked up and more rainwater flowing into the river increasing the risk of raised water levels and increasing the risk to existing housing stock next to the river to flood. The council has a duty to protect its current residents from flood risks. - - The effect of any development impacts on the character of the neighbourhood. Helmshore has become a popular location to live in Rossendale and this popularity has naturally seen a vast increase in the housing stock in our village meaning an increase in council tax from these new mainly high band residences. This cannot be expedient as this will ultimately mean destroying the reason why so many want to live in Helmshore. Nature and the character of our neighbourhood must be preserved.</p>		
1290	Deborah	Chapman	-	SHLAA16383 (?)	Object	<p>The village of Helmshore has been steadily expanding and merging into Haslingden. The green spaces are disappearing and the character of the landscape is changing. These proposed developments will be detrimental to the environment and the wildlife in the area. The Greens lane site is already congested at school times and there is a wealth of wildlife on the golfcourse (I hear a rumour about more proposed building along the golf course backing onto Cherry Tree Way). There are foxes, hedgehogs, too many bird species to mention. - - The roads and parking are at a premium in this area. The land at Snig Hole and Curven Edge are places where children play - more houses would mean more traffic and parking problems. A new park has just been built and crossing as it was dangerous and parking at Snig Hole along Station Rd (Bowl Alley) is a problem already. - - The Grane site backs on to Grane Road which is already completed congested and a rat run to the M65. The road network, , drainage, schools and amenities cannot take any more in this area. The council do little to look after the area - - building more houses mean we would loose the beautiful walks around here.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1299	David	Bemment	-	SHLAA16384	Object	There is too much development in and around Helmshore, The roads cannot cope with an increase in traffic volume.		I vigorously object to any further development in and around Helmshore. - The majority of the open spaces have been built on and the few remaining ones should be left alone, especially the one off Curven Edge, SHLAA16288. This area has been used by children as a play area since I moved here in 1990 and before that. - The local roads are gridlocked in the mornings and late afternoons, any increase in traffic volume would be intolerable. The other routes out of Helmshore are gridlocked as well e.g. Grane rd, M66 and Haslingden Rd. - The schools are full already and children from Helmshore can't always get into a school in Helmshore. - I think the development of Helmshore as a suburb of Manchester has gone far enough. -
1311	Joanne	Mellody	-	SHLAA16384	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1313	Jonathan	Hunt	-	SHLAA16384	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1334	matthew	dickinson	-		Object	It was a mystery to me where the money was found to pay for such a high quality resurfacing of the lane through Snig Hole at a time of "austerity" when it's only serving a handful of houses. Especially when the main roads in the valley would embarrass 1990s Bosnia. However, it is now clear that this is a precursor to the development of housing. A few points I would like to make would begin with the money spent installing paving for the blind and a zebra crossing to make it possible for the large amount of people who now attend the newly refurbished park to cross bowl ally and Helmshore road without being run over. After that, increasing the amount of traffic in that one spot by building houses would seem a retrograde step. If these houses have children living in them where will they attend school? Not in the nearly full local schools surely? Where will the new residents go for medical attention? I haven't attended Haslingden health centre in years. Partly because I don't get ill but mainly because I can't get in. It's to be hoped none of these new residents want to swim because the entire valley can't fit in Marl Pits! - - I cannot see how it can be justified to ruin a beautiful area of green village land for the sake of cramming in a small number of houses! It is completely disproportionate when there are other local abandoned ares that would benefit from development rather destroying public areas of natural beauty. - - - Regards - Matt Dickinson - - -		-
1345	Gerard	Greenhalgh	-	SHLAA16384	Object	This area is the start of one of the few unspoilt areas of Helmshore, into snig hole. - It is next to Helmshore Park on a elevated position, so will have a visual impact from the Park and opposite side of the Valley. -		
1355	Rebekah	Haworth	-	SHLAA16384	Object	The area recently average speed check cameras have be implemented to improve the safety of the road, if you have ever tried to exit Holcombe road in peak traffic to either head to Blackburn or Haslingden you would would appreciate the 160 extra houses would only add to this problem. - I also am concerned by how local schools will be able to accommodate extra pupils. I myself moved closer to our local primary school, as I know that year on year there is increasing pressure on children to get a place in a good ofsted rated school, and each year there are more and more stories of children having to travel to ramsbottom as they have not been able to get a place in their local school. - Also currently our nearest NHS dentist is in rawtenstall a few miles down the road, and to try and get a appointment within a week at my local GPs is almost impossible. I am not against building more housing, however the current infrastructure will not support these extra houses. And will only lead to further problems.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1367	Nicola	Hardman	-		Object	<p>Look at an aerial picture of Helmshore 'village' in 2017. Can this once beautiful village really be classed as a village anymore? There is hardly any green space with housing having been allowed to be crammed into every available space and Helmshore is no longer distinguishing from Haslingden. - - You refer to the government white paper, encouraging higher density 'where appropriate'. How can the destruction of a small village be classed as appropriate? - - Does anyone in the council commute outside the valley for work? Particularly the m66? You are encouraging the move to the countryside (cheshire based property developers at the Loom development) yet it is not reasonably possible for anyone who values family life and their time to commute to and from Manchester anymore with this journey now taking approx 90 minutes each way and the roads unable to cope. - - You address the serious concerns about the m66 and the m60 which are virtually gridlocked but do not propose any solutions. This is merely an afterthought. How you can even consider the building of so many new homes 'encouraging higher density' without addressing the lack of infrastructure and the gridlock is negligent. The travel issue such as re-opening the railway should be the starting point. - - No mention is made in the report of building extra schools or how Helmshore will cope with an influx of local residents when schools are already over subscribed with some people resorting to pay for their children to attend primary school due to be offered unsatisfactory schools outside of the area they reside. Again this should be a starting point. - - The lack of green space in the urban area of Helmshore is particularly sad for future generations. Yes, Helmshore is surrounded by beautiful hills, but is this a reason to remove all the green space within the 'village' itself and turn this into a concrete jungle? - - HS2 76 SNIG HOLE - - one of the more beautiful areas of Helmshore opposite the memorial park is at risk. See your policy HS5. This would have a clear impact on local character and appearance. - - Very close to one of the only green spaces where all the children in Helmshore are squished in the park to play. Development here is not safe. - - - the houses that have been allowed to have been built on Helmshore road in front of this proposed development are already an eyesore being so elevated. Further development would ruin this area steeped in history with the church so close by. - - Green belt? - - I fail to see why any green belt should be released to meet the 'housing requirement'. Planning for future generations should require saving greenbelt, not amending urban boundaries as suits and developing other areas of brownfield or other less developed areas of rossendale. The ratio of what is being proposed in Helmshore is grossly out of proportion with the size of the village. - - It's shameful that these developments are even being proposed and I assume that the council knew this given that the documented Proposal does not have the confidence to clearly define the proposed building in 'Helmshore' in the contents and attempts to sneak these developments in</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						under vague headings. Perhaps the council was aware of the upset anticipated from local residents. - This speaks volumes. Do you want your legacy to be ruining Helmshore for the future? -		
1399	George	Garlick	-		Object	Traffic hazard. - Junction Helmshore Rd / Station Rd already a mess due to Snig Hole parking (usually very badly) on Station Rd. Station Rd yellow lines stop too near jct, so traffic turning into Station Rd backs up onto Helmshore Rd. Turning L uphill out of Station Rd always hazardous because of cars parked in front of Elm Terrace too corner; you have to swing out into invisible traffic. Add to this suggestion of traffic merging from Snig Hole on a much more regular basis and you end up needing a mini roundabout or other control. Traffic going into Snig Hole will copete with traffic coming out, resulting in backing up onto Helmshore Road again. it's not realistic to have more traffic coming from that direction (the access road below Sunnybank Club may be a little less chaotic though I imagine getting out/in will still be a major problem for people. - User of the Snig Hole route is an obvious and dangerous hazard to children, pedestrians abd horseriders, all of whom rightly have priority and ownersip of a park entrance adn Lancashire greenway. i though teh whole point was to develop safe cycling space for children. - More posh houses are not needed in the village, and in the absence of a scheme for low cost housing on this site with careful traffic management, this should be rejected.		I would not support any further building in the green belt. - I would support building on the urban side of Holcombe Road between the (ex Holden Vale hotel) corner and Grane Road, subject to that land being deemed safe. the open space north of the textile mill lodges and linked to teh old railway line should be protected

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1400	Yvonne	Cox	-	SHLAA16384	Object	<p>The site at Snig Hole would put housing adjacent to the entrance of the recently refurbished Snig Hole Park. This is currently grazing land and with the river on the other side of the entrance provides a beautiful natural break from the buildings on Helmsshore Road to the park. The site is not flat and retained by a stone wall that forms a vital part of the entrance to the park. Any building on this area would reduce natural light to the entrance to the park and form a corridor effect to the lane. The park is well used and the lane already has vehicle access to the houses at the end of the lane. If access to the site is obtained via the entrance to Snig Hole a further 7 houses would result in potentially another 14 vehicles accessing a lane that is single track, has been specifically resurfaced for cyclists and regularly has high pedestrian levels (particularly young children). With the new crossing on Helmsshore Road encouraging safe pedestrian access to the park any increase in the number of vehicles in the area would seem to be a complete contradiction to the road safety measures already taken. Traffic along this road at peak times is already heavy and a development would add to this. This also would apply if access to the site is obtained via the lane next to Sunny Bank Social Club. The pavement was reinstated next to this entrance so that visitors to the park could access it safely. Encouraging more housing and more vehicle access would contribute to increased noise, pollution and waste and would remove essential natural features that assist in the drainage of this area. The park is a haven for those wishing to enjoy its beautiful natural surroundings and a playground that cost over £100k of public money to refurbish. This development would literally cast a shadow on this area of natural beauty and encroach on the enjoyment of this much loved facility .</p>		<p>Although it is appreciated that there is a housing requirement in the area , building executive homes at a cost of natural green space, children's play areas , and the environment does not seem to address this issue. Just because land owners see a potential housing site is agreeable to their pockets does not mean residents have to agree with this. Helmsshore has had a significant amount of new build housing over the last 3 years and the increase in traffic through the village has turned a quiet village into a commuter over spill. I sincerely hope that the council will listen to the objections from the residents of Helmsshore and keep our green spaces green.</p>
1403	Mark	Haworth	-	Snig Hole	Object	<p>Objections base around the following: - 1. The volume of traffic will increase in an area where the volume is already for the surrounding roads. (in particular Bowl Ally and Station Road. - 2. The increase of traffic will likely cause potential hazards on the runs along the park and the surrounding areas - 3. Parking in this area is already difficult for residents because of the recently developed park and usage of Helmsshore Road by patrons of Sunny Bank Social Club - 4 Double parking and parking on the pavement on Bowl Ally is already a cause a hazard and access problems for residents. - 5. The height of this development is also a concern for potentially obscuring/overlooking the surrounding houses. - 6. The access to this proposed development will be a problem due to so many converging in a very small area, where vision is already difficult because of parking in this area. - 7. Noise pollution for the surrounding residents will go up .</p>		<p>The communication about the nature of these plans has been so far uninformative. Residents would appreciate more details and more information. - E.g. Where the access Road is potentially going to be? The height of the proposed</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1414	Gavin	Cox	-	SHLAA16384	Object	This land, while being made available for development by the owner has unsuitable access. Access onto Helmshore Road which, at this point is almost single carriage way due to car parking, is unsuitable and allowing more cars access onto the bridal way leading into the park is unacceptable given the number of children and bikes that access this location. The site is being taken out of green belt to allow development and this should be reviewed in light of the reduced number of houses that are now needed per the latest government announcement that came after the local plan was released. - - As it is, the bridal way is single carriage way so the additional traffic will lead to more cars trying to pass each other and the only option would be to reverse back onto Helmshore road directly opposite station road. Additional cars should not be allowed to mix with other users of the bridal way in this location.		-
1424	Pamela	Beech	-	SHLAA16384	Object	I find it hard to believe that Rossendale council are planning to take away designated green spaces, which have been in place for many years. - The outlined plan for green belt land to have housing built on it is disgraceful. - They say there is a housing shortage in the Rossendale area, perhaps if the council looked at the many empty houses in the area and encouraged building company's to look at these rather than continually wanting to build new. - The Helmshore area is already over populated, the schools are over subscribed with children having to travel some distance to attend school. The traffic congestion in the area is getting worse, what should be a 20 minute drive to work takes me 40, 20 mins just to get out of Helmshore. - The proposed site at sing hole, I feel would lead to many accidents, even with the new crossing it is still a challenge to cross the road, 3 weeks ago when taking my granddaughter to the park when waiting to cross a bus was going so fast I did not think he was going to stop, he slammed is breaks on, then as we crossed a car over took the bus and nearly ran us down. - This would be even worse with cars trying to get out of the entry as well. - - Rossendale golf club seem to think that every time they run out of funding that it is ok to try sell off land and build houses, maybe they should look at the accounts team who manage there finances. - The impact of houses been built on the golf course, will affect not only the population increase but will have a major impact on the wildlife. - - Therefore as a resident of Helmshore I strongly object to the proposed plans. -		I feel that before any further decisions are made the people of Rossendale should be given the opportunity to speak. And given advance notice of any plans so they have time to reposond unlike this consultation which has not allowed people time to respond.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1427	Lee	Kershaw	-	SHLAA16384	Object	Again this is green belt land. It is right next to a park. The access into this area is very tight and is only single track.		We live in a beautiful part of the World, packing houses onto any bit of spare land just so that we can say to the Government that we have completed our quota is a bloody crime. If we are not careful we will become another suburb of Manchester.
1462	Robert	Harbin	-	SHLAA 16384	Object	This proposal would build 7 houses directly opposite a new and very successful young childrens play area. Access via Snig Hole would result in a major increase in traffic along the end of this lane and would represent a danger to children and others using the site. - - It would also sit directly opposite the Memorial Gardens and reduce the amenity value of this historic site. - - In addition it sits directly on National Cycleway 6 which runs along Snig Hole. This would represent a hazard to those using the cycleway.		- Both comments relate to proposals that go against the council role in promoting health and physical activity
1523	Kathlyn	Lawson	-		Object	HS2.76 is situated directly in front of a newly erected children's crossing on an already over populated, extremely busy Helmshore Road. Traffic flow on Helmshore Road is many times single line traffic due to the road being quite narrow, alongside parking for existing houses and a very popular Working Men's Club where there is constant traffic and no parking facilities. Access to more housing would create even further problems if proposed access is via SnigHole single lane track where the recently refurbished children's park is situated and no provisions made whatsoever for parking. Parents park cars dangerously on footpaths on Helmshore Road and Bowl Alley when visiting the park with their children. Any other proposed access to additional housing would be potentially dangerous for the same reasons as above.		Helmshore is already over populated with new housing and car congestion on housing projects recently completed in the vicinity of HS2.76 Lack of school spaces and funding being axed from central government leaving RBC always pleading poverty seems totally irresponsible to even consider the proposed amount of housing required in the area when there are insufficient funds to implement the necessary infrastructure. Leave green belt alone!!!!!!
1529	Lena	Warburton	-		Object	1. Loss of Greenbelt - 2. Inappropriate development on Greenbelt - 3. Highway safety - 4. Loss of visual amenity		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1548	Victor and Linda	Marcinkiewkz and Doody		SHLAA16384	Object	<p>I am writing to register my objections to proposed developments on sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) SHLAA 16384 HS2.76 Land at Snig Hole 2) SHLAA 16288 HS2.77 Land off Curven Edge <p>I attach my objections on separate sheets to this letter, for your examination. It should not be forgotten that in addition to these proposed building sites, close to Helmshore Road. Here are also more houses planned further up the toad on the St Veronica site.</p> <p>Site SHLAA 16384 HS2.76 Land at Snig Hole</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site location: Unnecessary removal of site from Green Belt and alteration of Urban Boundary when there are sufficient Brown Field sites available. RBC should be looking at the development of former commercial premises in town centres to provide flats which would be more affordable for first time buyers etc. For example, in Haslingden there are the half completed flats in the former Roebuck pub in Lower Deardengate; flats above former NatWest Bank in Lower Deardengate; former Methodist manse on Manchester Road; empty flats above property at corner of Dale Street. A recently example of conversion of former commercial premises can be seen at 176 - 180, Blackburn Road, Haslingden, where a disused antique shop has been made into three houses. 2. Topography (comments): Site is not 'virtually flat' 3. Vehicular access: Vehicular access to site would be along narrow lane to Snig Hole from a busy junction on Helmshore, which has recently been upgraded to improve road safety for pedestrians. More traffic here would create a dangerous situation both at the junction and along the lane. The lane adjoining the site is being incorporated into National Cycle Route 6 and is already heavily used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. An increase in traffic on the lane would have an adverse effect on this route and its users. 4. Ecological value: It is incorrect to say the site is not adjacent to a Biological Heritage Site. It is within a few hundred yards of the BHS at Snig Hole/Ravenshore and is connected to it by neighbouring fields and the Memorial Grounds (Snig Hole park). Nature does not recognise lines drawn on a map and the site is an important link in the Environmental Corridor that runs through Helmshore from Ravenshore via Snig Hole, Riverside Walk, former railway lines etc. No artificial fertilizers have been used on the field for at least 30 years which is likely to have increased its biodiversity. This is in contrast to the neighbouring Memorial Grounds, which, although part of the Environmental Corridor, have been more intensively managed. 5. Any housing development would have an adverse impact on the setting of Helmshore Memorial Grounds (Snig Hole park), the children's play area of which has been upgraded and is heavily used. This land was given as a memorial to men killed in the First World War and according to the deed of gift in 1925 includes the lane from Helmshore Road to Snig Hole. It would be 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>unacceptable to take any land from the park to widen the lane or to allow the setting of the gateway at the entrance on Helmshore Road to be altered. To take land from the field to widen the lane would reduce the acreage and make a development unviable.</p> <p>6. Constraints due to utilities: sewers, gas pipes etc. to neighbouring properties underlie the site.</p>		
1553	M	Rimmer			Object	<p>I am writing in objection to the above proposed plans.</p> <p>1) This access is used by many children so will be unsafe.</p> <p>2) The land is too narrow for traffic.</p> <p>3) Danger of traffic coming onto Helmshore Road.</p> <p>4) Use of green belt land.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1616	Janet	Simpson			Object	<p>SHLAA16384 – Land at Snig Hole, Helmshore (HS2.76)</p> <p>I wish to lodge an objection to the designation of the above parcel of land for housing development, plus why the change to the current Green Belt boundary and extension of the Urban Boundary should not go ahead.</p> <p>To being with there are a number of inaccuracies and errors in the SHLAA, which have a bearing on the suitability for inclusion of this parcel in the Urban Boundary and allocation for housing development.</p> <p>ASSESSMENT</p> <p>Availability</p> <p>The Assessment states that this parcel of land is in single ownership, when in fact it is multiple ownership. This criterion should be changed from green to reflect this.</p> <p>Legal constraints/ownership issues – part of the site was not put forward by the owner for release for housing development. This should change from green to red.</p> <p>Intentions of the landowner – the landowner who did not put forward their land for release has indicated that they are not willing to release it. This should change from green to red.</p> <p>Whilst the owner of the remaining parcel of land may still wish to release this for housing development, given the reduction in size, together with further constraints which will be outlined later on, would this site still be viable or would it now be considered too small?</p> <p>Suitability</p> <p>Topography – the comment is that this site is virtually flat, which is not correct. The land slopes sufficiently to require some engineering works to provide suitable ground levels for development. This should change from green to amber.</p> <p>Vehicular access – this has been set as green indicating good access or adjacent to a road. The lane leading from Helmshore Road to Snig Hole is a narrow, single track lane with only one passing place, this being the site entrance to one of the properties accessed off the lane, not owned by the applicant.</p> <p>The entrance into the lane at its junction with Helmshore Road is narrow with very restricted views of users (vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders) entering or leaving the lane.</p> <p>The lane is very well used not only by residents to access their properties but also by people going to the play area, including families with prams and young children; walkers on the Public Right of Way network (FP375 Haslingden); dog walkers; horse riders and cyclists on the recently upgraded National Cycle Route 6.</p> <p>A great deal of money has recently been spent on providing a pedestrian crossing immediately adjacent to the park gates. This was to provide a safe</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>place to cross for all those going to and from the park and beyond. Likewise money has been spent upgrading the lane as part of the Sustrans National Cycle Route No 6. Increasing the number of daily vehicle movements along this narrow lane, with no footway or places for other users to safely move off the lane to allow vehicles to pass is contrary to NPPF paragraph 75 which states that 'planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. ' A new access road would have to be created from the lane into the site, thereby reducing the area of developable land. Any proposed local widening would have to be taken off the site, again reducing the area for development. The two stone park gateposts at the entrance to the lane are a noted feature when entering Helmshore Memorial Park. These should not be removed purely to facilitate access. There is also the danger that these could be damaged irreparably by any large construction vehicles. Ecological value – the assessment states that the site is not located adjacent to a Biological Heritage Site (BHS). This is wrong as the site clearly is adjacent to one. There are no physical barriers or constraints that would prevent the free movement of plants and wildlife. This parcel of land has been used for agriculture for hundreds of years, but has not been farmed intensively for at least the last 40 years. It acts as a Green/Environmental Corridor allowing the movement of flora and fauna from the adjacent BHS to the surrounding countryside. Land management of the dismantled railway to the north of the site has also provided a more biodiverse environment than when it was in use as a railway. The creation of any new access would mean the loss of mature trees and hedgerow. Draft Local Plan Policy ENV12: states that development should not result in the loss or harm to trees or hedgerows and that the retention and protection of trees and hedgerow is critical in terms of biodiversity and also to protect the Borough's individual landscape and character. Constraints due to utilities – this is shown as green but should be red. The sewer serving the existing dwellings runs diagonally across the site. The gas pipe supplying the same properties also runs at a right angle across the middle of the field. The presence of these utilities would further reduce the area available for development. Achievability Extra costs of development – currently shown as green but should be changed to red. There would be the cost of creating a new access road into the site due to changes in ground levels, plus the presence of utilities infrastructure. Conclusion The conclusion summaries would need to be changed to accurately reflect a true assessment of the site, which should be that this is not a suitable site to be developed for housing. The creation of any new access would mean the loss of mature trees and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>hedgerow. Draft Local Plan Policy ENV12: states that development should not result in the loss or harm to trees or hedgerows and that the retention and protection of trees and hedgerow is critical in terms of biodiversity and also to protect the Borough's individual landscape and character.</p> <p>Proposed changes to the Green Belt Boundary</p> <p>Moving on to the proposed changes to the Green Belt Boundary and the removal of this parcel of land, currently within the existing Green Belt, and the argument for its retention as Green Belt. (An objection to the proposed changes to the Green Belt will also be lodged under a separate submission.)</p> <p>According to NPPF Purpose 3 of the Green Belt is 'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.'</p> <p>In the proposed changes to the Green Belt, Urban Boundary and Countryside document – Land Parcel Ref 30 notes on Purpose 3 state that 'there is a sense of encroachment with the parcel as a result of a cluster of residential properties, facilities of Sunnybank Social Club and a children's play area' so that 'the north of the parcel has a somewhat weakened rural character.'</p> <p>Sunnybank Social Club and Helmsore Memorial Park (which includes the playground) have both been in their locations for over 100 years. Likewise the residential properties are mainly a farmhouse and cottage which have been on site for over 300 years with associated farm buildings having been converted or re-built on the original footprint. In this respect there has been no recent 'encroachment'. Other buildings/structures associated with equestrian use are recognised as accepted use in rural areas (Policy LT5).</p> <p>The Potential Degree of Harm caused by the removal of this area from the Green Belt is considered Medium. However, this parcel is adjoining a large area of land where the Degree of Harm is considered High. If this parcel were to be removed the threat to the Green Belt would be increased. This parcel of land should remain, not only for its own value, but also to protect this whole section of Green Belt and the adjoining BHS.</p> <p>Draft Local Plan</p> <p>There are various policies in the draft Local Plan which strongly support the case of the Green Belt boundary not being move in this part of Helmsore. Briefly there are.</p> <p>Policy ENV4: Landscape Character and Quality</p> <p>In order to protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape, development proposals should:</p> <p>Retain and, where possible, enhance key views</p> <p>The Borough's landscape is significant in terms of its local identity, cultural value, tourism and general contribution to quality of life and it is essential that it is protected.</p> <p>Whilst the council are proposing the above policy for new builds, the same protection should be applied to existing properties. Views from the properties at Tor View Farm are considered some of the best in Rossendale.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks Ecological networks should be conserved, enhanced and expanded.</p> <p>Policy ENV6: Green Infrastructure Schemes which would result in a net loss of green infrastructure on-site will only be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on amenity, surface water run-off, nature conservation or the integrity of the green infrastructure network. <p>Green Infrastructure refers to the network of Rossendale’s multi-functional green spaces, corridors and waterways (“blue infrastructure”), which provide multiple social, environmental benefits, and enhance quality of life. It has an important role in providing habitats and migratory routes for many plants and animals</p> <p>Policy ENV12: Trees and Hedgerows Development proposals must seek to avoid the loss of, and minimise the risk of harm to, existing trees, woodland, and/or hedgerows of visual or nature conservation value, including but not limited to ancient and veteran trees. Development proposals should:</p> <p>b) not give rise to a threat to the continued well-being of retained trees, woodlands or hedgerows;</p> <p>Policy TR2: Footpaths, Cycleways and Bridleways The Council will support the development and enhancement of a strategic Public Rights of Way network including enhancements to surfacing, signage and feeder routes. Key routes are shown on the Policies Map and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Cycle Route 6 (Bury-Accrington) <p>Proposals to improve, extend or add to the existing footpath, cycleway and bridleway network in the Borough and in new development will be supported providing they: The creation of any new access would mean the loss of mature trees and hedgerow. Draft Local Plan Policy ENV12: states that development should not result in the loss or harm to trees or hedgerows and that the retention and protection of trees and hedgerow is critical in terms of biodiversity and also to protect the Borough's individual landscape and character.</p> <p>The creation of any new access would mean the loss of mature trees and hedgerow. Draft Local Plan Policy ENV12: states that development should not result in the loss or harm to trees or hedgerows and that the retention and protection of trees and hedgerow is critical in terms of biodiversity and also to protect the Borough's individual landscape and character.</p> <p>d) Do not harm residential amenities; e) Do not harm nature conservation interests; i) Have regard to other users of the route and vehicular traffic. j) The development would not reduce, sever or adversely affect the use, amenity or safety of a Public Right of Way (PROW).</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						<p>NPPF</p> <p>Para 81 – Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to ... retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity ...'.</p> <p>Para 83 – Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances...'</p> <p>Para109 – The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:</p> <p>Recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;</p> <p>Minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.</p> <p>Para 114 – Local planning authorities should:</p> <p>Set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Given all the above evidence and reasons this parcel of land should not be removed from the Green Belt and should not be designated for housing.</p>		
1655	Kirsten	Black		Snig Hole	Object	I would like to object to this development - it would be turning Helmshore into something it's not supposed to be and the local resources won't be able to support it e.g. schools, nor will they be adequately funded.		
1770	Katharine	Kennedy			Object	<p>HS2.76</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to the planned houses on the field adjacent to Sunnybank social club. I lived at Snig Hole for many years and was always struck by what a well-used and loved area this is, popular with walkers, cyclists and families using the park. It is also a significant wildlife corridor which links with Irwell Vale. Housing development here chips away at this crucial and much- valued green space.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
1814	P N & J	Heath			Object	<p>Housing Allocation Reference HS2.76 - Land at Snig Hole, Helmshore</p> <p>As residents of Helmshore for over 40 years we wish to put forward our objections to the inclusion of the above area of land in the Rossendale Draft Local Plan for future housing development. We feel this is an unnecessary and unacceptable intrusion into the Green Belt.</p> <p>1. Development of Land in the Green Belt</p> <p>Government Policy is to support the retention of the Green Belt except in very special or exceptional circumstances. We cannot see any special or exceptional circumstances which would warrant the removal of this land from the Green Belt when there are sufficient other areas of land within the borough outside the Green Belt which are available/suitable for housing development. The removal of this area of land from a Green Belt is premature.</p> <p>2. Accessibility</p> <p>It would appear that access to the site would have to be from the lane from Helmshore Road adjacent to the Memorial Gardens, children's playground, kick about area, cycle way and access to countryside walks. This would create a potential danger to children, families, walkers and cyclists (it is on the National Cycles Route) and horse riders who regularly use the lane. The provision of 7 houses could mean potentially an extra 20 cars (residents and visitors) using the lane.</p> <p>The land is in close proximity to the dangerous junction of Snig Hole/Helmshore Road and Station Road.</p> <p>The fact that a pedestrian crossing has recently been provided in this area for the safety of pedestrians is proof of the fact that there was a danger to pedestrians gaining access to Snig Hole. Any further development will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>In addition the high retaining wall to the Sunnybank Social Club Bowling green will severely restrict the visibility for vehicles entering Helmshore Road from the proposed development.</p> <p>3. Overdevelopment</p> <p>Since the 1970's Helmshore in general has been overdeveloped. The most recent developments at Sunnybank, Alden Rise, The Power Mill, Holden Vale and the former Airtours' sites, to name but a few, have placed tremendous pressure on the local infrastructure particularly the local primary and secondary schools and the Health services. Further development such as this will only exacerbate the current situation.</p> <p>4. Amenity</p> <p>The removal of this area of land from the Green Belt for the provision of 7 houses, given its location and close proximity to the Memorial Gardens, children's playground and the open countryside will be injurious to the amenities currently enjoyed by local residents of Helmshore and elsewhere and must be resisted.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.076	Further comment
						Please acknowledge receipt of this letter. We hope that our objections and concerns will be given very careful consideration and look forward to the amendment of the plan by the removal of the site from policy HS2 - Housing Site Allocations.		
Number of comments						77	HS2.076	
Reference		HS2.077		Land off Curven Edge, Helmshore				
524	Susannah	Penney	-		Object	Too many houses in an area of countryside already.		-
589	Stephen	Langridge			Not Applicable	3. HS277 Curven Edge, this land fronting onto Curven edge has, I understand, previously had planning permission granted for housing but the developer decided not to build on this area because of unsuitable ground conditions - I doubt that state of affairs has changed.		
665	Julie	Darbyshire	-		Object	A high risk proposal to further develop an area so close to a very well used young children's playground. Access arrangements are totally impractical for this development.		
673	Rosemary	Kearney	-	SHLAA16288	Object	We strongly object to the above planning applications for a number of reasons. - - Helmshore as an area is struggling to cope providing the amenities at present with the residents there are at the moment. The local primary schools are already over subscribed and children from the area are having to attend school in other towns. - - There has been a lot of money (self funded) spent on Snig Hole play area which is a great place for children to play safely and away from the main road. If there are more houses built there, the new resident's cars will have to drive right past the area which is unsafe for children. - - The planning for Rossendale Golf Club on Greens Lane again affects local school children as Haslingden High School is located on Greens Lane. This road is already busy especially at school times and more housing will only exacerbate the situation. - - The land off Curven Edge is one of the only green grass areas that children can play on safely. Especially as the local playing fields have been fenced off on Helmshore Road. This area is known locally for holding water as a culvert flows directly under it so I would not expect it to be a good area for development.		-
683	Brenda	Williams	-	HS2.77 curved edge, helmshore	Object	I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS SITE BEING BUILT ON. - - THIS IS THE ONLY LITTLE BIT OF LAND FOR THE CHILDREN FROM THIS AREA TO PLAY ON WITHOUT GOING TO THE PARK WHICH FOR SOME IS TOO FAR TO GO, AS THIS WOULD MAKE THEM GO ON A BUSY ROAD TO GET TO THE PARK. - - WE ONLY HAVE THIS SMALL GREEN AREA FOR THE CHILDREN. IT WOULD BE DISGRACEFUL IF THIS WAS TAKEN AWAY.		Only that we need green spaces for our wellbeing.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
697	Julie	Woods	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277, hs276	Object	<p>Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
698	John	King	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
699	William	Woods	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277, hs276	Object	<p>Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
700	Thelma	King	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
749	Fred	Barlow			Object	<p>I have been looking at the proposed plans for helmshore,holcombe road area. (1) Land off curven edge;This bit of land is the only play area this estate has,it has a culvert running under it,the land itself is infill ,the site is an old lodge belonging albion mill,it was something like 30ft.deep at the road end and I would say totally unsuitable for building on.I also believe some of the infill came from the bleach works site at Holden Wood where it was considered unfit for building on.</p> <p>(2) snig hole site;This sight has got problems with road junctions ,the river, road access ,it has parking problems connected with Sunnybank social club,it is overlooked by the bowling green.This land is also GREEN BELT land. Both sites will suffer from lack of school places,Helmshore school is full up now.The bus service is hopeless.</p> <p>I would like to object to the Plans for the above reasons.</p>		
751	Noel	Broadgate		SHLAA16288	Object	<p>I write regarding the unacceptable decision to appropriate the Green Belt land off Curven Edge to permit the erection of seven houses on this quarter of a hectare of Green Belt land.</p> <p>This can of worms has been opened at least once before, when an overwhelming number of local residents quite rightly had their way, and the flawed plans were withdrawn.</p> <p>Apart from obvious reasons such as the drain on local resources - schools, hospitals, police, sewers etc etc, there are problems specific to the proposed site, viz:- the ground is naturally soggy - drive past today and you will see clumps of marsh grass everywhere - such that local lore suggests that a digger once sank into it. There is an underground culvert, and at one time there was a big drain hole, now covered over. One of the reasons why the ground is boggy, particularly after the prolonged rain that we get in Rossendale, is that it is bordered on two sides by steep slopes, on three sides by domestic dwellings, the majority of which have drives, paths and paved areas which do not absorb water.</p> <p>Access would have to be from Curven Edge, as access from Fairhill is too steep. When residents protested last time, a photograph and an article appeared in the Rossendale Free Press. Access to their archive will show the strength of local feeling, as a result of which, this area, which we call "the rec", was designated as open land, for the use of residents, and future generations to enjoy.</p> <p>If you likewise appropriate the park down at Snig Hole, then there will be no usable local open recreational area.</p> <p>Please take this letter as an objection to the above plans, lodged by myself and my extended family.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
756	John	Simpson	-		Object	1. Site unsuitable for building as it straddles the culverted Longshaw Brook. - 2. Site already heavily used for informal recreation (not 'is likely to be'). It is a valuable space for the nearby housing estate. - 3. Site likely to be contaminated as it was used as a tip in 19th/20th centuries. - 4. Any increase in traffic at this junction undesirable.		RBC should concentrate on the conversion of former commercial property in towns into residential properties: - 1. High street shopping has changed with the number of supermarkets in the valley and online shopping. Towns do not need the same number of shop units. Banks etc which are closed are never going to reopen as banks and so again could be converted into apartments (at least in part, e.g. the upper storeys of the former Barclays Bank in Haslingden). - 2. This would reduce the need to build on so much of the Green Belt as is proposed, especially if, as is alleged, central government has reduced targets for the number of new houses that have to be built. - 3. Flats etc. would be more affordable for first time buyers, single people (one in three people in the UK now live alone) etc. - 4. Such developments provide a realistic attempt to address the problem of the homeless, which three and four bed-roomed houses etc do not. -
764	Chris	Aspin	Helmshore Local History Society		Object	Land is above a stream and former mill pond. Part was a local authority tip. - - Children use this area. Since the Borough Council allowed the Primary School to deny access to the School Field,, the land has been used much more for recreation.. -		Helmshore has more than enough houses. More would place an extra burden of the local schools and the Health Service. More cars, more problems.
795	Michael	Lord	-		Object	This is a green space used by kids to play in summer and often sledging in winter. Although we have a screen of trees between us and the field I want to look at a field in winter where there are no leaves on the trees not look down at 5 new houses.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
799	Sarah	Lord	-		Object	This is a village green area that is used by children throughout the year and also dog walkers. Building houses on the land will increase traffic on to an already busy road (Helmshore Road) which as well as parking issues, could cause safety issues (due to children playing on the land). Helmshore has recently had new (substantial) housing developments; below St Thomas' church and on the old Airtours car park, and there will soon be no green spaces left. Additionally the area is subject to flooding. - -		-
800	Peter	Wright	-		Object	I strongly object to development on land at Curven Edge, Helmshore. - This parcel of land has been used by generations of children and adults as leisure land. Removal of this would be to deprive (particularly) children of a safe place to play 'informally.' The 'dip' as it is known locally has been used by children (including my children and grandchildren) for sledging over many years and there is no other land in the area which offers the same 'facility.' I appreciate there are public parks and play areas at Snig Hole and Victoria Park but these in no way match the character and nature of 'the dip.' - Active outdoor play does have health benefits - I would not wish for any such benefits, however small, to be removed, - - In addition to the leisure aspect removing this green belt land would destroy a vital characteristic of the neighbourhood - an amenity lost for ever. - Should you require any further comment please let me know		-
810	Carl	Warren	-		Object	I would like to know why a notice informing residents of the Local Plan & site HS2.77 was attached to a lamp post on Fairhill only at the end of last week. Surely if you wish to inform people then the time to have done this was at the end of July, certainly before the meeting in Haslingden library. - - This development is for 5 houses, the yield proposed by applicant is blank since there is no applicant as yet. Is 5 the maximum that will be allowed & if not why not? - - This site known locally as "The Dip" is a popular place for children, especially for sledging on the bank after snow. The slope on the other side is much steeper and any houses would have roofs approximately level with the pavement on Fairhill. Relatively recently it has been realised that wood burning stoves are not "Green" but a source of particulate matter known as PM2.5 & this is the most harmful type of air pollution. - - Because the ground rises to the north & east of Fairhill & the prevailing wind is from the south west, smoke & pollutants often linger. Having a source at ground level with make this problem much worse. - - Since the number of wood burning stoves is rapidly increasing & in some areas there are plans to ban their use, I believe that this issue should be adressed before any decisions are made. - - I presume that the whole of the site will be sold off & there will be no guarantee that any of the trees will be retained.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
860	Stephen	Harris	-		Object	This is a greenfield site which has ALWAYS been used as an informal playing area since the estate was built in the early 1970s, particularly by local children. It is the only open green space in the area and it is within my knowledge that it has been used for that purpose at least as far back as September 1978. My wife and I have lived on Cherry Tree Way since then. It is used daily for general play and a variety of ball games; also by dog walkers. The slope at the side has always been used for sledging. The proposed alternative area at the back of the site is in my opinion unsuitable for recreational use. The children playing would no longer be visible from the road and so there is a safety aspect. It is also unclear as to how they would access the area. The land has long been thought unsuitable for building in any event. There is thought to be a culvert underneath. The Plan notes that there is a risk of flooding, which apparently is even more significant at the back of the site (proposed as a play area - it is not much used at the moment). The three storey houses built to one side several years ago are not in keeping with the area but they now conceal the site from St Thomas Church. They were built on the site of the old Portofino Restaurant (later "Truffles") which itself replaced a building which had been erected many years ago on stilts. The Plan shows that a significant part of the site is shown to be at medium risk of surface water flooding. We have witnessed serious flooding in Helmshore in the past. The main objection is that the site has ALWAYS been used by residents for recreational activities.		I object in principle to the proposed use of green belt land for housing, which should be kept as green belt, as originally intended. It seems to me that there are other possibilities, such as brownfield sites, which have not been satisfactorily explored. Also, there should be greater restrictions on the number of houses proposed in any given area. There seems to be a policy of "nibbling away" every few years at the established green belt. Ultimately
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16288	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -		
975	Lynn	Bentley	-		Object	This is an area where children can play safe and an area of relaxation		Unfortunately there are two many housing estates being built in the Helmshore area without an thoughts to its infrastructure

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
976	Gillian	Stephens	-	SHLAA16288	Object	Helmshore has been ruined as a village with the over development which has been allowed to take place over the years. There are virtually no green spaces left without a significant walk. We are supposed to encourage healthy living for our children yet you are proposing taking away green land used by many many children as a playing field close to their homes. Helmshore Primary School was the only other area where the whole community walked, played and generally enjoyed the outdoors, but that has been stopped due to the headteacher actions. This means the only other area for recreational use is Snighole park, which is already heavily used. The fact that there would only be one piece of land for such a large population is ludicrous and unfair. 'The Dip' as it is locally called is used every single day Winter and Summer. I was under the impression that some green land should be available for estates for the benefit of children and adults alike. I think the Council needs to give serious consideration to the amount of people's lives that will be affected with the building on 'The Dip' and consider the consequences of removing for ever this final small piece of green land. Does this Council was the legacy of ruining Helmshore.		Please consider the views of the local people who inevitably know their areas better than the Councillors. You cannot keep allowing one area to be built on over and over again until there is nothing left.
980	Julie	Cawtherley	-	SHLAA16288	Object	It's green belt land and should not be built on. It's the only green space for children to play on on that estate		There are too many housing developments being considered. The infrastructure in Helmshore can not accommodate the new residents
983	Neil	Leeming	-	SHLAA16288	Object	The land is constantly water logged, and is used by children to play games i.e. Football , sledging in winter and it is a green belt site and brakes up the monotony of houses.		by building on green belt sites you are taking away our village way of life and wildlife areas within the village.
996	Gillian	Bower	-		Object	There is a river running underneath this land. - The land is used by locals for a variety of activities. - The green land should not be eroded.		The proposed site for 160 houses adjacent to the Grane Road will also impact on our status as a village and erode into our green fields. The unused derelict buildings should be redeveloped into affordable housing to avoid the expansion of more concrete and buildings. We wish to remain a village with open green spaces, countryside surroundings and pleasant views not a built up urban sprawl. - -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
998	Jill	Jihkson	-		Object	Helmshore is already overdeveloped thanks to the Taylor Wimpey hideous estate on holcombe road. The roads are in a terrible state and too crowded you can't get off holcombe rd or up helmshore road. The schools are already at full capacity. There is not enough infrastructure to continually add hundreds more houses to this village. We have no train links. Just the bottle neck m66 - People need to listen to residents we have had enough we have no support from local council - Stop building in helmshore green belt before we have no green spaces left		Listen to the complaints that people are raising
1005	Peter	Dickinson	-		Object	This land is the only green space accessible to the public for recreational use in the immediate area. - It is used by local children - from Fairhill/Curven Edge/Cherry Tree Way/Knowl Meadow/Newbarn Close/St Thomas Close/East Street - as a play area. - The only other option for these children would be the park, at Snig Hole, but this is too far away for under 12 year olds to be allowed to go to unsupervised. - It would be most unfair to take away this amenity to build ONLY 5 houses, which is an insignificant contribution to the development plan. - - This land is also used by dogwalkers, the more elderly of whom cannot walk further to the next available green space.		
1014	Geoffrey	Hallam	-		Object	The same comments apply as same as those relating to area adjacent Helmshore Park.		
1019	Rachel	Dulson		SHLAA16288	Object	Helmshore is not equipped for additional homes to be built. Roads and schools are inadequate for the current population already. Current issues have not been addressed and now you are planning to throw even more people into the mix, as well as the disruption to traffic flow that building work brings. - Build us a new school, improve our roads and perhaps once that is done, redevelop the existing old buildings that are abandoned and in disrepair and then think about building new homes.		
1049	wendy	boniface			Object	There are to many references to list - The house proposed behind cherry tree will cause problems with site entrance and traffic. The same is applicable for greens lane and the dip off cherry tree. - - The last set of houses built in helmshore were supposed to be the last. You are compromising the integrity of the village. - - I would like to point out that greens lane is already an unsafe road and should be one way. Heavy water that runs down that lane after rain will also be made worse by the removal of trees -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1060	Stephen	Davies	Resident	SHLAA16288	Object	I agree housing needs to be built. But there are no plans to support infrastructure in the area. Grane road for example has a lot of traffic issues since joining up to the M65. Another 160 homes on that road trying to get out and in to the development will be a nightmare. Also there are plenty of brown field site to build on especially in Blackburn. Helmshore is a village we pay premium prices for homes in the area to have this life style we don't not want it spoilt. Large firms/ housing contractors build quick homes cutting corners all the time. Where are the children going to go to school with all schools in the area full and some of our children already having to travel to bury for school.		We need homes but well thought out planned homes. With good investment in roads, gp surgeries, schools, parks etc. We can not keep cutting into our countryside for the sake of making shareholders rich they don't love here we do please don't have the wool pulled over your eyes for all our sakes and children's.
1066	David	Ormerod	-		Object	<p>- I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed building of houses on landmark off Curven Edge. - It is imperative that no house building takes place on this valuable green space. This small green haven, known by our family and others as 'the big dip', has been used for years by children as a safe place to play, make dens, kick a football, around, go sledging when it snows etc. It is also full of wildlife and established trees. - This land should NEVER be built on, instead I propose that the 'big dip' be given the status of Village Green and be properly maintained, not neglected as it and it's surrounding pavements have been recently. Please save this lovely little area for generations to come.</p> <p>Email received 05/10/2017: I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed building of houses on landmark off Curven Edge. It is imperative that no house building takes place on this valuable green space. This small green haven, known by our family and others as 'the big dip', has been used for years by children as a safe place to play, make dens, kick a football, around, go sledging when it snows etc. It is also full of wildlife and established trees. This land should NEVER be built on, instead I propose that the 'big dip' be given the status of Village Green and be properly maintained, not neglected as it and it's surrounding pavements have been recently. Please save this lovely little area for generations to come.</p>		Helmshore is one of the few remaining jewels in the Rossendale Valley, proving very popular with commuters, but without its green spaces it will lose it's attraction as a Village and just become another small, overcrowded town. This is already in evidence in the standard, aesthetics and quality of the development opposite Musbury Fabrics, this new build is an eyesore built with a totally disregard to the heritage around it.
1218	Jack	Bacon	-	SHLAA16288	Object	Helmshore is a historic country town but our green belt land is gradually being taken away. There is one park in Helmshore and Snig Hole is one of the few green parks in the Valley as a whole. I personally do not want children to have to grow up without the countryside we all value greatly. Why should we have to pay the price for government quotas losing the green belt land we value so greatly?		-
1254	Sian	Davies	-	SHLAA16288	Object	Objection to loss of green spaces in Helmshore		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1290	Deborah	Chapman	-	SHLAA16288	Object	The village of Helmshore has been steadily expanding and merging into Haslingden. The green spaces are disappearing and the character of the landscape is changing. These proposed developments will be detrimental to the environment and the wildlife in the area. The Greens lane site is already congested at school times and there is a wealth of wildlife on the golfcourse (I hear a rumour about more proposed building along the golf course backing onto Cherry Tree Way). There are foxes, hedgehogs, too many bird species to mention. - - The roads and parking are at a premium in this area. The land at Snig Hole and Curven Edge are places where children play - more houses would mean more traffic and parking problems. A new park has just been built and crossing as it was dangerous and parking at Snig Hole along Station Rd (Bowl Alley) is a problem already. - - The Grane site backs on to Grane Road which is already completed congested and a rat run to the M65. The road network, , drainage, schools and amenities cannot take any more in this area. The council do little to look after the area - - building more houses mean we would loose the beautiful walks around here.		-
1294	Michael	Chapman	-	SHLAA16288	Object	These developments will alter the community feel of Helmshore. - The school infrastructure isn't suitable. - The green belt should be protected. - -		-
1299	David	Bemment	-	SHLAA16288	Object	This area is the last green space locally available for the children of our estate to play on. - There is already too much traffic on Helmshore Rd, this will make it worse. the area is too congested as it is.		I vigorously object to any further development in and around Helmshore. - The majority of the open spaces have been built on and the few remaining ones should be left alone, especially the one off Curven Edge, SHLAA16288. This area has been used by children as a play area since I moved here in 1990 and before that. - The local roads are gridlocked in the mornings and late afternoons, any increase in traffic volume would be intolerable. The other routes out of Helmshore are gridlocked as well e.g. Grane rd, M66 and Haslingden Rd. - The schools are full already and children from Helmshore can't always get into a school in Helmshore. - I think the development of Helmshore as a suburb of Manchester has gone far enough. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1311	Joanne	Mellody	-	SHLAA16288	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1313	Jonathan	Hunt	-	SHLAA16288	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		-
1334	matthew	dickinson	-	SHLAA16288	Object	After the mean spirited actions of Lancashire county council in fencing off land which had been in public use for many years (playing fields behind Helmshore county primary), I find it beggars belief that one of the only green spaces left in Helmshore in public use could be ear marked for housing. This land is in constant use all year round by children for playing out in good weather, sledging in winter and is even used by local scout, cub and brownie troops to practice erecting tents. Whilst I was born and raised in haslingden, my family lived in Helmshore and I am aware of this land in constant use for recreation for the 34 years that I can claim to be aware. To add to that the roads, doctors surgery, primary schools, secondary school and available recreation facilities haven't grown appreciably since I was born (in fact thanks to your employers actions they have noticeably shrunken) so how your organisation proposes to handle more incoming residents is a mystery to me. - Regards - Matthew dickinson		-
1355	Rebekah	Haworth	-	SHLAA16288	Object	The area recently average speed check cameras have be implemented to improve the safety of the road, if you have ever tried to exit Holcombe road in peak traffic to either head to Blackburn or Haslingden you would would appreciate the 160 extra houses would only add to this problem. - I also am concerned by how local schools will be able to accommodate extra pupils. I myself moved closer to our local primary school, as I know that year on year there is increasing pressure on children to get a place in a good ofsted rated school, and each year there are more and more stories of children having to travel to ramsbottom as they have not been able to get a place in their local school. - Also currently our nearest NHS dentist is in rawtenstall a few miles down the road, and to try and get a appointment within a week at my local GPs is almost impossible. I am not against building more housing, however the current infrastructure will not support these extra houses. And will only lead to further problems.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1367	Nicola	Hardman	-		Object	<p>I am writing to put forward my objections to the proposed property development in Helmshore. - - I will address each of the sites separately below however my overall concern which applies to all of the proposed development sites in Helmshore is the lack of services, infrastructure, and erosion of valuable green space. - - Look at an aerial picture of Helmshore 'village' in 2017. Can this once beautiful village really be classed as a village anymore? There is hardly any green space with housing having been allowed to be crammed into every available space and Helmshore is no longer distinguishing from Haslingden. - - You refer to the government white paper, encouraging higher density 'where appropriate'. How can the destruction of a small village be classed as appropriate? - - Does anyone in the council commute outside the valley for work? Particularly the m66? You are encouraging the move to the countryside (cheshire based property developers at the Loom development) yet it is not reasonably possible for anyone who values family life and their time to commute to and from Manchester anymore with this journey now taking approx 90 minutes each way and the roads unable to cope. - - You address the serious concerns about the m66 and the m60 which are virtually gridlocked but do not propose any solutions. This is merely an afterthought. How you can even consider the building of so many new homes 'encouraging higher density' without addressing the lack of infrastructure and the gridlock is negligent. The travel issue such as re-opening the railway should be the starting point. - - No mention is made in the report of building extra schools or how Helmshore will cope with an influx of local residents when schools are already over subscribed with some people resorting to pay for their children to attend primary school due to be offered unsatisfactory schools outside of the area they reside. Again this should be a starting point. - - The lack of green space in the urban area of Helmshore is particularly sad for future generations. Yes, Helmshore is surrounded by beautiful hills, but is this a reason to remove all the green space within the 'village' itself and turn this into a concrete jungle? - - To turn to the particular proposed developments; - - - HS2 77 CURVEN EDGE - - this proposed development would remove a playing field for children which contravenes the government policy on reducing child obesity. This is a safe local space for the children of the estate to play on. Surely this contravenes open space requirements if you are taking away open space on one development to make a new development? - - the houses that have been allowed to have been built on Helmshore road in front of this proposed development are already an eyesore being so elevated. Further development would ruin this area steeped in history with the church so close by. - -Green belt? - - - I fail to see why any green belt should be released to meet the 'housing requirement'. Planning for future generations should require saving greenbelt, not amending urban boundaries as suits and developing other areas of brownfield or other</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
						less developed areas of rossendale. The ratio of what is being proposed in Helmshore is grossly out of proportion with the size of the village. - - It's shameful that these developments are even being proposed and I assume that the council knew this given that the documented - Proposal does not have the confidence to clearly define the proposed building in 'Helmshore' in the contents and attempts to sneak these developments in under vague headings. Perhaps the council was aware of the upset anticipated from local residents. - This speaks volumes. Do you want your legacy to be ruining Helmshore for the future? -		
1399	George	Garlick	-		Object	Drainage and implications on site + further down the hill. - This site has not previously been built on because of serious drainage issues. Any suggestion of building would need a watertight - literally - solution to be in place before construction. i don't know if this is practical or achievable; if this scheme delivered solely or majority low cost housing I would support its implementation if it is achievable. - Part of any plan must NOT result, as Lime Tree Close has, in further problems down the hill. Land below Lime Tree Close is now significantly wetter than before, with the loss of soakaways above the railway line resulting in flooding risk and actual flooding below due to water ingress. - Play area - This is a rare open space among the housing. the only other one - the school playing field - has been rendered inaccessible to a generation of children now by obstructionist policies perpetuated by the Helmshore Primary School head. This has rendered the area unusable, without expanding play space for the schoolchildren. Has any consideration been given to building on some of the school playing field and leaving this known open space with unfettered play access alone?		I would not support any further building in the green belt. - I would support building on the urban side of Holcombe Road between the (ex Holden Vale hotel) corner and Grane Road, subject to that land being deemed safe. the open space north of the textile mill lodges and linked to teh old railway line should be protected

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1400	Yvonne	Cox	-	SHLAA16288	Object	<p>This land is currently green space at the entrance to a housing estate built in the 1970's. It is predominantly used by children to play on and dog walkers . In snowy weather it is a well used well loved sledging area . It has mature trees to one side and housing around it. This area provides vital vegetation to absorb surface water in the area and any building on this area would impact on this. - Any access from this site on to Curvan Edge would increase traffic directly onto a road where traffic backs up the hill, queuing to turn onto Helmshore Road .The town houses opposite St Thomas Musbury have their parking accessed via Curvan Edge and increase in traffic or additional access to this road would be potentially dangerous to pedestrians walking up the hill and cars turning into the Curvan edge. It is vital that to keep the village feel of Helmshore green areas such as this are protected and not built on. - In an area where there are limited school places, doctors and dentists, it would be interesting to have details of what provision is in place to support this requirement.</p>		<p>Although it is appreciated that there is a housing requirement in the area , building executive homes at a cost of natural green space, children's play areas , and the environment does not seem to address this issue. Just because land owners see a potential housing site is agreeable to their pockets does not mean residents have to agree with this. Helmshore has had a significant amount of new build housing over the last 3 years and the increase in traffic through the village has turned a quiet village into a commuter over spill. I sincerely hope that the council will listen to the objections from the residents of Helmshore and keep our green spaces green.</p>
1414	Gavin	Cox	-	SHLAA16288	Object	<p>This land is well used by local residents for all round leisure activities. The argument that this land had been previously discounted due to the proximity to St Thomas' church still applies. The fact that a building that was becoming derelict and has been refurbished now presents a barrier between this site and the church seems tenuous. It is already difficult to exit the estate at rush hour and additional cars and access to this site within a short distance of the junction will only make this harder. The apartment have access from Curven edge and development on this site would mean two junctions onto Curven edge in a very short distance decreasing the safety of the young people who live here already. You have to wonder why this site was not developed originally and it doesn't take much to discover the site is very much covering historic pollution. Given the pressures of school places locally and doctors additional housing, which most likely would be targeted at families, does not have the local amenities to support it.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1424	Pamela	Beech	-	SHLAA16288	Object	I find it hard to believe that Rossendale council are planning to take away designated green spaces, which have been in place for many years. - The outlined plan for green belt land to have housing built on it is disgraceful. - They say there is a housing shortage in the Rossendale area, perhaps if the council looked at the many empty houses in the area and encouraged building company's to look at these rather than continually wanting to build new. - The Helmshore area is already over populated, the schools are over subscribed with children having to travel some distance to attend school. The traffic congestion in the area is getting worse, what should be a 20 minute drive to work takes me 40, 20 mins just to get out of Helmshore. - The proposed site at sing hole, I feel would lead to many accidents, even with the new crossing it is still a challenge to cross the road, 3 weeks ago when taking my granddaughter to the park when waiting to cross a bus was going so fast I did not think he was going to stop, he slammed is breaks on, then as we crossed a car over took the bus and nearly ran us down. - This would be even worse with cars trying to get out of the entry as well. - - Rossendale golf club seem to think that every time they run out of funding that it is ok to try sell off land and build houses, maybe they should look at the accounts team who manage there finances. - The impact of houses been built on the golf course, will affect not only the population increase but will have a major impact on the wildlife. - - Therefore as a resident of Helmshore I strongly object to the proposed plans. -		I feel that before any further decisions are made the people of Rossendale should be given the opportunity to speak. And given advance notice of any plans so they have time to reposond unlike this consultation which has not allowed people time to respond.
1427	Lee	Kershaw	-	SHLAA16288	Object	This area of land is an old rubbish tip. This is why it has not been built on in the past. The area has been covered over some years ago and is now used as a children's play area. To destroy a children's play area for the sake of 5 house is ludicrous.		We live in a beautiful part of the World, packing houses onto any bit of spare land just so that we can say to the Government that we have completed our quota is a bloody crime. If we are not careful we will become another suburb of Manchester.
1462	Robert	Harbin	-	SHLAA 16288	Object	This proposal for development of 5 houses is on the only open area for children to play within the whole of this estate. - - Given the role of councils to promote healthy liefstyles it seems peverse as it would remove the opportunity for informal play. The area in question is well used by local children. The Local Plan emphasises the importanc e of playing fields but it is important not to forget the role of informal play areas, easily accessible and in close proximity to childrens homes. (It was even better used before RBC suspended regular mowing of the whole site and only the roadside margin mowed.) - - Im not qualified to comment on the suitability of the land for building but when we moverd to the area - 34 years ago - the site contained a small lake! -		- Both comments relate to proposals that go against the council role in promoring health and physical activity

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1467	Karen	Brooks	n/a		Object	The land in question is regularly used by the community as a children's play area. Play occurs on here throughout the year - regardless of weather conditions. It is especially popular during the winter months, when it snows, with families going out sledging. The space is invaluable for those families living on the estate from Fairhill to Curven Edge as it provides a safe space for the children to play and removes the need for them to cross Helmshore Road, which is high in traffic at most times during the day, week and weekends alike. - - There are many people with dogs in the local area and dog walkers equally use the space responsibly. - - The land as it stands is a welcome bit of green space generally for all concerned. There are well established trees and it would be a huge loss if these were to be removed or their future growth curtailed. - - Helmshore, in my opinion, has already been developed to the max. in terms of housing. Any further additions to the housing stock, regardless of how big, would provide added strain on the infrastructure and services in the area (road usage, schools, bus routes, local facilities). - - The disruption the development would cause in the interim would, I feel, be detrimental to everyone in the local area - noise, added construction traffic. - - The ongoing impact of the development on the environment - more pollution especially from cars, wood-burners, etc.		-
1474	Peter	O'Dowd	-	SHLAA16288	Object	Object to green belt land being built on especially the golf course and breach of covenant on curven edge		No
1498	mary	garlick	-		Object	This area is routinely flooded in wet weather and is permanently boggy indicating it is land that acts as drainage and potentially flood defense for the area. Having experienced water inundation in my property, in part possibly linked to housing development on Lime Tree Close where drainage of the site has resulted in more water running onto the land below the old railway line, I would be concerned that building on the Curven Edge site would have similar effects.		It is not clear from information available at this point what provision for social housing is being made. - While some of the implications of increased housing in the area relate to service provision by the County Council e.g. Education it is not clear how the Local Plan will address increased need for public services when the local population increases.
1521	Barbara	Shaw		SHLAA16288	Object	There are already a lot of children living on this estate who use this space for playing ball etc in the summer and for sledging in the winter. If the proposed housing goes ahead then these children will resort to playing on the roads which will be both unsafe and a nuisance. It is too far for them to go the local parks whereas this plot of land is ideally placed.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1548	Victor and Linda	Marcinkiewkz and Doody		SHLAA16288	Object	<p>I wish to object to the Emerging Local Plan Draft Local Plan (2019 to 2034) for Rossendale and the proposals for Whitworth. I would like to state my objections to the local plan specifically for the Whitworth Area, and in particular Site Ref HS2.106 and Site Ref HS2.1 09 I attach my objections on separate sheets to this letter, for your examination.</p> <p>It should not be forgotten that in addition to these proposed building sites, close to Helmshore Road. Here are also more houses planned further up the toad on the St Veronica site.</p> <p>Site SHLAA16288 HS2.77 Land off Curven Edge</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site unsuitable for building as it straddles the culverted Longshaw Brook. 2. Site already heavily used for informal recreation (not 'is likely to be'). It is a valuable space for the nearby housing estate. 3. Site likely to be contaminated as it was used as a tip in 19th/20th centuries. 4. Any increase in traffic at this junction undesirable. 		
1553	M	Rimmer			Object	<p>I am writing in objection of this green field being used for building. It is the only place where children can play safely and it is used throughout the year. Where will they play?</p> <p>There are dangerous chemicals in the ground there which are still present although culverted (?).</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1561	Richard	Peat			Object	<p>Plan Ref: HS2.77 Land off Curven Edge, Helmshore Attached to this e mail</p> <p>1 Press copies about previous planning applications. There are significant comments from councillor and council officials in these cuttings. Please have a look at them.</p> <p>2 Photographs of the area under consideration before and after landfill.</p> <p>3 Letter from councillor John Holt with copies of minute extracts from Derelict Land Scheme/Landscaping and funding for landscaping.</p> <p>4 Minutes from Corporate Policy Committee Meeting 27.08.02 Please note points 3.3,4.1, 4.2, 5.1,6.1 and 9.2</p> <p>5 Letter from council estates officer Christine Sheasby 12.09.02 confirming the outcome of the 27.08.02 meeting with the comment 'THE SITE SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE SCHEDULE OF SITES FOR DISPOSAL'</p> <p>6 One page example of the 1044 signature petition.</p> <p>7 Letters of support from previous valley MP's. David Trippier and Janet Anderson.</p> <p>I write reference the Rossendale Local Plan and specifically regarding plot HS2.77 land off Curven Edge, Helmshore.</p> <p>There have been three previous attempts to build on this land. All three applications have been refused. The arguments against are basically unchanged since the first application in 1989. Mainly that the area was intended as a landscaped green play area and has been used for this purpose since landscaping took place after infill from the Haslingden Bypass was used to level the site in the 1980's. This allowed grass seeding and tree planting to take place. The trees were given preservation status by yourselves as you were landscaping the area for the future. The suitability of this land for development has also been called into question you can see from the attached photographs of before and after the state of the land and the depth of the infill. This is 7.9m at its deepest point there was a stream running through the centre of the plot that is now in a culvert at that depth. On the point of suitability I draw your attention to the corporate policy committee findings at their meeting in August 2002, copy attached. Please note points 3.3,4.1, 4.2, 5.1,6.1 and 9.2. You will also see in the attached letter from Christine Sheasby that this land should be removed from the schedule of sites for disposal.</p> <p>During the 2001 planning application a 1044 signature petition was raised objecting to any use other than for recreational purposes for this piece of land. The petition was raised within five days showing the strong feeling locally to keep the land available as a safe play area. If you look at the original planning application by Milbury Homes, for the development of Curven Edge,</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
						<p>you will see quite clearly the area as marked as a landscaped green infrastructure. You will see on your current plan there is a strip of land not owned by the council adjacent to number 48 Curven Edge, running through to the rear of the field. Again if you look at the original plan a fourth house, number 50, should have been built here but the land was deemed unsuitable for number 50 was never completed. The stability of the area would have to be brought into question if development was considered. During the landfill process the ground moved with the machinery that was tipping and levelling the site. Number 48 sustained cracking damage and had to have remedial work. Land behind numbers 32, 34 and 36 moved out towards the infilled dip. In this area only gardens and fences were involved, however, movement still took place. Any heavy digging work could likely cause such problems again. Building records should show if the new culvert was constructed to a specification to allow building over it. However, when the two properties were built at the end of Cherry Tree Way the site had to be excavated and the culvert upgraded under the houses. If this needs doing again this culvert is 7.9 metres in depth across the field.</p> <p>The council own the front part of the plot a retired builder the rear, the area you say will be left as a green infrastructure. If you allow planning on your part of the plot then the owner of the rear will more than likely expect he can get planning on his part. This will cause still more objections as the whole area is used by children to play on. Every planning committee that has looked at this piece of land since 1989 has accepted it should be left as a green play area support has come from all sides of the council including country councillors and local MP's. The area is used daily by families, dog owners and children from sledging in the winter to ball games etc. in the summer and should remain available for this purpose.</p> <p>Since 2003 the plot has provided a further 4 homes for the area when the original restaurant was rebuilt as a residential property and three townhouses were erected on the old restaurant car park area. There is additional space further up Helmshore Road where St Veronicas church has recently been demolished. I notice this area doesn't feature on your plan but I cannot believe this isn't intended for future development giving space for more than 5 houses that fit better in the surrounding area. I trust once again it can be accepted that the land off Curven Edge is better remaining in the community as a recreational area. It would be really helpful if you could once and for all declare this land not for housing development, as has actually been promised during the conclusion of each previous planning application review.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1627	Wendy	Leake			Object	We have concerns regarding the planning to this location. The roads are busy enough around this area. Our children in this area use this land in the summer to play and winter to sledge on there is not any other spare ground in the immediate vicinity to accommodate this. To build on this ground would stop this from happening. We have spoke to other families regarding this and we all feel the same way. Our prime interest is to keep our children off the street and safe. Please could you get back to us regarding the above issues.		
1639	Anthony & Janette	Lye			Object	<p>I am writing with my objection to the proposed building on the land at Curven Edge, Helmshore. The notice which as been displayed does not explain when the building will take place, the number and type of houses which are proposed, the name of the builders, and also the commencement of the buildings. The land at Curven Edge is used as a local amenity for children as a play area, provides open character, woods and dog walking facilities for our local community where this open space is enjoyed by many residents in the local community. Our concerns regarding this plot are the culvert running under the proposed building plot. We have lived here since December 2014 and we have noted that the land is constantly water logged. Our solicitor informed us when we purchased the property that it was unlikely consideration would even be given to building on this site due to these circumstances. We also understand that this site has been subjected to mine workings in the past. We are also concerned as to what impact any groundwork in preparation for building may have on our property. Please tell us who will indemnify us in respect of any possible structural defects to our property, which may result from any such works.</p> <p>In the past few years RBC have passed for houses to be built on the land adjacent to St Thomas's Church on Limewood Close, the conversion of flats in the Power Mill on Holcombe Road, houses on Yarn Avenue the old Airtours sight and a possible proposal of 150 houses on Holcombe Road and Grane Road which is still under consultation with a proposal of houses being built on land adjacent to Snig Hole.</p> <p>Helmshore was considered a village in the 30's and 40's with a rail network and roads to use for the use of commuting. At present we do now have no rail network, buses run around Helmshore infrequently, and the X41 bus, which goes either to Manchester or Blackburn, is only accessible on Broadway. This means people have to commute to work using their own transport therefore increasing the volume of cars in the area. Also affected are public services such as schools and doctor facilities, which are going to be stretched even further than they are already when the population increases in this neighbourhood.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1658		Bickford			Object	<p>I would like to register my protest to the building of houses at Curven Edge (HS2.77)</p> <p>Our house over looks this land and through the spring/summer we have taken great delight in seeing the local children, on a daily basis using this land to play on. Their activities range from football to den building.</p> <p>In an environment when we are seeing children become less and less active leading to future obesity and other health issues which put demands on the NHS, it is surely a necessity that we keep the sites which allow children to participate in activities which nurture good health and help to build friendships in local communities.</p> <p>The other group that regularly use the land are dog walkers who we see responsibly picking up their dog litter and disposing it. The area provides a safe grassy sites for any dog owners on the large estate to allow their dogs to have a good run around.</p> <p>It is also well documented that the presence of greenery from grass and foliage has a positive effect on mental health. Mental health issues as you will know are increasing and anything that could alleviate this would be beneficial. Please consider that the effects of removing such a well used and loved site on the health and well being of the local population</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
1814	P N & J	Heath			Object	<p>Housing Allocation Reference HS2.77- Land at Curven Edge. Helmshore As residents of Helmshore for over 40 years we wish to put forward our objections to the inclusion of the above area of land in the Rossendale Draft Local Plan for future housing development.</p> <p>1. Unsuitability of land for Development This land was the subject of a Derelict Land Reclamation Scheme in 1979. For more information please refer to Rossendale B.C. Planning Committee Minute no. 597© 10/9/79, minute no. 885 12/11/79 and minute no. 1077(b) 10/12/79.</p> <p>The land was culverted and then filled in using spoil from the Haslingden By-Pass Scheme. From personal knowledge the material tipped was more like slurry and many complaints were made at the time about the type of material being used to fill the site. The land was then top soiled and seeded. The result of this has meant that part of the site in the vicinity of the deep manhole shafts (see photographs) is always wet throughout the year whatever the weather. We would suggest that the unsuitable/unsafe ground conditions would preclude any possible housing developments without expensive and extensive engineering/foundation works being undertaken, thus making it uneconomical to develop.</p> <p>2. Loss of amenity This land and the land opposite forms a pleasing aspect at the entrance to the estate and its development would mean the loss of a valuable amenity to the residents of the estate.</p> <p>The main area of land which is adjacent to Curven Edge has been and still is used by residents and others as a dog exercise area, by families and children for ball games, communal bonfire/firework displays and for sledging and snowballing in the winter- It provides a safe play area for children on the estate,</p> <p>Our own children enjoyed the use of this land and we would not like to see the current and future generation of children deprived of the use of this valuable recreation facility,</p> <p>The loss of this area of land would therefore be injurious to the amenities at present enjoyed by the residents of the estate and Helmshore as a whole,</p> <p>3, Overdevelopment Since the 1970's Helmshore in general has been overdeveloped, The most recent developments at Sunnybank, Alden Rise, The Power Mill, Holden Vale and the former Airtours' sites, to name but a few, have placed tremendous pressure on the local infrastructure particularly the local primary and secondary schools and the Health services, Further development such as this will only exacerbate the current situation,</p> <p>4, Previous History As we understand it part of the land is owned by the Council and the Council</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.077	Further comment
						in the past has refused to dispose of their interest therein, In addition planning permission has been refused for housing development for the whole site. No doubt your records will confirm the planning history of the site, Please acknowledge receipt of this letter- We hope that our objections will be given very careful consideration and for the reasons stated above the Draft Plan will be amended by the removal of this site HS2,77 from policy HS2- Housing Site Allocations.		
Number of comments						HS2.077	58	
Reference		HS2.078	Grane Village and land off Holcombe Road					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
179	Anthony	Hodbod			Object	<p>B6232 Grane Road</p> <p>When the highway planners decided to put an intersection off the M65 at guide into the B6232, did they intend that this little used, and under considered difficult road should become a major traffic artery in the North West of England? Because this is what it rapidly became.</p> <p>The attached map is not based on traffic survey. It is based on good estimates of driver choice to use the most efficient route. Thousands of drivers now use B6232 Grane Road as their first choice of travel between a very large range of destinations.</p> <p>The transformation of a quiet local road into an arterial road since 1998 has had a major impact on the quality of life of people in the inhabited area through which the road passes before it joins the A56.</p> <p>Traffic Volume</p> <p>Large numbers of vehicles are not just experienced at "rush hours". There is dense traffic at all hours during the daytuime. Night-time is favoured by HGV drivers ignoring the 7.5ton limit. During the daytime "convoys" of some 50 cars are regularly observed (local observation)</p> <p>Speed</p> <p>The writer considers that, from his own and other peoples' observations, a large proportion of drivers in the 30 mph restrctied section of Grane Road have no intention of conforming to the speed limit. This is most probably because the inhabited length of Grane Road is a minor interruption on a longer journey which must be undertaken at maximum speed.</p> <p>There is occasional police presence which slows the traffic down for a while. The open stretch of the B6232 attracts riders of powerful motorcycles. Some riders do not wait until the have cleared the 30 mph zone to open their throttles to maximum acceleration. Thry experience the exhilaration of power and speed whilst the residents are subjected to high levels of noise and danger.</p> <p>Residents have suggested a number of safety measures over the years from 1998:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40 mph speed limit from heap clough to the present 30 mph limit speed cameras in the 30 mph zone Predestrian refuges at bus stops A roundabout at the Holden Arms <p>Even if all these measures were implemented it would still leave Grane Road as an over-used, congested and dangerous road. It would be the height of folly to place a surther 160 houses into this completely unsuitable environment.</p> <p>The solution</p> <p>Recently in the north west money has been lavished on two majoy congestion points - the A55 in Chesire and the A6 north of Preston. The M65 at guide to the A56 at haslingden grane road is now a major traffic axis, and should</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>therefore be given similar treatment.</p> <p>This axis of travel should continue BUT on a new road dedicated to this traffic (see map No.2). The new road would not pass close to any inhabitation and the traffic would disturb no-one. It would not be expensive to construct. A few bridges and underpasses would be needed for farm access, but otherwise there should be no access or exit points. The US army corps of Engineers could build on the road in three months.</p> <p>The intersection of the A56 and Grane Road should then be closed. Only when the inhabited part of Grane road returns to being a quiet, peripheral urban back water should any further house building be contemplated.</p>		
459	Brian	Clarke			Object	Can't open windows, can't cross road, can't get out of jubilee road, very stressful trying to get out of street on to grane road		Too many houses and cars here now to much vibration and is very noisy with traffic, can't keep windows open as noisy and very dusty it doesn't help our asthma + allergic rhinitis, not enough doctors and schools to cope with the people now do not think this is a good idea to have more houses in this area.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
462		Seddon			Object	<p>Dear sir or madam, I am writing as a long standing resident of Grane Road, as yet again we have a set of plans for housing on this small site, and I can't imagine why :-</p> <p>a) so many houses can be considered for such a small site, not to mention the amount of disruption, noise and dust this will inflict on Grane residents who already have to put up with the huge amount of traffic noise and pollution as it is.</p> <p>b)some of this land may still be contaminated from past industrial use.</p> <p>c)there is a great danger that by putting an access road onto the site off Grane Road, a road that already has way too much traffic than it's "B" road status can handle, will increase the chances of accidents, especially during peak periods, first from construction traffic, and then from heaven knows how many cars trying to get on and off the site.</p> <p>d)and what about a little bit of thought for the present Grane residents who already have to put up with the daily struggle of first trying to get into their cars, and then trying to join the incessant flow of traffic that is never ending. What about resident parking, it's bad enough now as a lot of households have two cars, because as an access road I'm assuming there will be some ban on parking near the entrance. How is that going to work for all concerned?</p> <p>e)putting a roundabout at the cemetery is going to cause absolute chaos because it's not a big enough area, and the non-stop traffic up and down the road will make it near on impossible to join the flow, and what about ambulances? They have a hard time as it is.</p> <p>f)another thing to think about is schools and GP surgeries, there aren't enough places now so how are we going to accommodate in influx of people?</p> <p>Finally, may I suggest that members of the planning committee put themselves into a couple of cars and park on Grane Road near to the proposed site access between 6.30-9.00am, and 4.30-7.00pm during term time just to witness for themselves the sheer volume of traffic already on the road, and ask themselves - is this a suitable place for any kind of access to this proposed site.</p> <p>I know we need housing , but I just think this needs to be thought through a bit more. Maybe try to find another access route, because I realise that even with objections some kind of housing is going to be built anyway. It's just that this is a dangerous road already, and we don't need anything else to make it worse.</p> <p>Letter received 09/10/2017:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>9. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>10. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take? <input type="checkbox"/> 5-10</p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Increase in traffic volume onto an already very busy 'B' road will lead to more noise, dust and possibly accidents esp. if families with small children move in.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
484	Michael	Murray	GRAss	H84	Not Applicable	<p>Letter dated 23 August 2017</p> <p>I write as Chairman of Grane Residents' Association (GRAss) following our meeting on 15 August 2017. Before entering into discussion on the Draft Local Plan Consultation, I wish the Planning Department to consider the following three points which are vital, if subsequent consultations are to be meaningful, in deciding whether the proposed site is suitable for development.</p> <p>The general information for Site SHLAA16304 sets out the site location, the area available for development and the calculated yield for housing at 106 to 160. It sets out topography, vehicle access, bus and distance to strategic road network, distance to schools, surgeries, local town centre, play areas and sports grounds. It sets out flood risks, ecological value and the landscape value. It could well be that we would wish to comment on these items following further meetings with residents, when the developer's plans are known. In the meantime we submit the comments made in relation to the previous submission for housing development on this site, copy enclosed. Whereas the above items are important when assessing whether the site is suitable, it is believed that it is lacking in three critical areas which are as follows:</p> <p>1 The volume of traffic on Grane Road has increased dramatically over the years. We believe that in assessing the suitability of the site for development, this increase should be taken into account. Can you please supply me with any surveys of traffic volume, which you have taken into account when deciding that the site is suitable for the building of 106 to 160 houses, which would considerably increase the volume of traffic using Grane Road. We have endeavoured to obtain traffic figures from various official sources, so far without success. I refer to a survey conducted by GRAss in 1992 in support of our objection to this site being designated for Employment purposes. During a 12 hour period on Thursday 5 March 1992, 6,952 vehicles used Grane Road. On 8 March 2010 a report was submitted to Lancashire Local Hyndburn – Lancashire Local Rossendale. The Committee was asked to make decisions on this document on the then current position regarding HGV usage of Grane Road. It was stated that in January 2006, 11,843 vehicles were counted and in April 2006, 12,909 were counted. What is the current statistic? If no current survey has been carried out, then surely an up to date survey should be undertaken to assess the current volume of vehicles using Grane Road. Then a correct assessment could be made of a housing development and subsequent increase in traffic and whether this meets the needs of local residents, pedestrians and road users, on what has become an extremely busy and congested road, especially during peak periods. Is the Council prepared to commission such a survey?</p> <p>2 Local Authorities in the UK have a responsibility under Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) legislation to review air quality. Where concentration</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

exceeds national objectives, measures should be put in place to reduce emissions. What is the current Air Quality on Grane Road? Has it been measured? If it is above national levels in the vicinity of the proposed site, further siting of housing increasing traffic volume on Grane Road would not meet the Council's obligations relative to Local Air Quality legislation. If no monitoring has taken place, it should immediately be undertaken by the Council before any decision is taken in regard to development of the site. Is the Council prepared to commission such a survey?

3 Have any recent assessments been made on the flood risks and surface water flooding risks? We have noticed sample drilling has taken place over the site and we would be pleased if the results of these tests could be made available to us.

It is noted that a developer has shown an interest in developing the site. During the previous Draft Local Plan Consultation, when the developer's plans for housing were proposed, you obtained on our behalf a copy of these plans, to enable residents to consider the proposals. It would be helpful if could forward to GRAss the developer's current plans for the site so that local residents can be made aware of what is now being proposed.

29 August 2015

Dear Sir

Re: Policy Reference, Grane Road, Grane Village – Site Location H84

Following their attendance at the "Lives and Landscapes - Local Plan Part 2" exhibition at Haslingden Library on 4 August, this matter was discussed by Grane Residents' Association at their meeting the following week. It was agreed that local residents be informed of the planned housing development on Grane Road as enquiries from residents had been received by Association members, having had no official correspondence regarding the plans that would result in dramatic changes to their lives, outlook and amenities. Local residents were invited to an open meeting on 26 August to discuss the proposals and to express their views. Although as a group, there was no opposition to some housing development on the site, anger and concern was expressed in relation to the consequences of a development of this scale and the number of dwellings to be situated in Grane, as opposed to the spread of such development across the Valley. There was concern on the possible impact on schools and amenities in the area which are operating at capacity, together with the impending traffic mayhem on the notoriously busy and dangerous Grane Road.

After long and heated discussion residents agreed that the views of local residents must be considered by Rossendale Borough Council, Planners and Government when making a decision which will affect them. Equal consideration should be given by Planners, to residents who have paid their Rates/Council Tax for 40-50 years as oppose to developers and new residents

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>who may be just starting to contribute to the economy of Rossendale.</p> <p>Adequacy of Parking/Loading/Turning/Road Access</p> <p>A major concern is the volume of traffic currently using Grane Road, which is always busy and fast moving, with peak times creating chaos for anyone wishing to cross the road, especially the elderly and children. Great difficulty is also experienced by residents wishing to exit side roads or driveways onto Grane Road. It has been intimated that should planning permission be granted, an entrance/exit onto Grane Road would be required with the provision of traffic lights. In our view this would cause major disruption, not only from traffic approaching from Blackburn but from traffic backing up onto the by-pass at peak times. It would also cause problems for the residents in the immediate vicinity of the traffic lights who currently park their cars on Grane Road, having no facility for off road parking. Alternative provision must therefore be considered for a roundabout which may result in a reduction of proposed properties but would ensure that traffic is free flowing with the added benefit of slowing down speeding motorists on a stretch of road where few cars travel at the 30 mph speed limit, making it very difficult for people to cross the road. A further smaller roundabout at the junction of Holcombe Road would ensure that traffic accessing Grane Road would do so more safely, as would vehicles exiting the cemetery.</p> <p>Grane Residents' Association has been campaigning for greater road safety since 1998 and over the years our efforts have brought about significant improvements to road safety for motorists both local and those passing through the area. We now wish to see consideration given to local residents by developers providing parking for current residents within the proposed site, as it is highly likely that residents will be faced with yellow lines bordering their properties. It has been pointed out that problems are currently being experienced by residents who are unable to park in front of their properties due to visitors/employees of The Courtyard parking outside their homes causing frustration and inconvenience.</p> <p>It should be noted that an application for planning permission for "a farrier training facility for a temporary 4 year period for 25 days per year" was turned down in August 2013 by Planners on the grounds that, "the scheme, by reason of the resulting traffic movement using a junction with poor visibility to the busy Grane Road would result in unacceptable danger to highway safety". This location is directly opposite to the proposed site access/exit.</p> <p>It should be further noted that Grane Road is the major route for the Valley to the Royal Blackburn hospital. Residents will confirm that ambulances pass their properties on a frequent basis throughout the day and night, with blue lights and sirens indicating the emergency they are responding to. There is further concern that traffic lights at the proposed junction to the site will not only cause a hazard when the development is completed, but during construction when heavy vehicles will be accessing and leaving the site on</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>going. It was stressed by residents that a site of this nature and size should have more than one entrance/exit for reasons of safety and ease of access from Helmsore, without the necessity to use Grane Road, especially during any construction.</p> <p>Loss of trees/Nature and Conservation</p> <p>We do not profess to be tree huggers but we are concerned that mature trees within the site and mature Hawthorne hedgerows bordering the site should be maintained to ensure that the habitat is catered for. We are aware that plovers and newts currently inhabit the area and evidence should be provided to confirm that development will not be detrimental to existing wildlife.</p> <p>Hazardous Material</p> <p>When opposing employment proposals for the site 24 years ago, Grane Residents' Association was mindful of the hazardous materials left on the site following the closure of the former Holden Vale Bleach Works. Are we to understand that the proposed Play Area to be situated next to the existing gas governor and pond is a suitable safe and healthy place for children to play? It is admirable that provision for a Play Area has been acknowledged but a site more central within the development would allow use by all local children, opposed to being situated at the edge of the development, next to a pond, gas governor and in close proximity to heavy traffic entering and exiting the existing employment site.</p> <p>As previously stated Grane Road is extremely busy and residents experiencing increased traffic emissions have yet to discover the effect on their health and wellbeing. Experiencing wide disruption caused by heavy traffic movement, dust and noise over a possible five year period during construction, will no doubt have a devastating effect on some members of the community should planning permission be granted. A survey on such a topic may be beneficial to determine the current health status of local residents.</p> <p>Overlooking, Loss of Privacy</p> <p>It is of concern that a minority of residents backing onto the proposed site, most of whom have lived in their homes in excess of 30 years, will not only lose their view of the countryside, the main consideration for buying their properties, but also lose their privacy. It is proposed that one property in particular is to be surrounded on three sides by new properties with the remaining side overlooking Grane Road and all its present and future traffic chaos. Surely it is not unreasonable to believe that consideration should be given for an appropriate barrier between existing and new properties to accommodate privacy, overshadowing and to provide parking provision. A consideration should also be paid to the design of properties in close proximity to current dwellings to ensure that they are of sufficient height not to have a detrimental impact on privacy. Such a barrier could provide a green space to facilitate the movement of wildlife within the site which will be seriously diminished by development.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>We understand that social housing is to be included in the proposals. Are we to presume that there may be some single storey properties suitable for single/elderly residents within the site? If so this may provide alternative housing for current residents whose properties have become too large to maintain but who wish to remain in the locality.</p> <p>Noise and disturbance resulting from use</p> <p>It must be said that development of this nature will have a massive impact on Grane due to the increased volume of heavy traffic generated both during and after construction. Should traffic lights be installed, as suggested, we believe this will create a further hazard by way of pollution from vehicles queuing in both directions, their engines labouring and emitting toxic fumes.</p> <p>It must be noted that construction of The Courtyard has provided invaluable experience for local residents and to ensure that planning constraints are robustly adhered to in any future development in the Grane area. During the former development, building materials used were not as stipulated and the provision of mature trees resulted in saplings that are still awaiting maturity. We believe that any further development must include consultation with Grane Residents' Association who will form a sub-committee to ensure that what is planned for development is agreed by all parties and executed accordingly.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Letter dated 03.10.2017: Thank you for your letter of reply dated 1 September to my submission dated 23 August 2017. I again write as Chairman of Grane Residents' Association (GRAss).</p> <p>As I see it the consultation must fall into two areas as determined by the true scale and information available. The first consultation is in regard to the suitability of the site SHLAA16304 as to its location, the area available for development and the calculated yield for housing at 106 to 160. The second consultation must be in regard to the plans submitted by the developer for the site.</p> <p>In regard to the suitability of the site, consideration must be given to the fact that it is within the West Pennine Moors, the largest new site of special scientific interest (SSSI) notified by Natural England since 2004, covering a total of 76 square kilometres including Haslingden Grane. This notification of the West Pennine Moors was approved by Natural England's Board on 19 July 2017. This move reflects the national significance of the area and its combination of upland habitats, moorland fringe grasslands and woodland, which support an impressive array of breeding birds.</p> <p>In my letter of the 23 August 1 stated that at this point in time we are unable to fully question the suitability of the site as we do not have figures for traffic volume/flow, air quality on Grane Road and surface water/flood risk. I asked</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>if you had figures for these items or if the Council were prepared to obtain such figures in order that a factual assessment could be made as to the suitability of the site.</p> <p>As I understand it from your reply of the 1 September and our brief conversation at the Public Consultation at Haslingden Library, the developers will supply details of surveys carried out in these three areas. I believe that they are obliged to supply you with such studies when they make a planning application. In order that meaningful consultations can take place, and as this information is mandatory in such a planning application, I would respectfully suggest that you let us have details of these items together with the developer's plans for housing and site access etc. Failure to disclose information on these items would in our view render the consultation process invalid.</p> <p>As Grane Road is very busy, the figures supplied by the developer will give us details of just how busy it has become, as the site is virtually at the corner of the increasingly busy Holcombe Road junction. We believe that Traffic Management Police should participate in the consultation process along with Emergency Services who direct ambulances which use the road in both directions to service the whole of the Valley during routine and emergency life and death situations. We fear that emergency vehicles may be hindered by the increased traffic flow which could result from the development of a further 106 to 160 houses.</p> <p>I hope that when the developers submit their plans they will be prepared to meet with residents to discuss how the proposed site would be developed to benefit all residents in Grane Village.</p>		
526	vicki	last	-		Object	<p>Helmshore has a major issue with vehicular access, parking and safety. - - Aside from people using helmshore as a cut through from one place to another, street parking, coupled with no local parking and poor roads/pavements means that as a 'family orientated village' its is becoming more dangerous for families. Adding more houses and hence more vehicles to the area will only make the area worse. - - Over the last few years the number of developments in Helmshore have been huge. The roads are already fairly awful during peak hours. Packing more and more houses into the area will only cause greater problems in my opinion unless access is greatly improved.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
589	Stephen	Langridge			Not Applicable	<p>2. HS278 Holden Wood, This area identified as a location for 100 to 150 houses with access from Holcombe Road.</p> <p>pros. a large and (by valley standards) flat area of land.</p> <p>cons. additional traffic load onto an already busy road with particular conjunction on the Grane Road/Holcombe Road junction - already a problem at peak times.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure - please refer to item 5 below.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>5. Pockets of land, I understand that if a housing development of under 100 houses takes place, then this is deemed as having no impact on local schools, doctors and other services. However, with developments such as Yarn Avenue, (off Holcombe Road) 60+ houses, Limewood Close (off Helmshore Road) 20+ houses and The Power Mill development (off Holcombe Road) then the accumalative effect is the same as a single 100+ development. Helmshore Primary School and Broadway Primary School are both running at full acapacity whilst Haslingden High School is running at or near full capacity. Where are the children from these new houses going to go to school? or Doctors? or Dentist?</p> <p>Lancashire County is already strapped for funds, how are additional places to be sourced or funded.</p> <p>If other pockets of land are identified by developers - e.g. the site of the recently demolished St. Veronicas Church in Helmshore - will this then allow for the removal of other pockets of already identified land from the local plan?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
612	Joe	Donovan			Object	<p>Can I ask you why there is only one speed camera in Haslingden, and only one in Helmshore?</p> <p>Could I point out to you, that Grane Road on any weekday, has in excess of 14,000 vehicles per day.</p> <p>Could I also point out there have been scores of accidents, just in the Rossendale section, many of them serious, and several of them fatal, all in the last 10 years.</p> <p>The blatant disregard for speed limits continues on Grane Road, day and night, every day. There is seldom any enforcement of speed limits, maybe one afternoon or evening every few months. The sheer volume of traffic makes it unenforceable. Drivers know this. This is why there is such disregard for the safety of other. This is the reason there are accidents, serious accidents.</p> <p>I must raise this point with you. The promised but still not operational average speed check appears only to cover the 40 mph section from the M65 to Belthorn, and the 50mph section from Belthorn to just outside Haslingden. Why is it not applied to the 30mph stretch? This is a well populated residential area with over houses on or nearby Grane Road.</p> <p>Residents have campaigned for speed enforcement cameras on this 30 mph section for years, all our requests have been repeatedly disregarded and ignored. All we have in the way of "enforcement" are two "slow down" signs, one of which is no longer working.</p> <p>A few moments spent on crashmap.co.uk will tell you instantly, this road more that fulfils all criteria for placement of speed cameras, and enforcement of the mph limit. There have been dozens of accidents on this 30mph section in the last 10 years, despite it being less than a mile long. All I can conclude from this, is that the authorities have no interest in enforcing laws which protect the safety of the public, and are simply content to allow the accidents to continue.</p> <p>Can you tell me why or how this is acceptable? The problems will not go away if nothing is done. When a stretch of road has a high rate of collisions, injuries and deaths, then the Highway Authority has a duty to do something about it. I feel as though I must write to you about this, because our repeated requests to Rossendale Council have all been ignored and resulted in nothing, no action being taken, and not even an excuse as to why.</p> <p>To add to this, the road surface is almost 25 years old and completely worn out, it is tiringly, incessantly, obtrusively noisy. When walking alongside the road or even stood outside a house, one has to shout to hold a conversation. Surely the noise of this road, when busy, which is most of the day, would be well in excess of safe noise limits at work. Why won't the Council provide decibel counters to monitor noise, and why isn't air pollution monitored? Surely, this is also well in excess of legal limits.</p> <p>Resurfacing Grane Road with modern day low-noise road surfacing would go a</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>long way to reduce the amount of excessive noise.</p> <p>We also recommended to the Council, pedestrian islands so, at busy times at least when crossing, one can cross halfway, and when traffic finally ceases the other way, cross the remainder.</p> <p>This request has been repeatedly ignored, despite at least 1000 vehicles per hour, and waiting well over five minutes to cross.</p> <p>In many places the road markings are completely worn out. This is purely down to overuse.</p> <p>For too long in this country, all policies and endeavours have been biased completely in favour of putting more traffic on the roads. Grane road these last 25 years, proves this point completely.</p> <p>It is very much to the cost and detriment of everything and everyone else. There is zero quality of life on this road. People don't socialize or walk, or go out, unless they have to. Traffic levels/speed/noise/accidents/pollution all make it so unpleasant to be actively discouraging. Many people have serious health problems, for example, permanent tinnitus, respiratory problems etc. It's all because of excessive amounts of traffic on Grane Road.</p> <p>The M65 was opened in December 1997. We have put up with this for almost 20 years. The point of a motorway is surely to get the traffic off roads like this. Can you please tell me, how or why this is acceptable in any way, and why this situation should be allowed to continue?</p> <p>In view of all the problems outlined above, are we expected to welcome the new Grane Village development, to include a further 160 houses, which will no doubt generate an estimated 320 resident vehicles, plus service vehicles? Whether the access point for this development is to be on Grane Road or Holcombe Road, we envisage that the majority of vehicles will be travelling through the residential 30mph section of Grane Road, thereby putting further pressure on both Grane Road and its residents.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
613	T	Riley			Object	<p>The road access to the proposed site is on, one of the busiest roads in Lancs. It is almost impossible to access the road even now from 6am to 7pm due to the constant flow of traffic. To add 160 houses, who may have more than one car is at least unrealistic and dangerous. Anyone who has travelled the Grane Road during peak times must realise there is a serious problem. Many people have been killed in road accidents on this road.</p> <p>Being a resident opposite the proposed site, we have a serious problem parking our own vehicles which now have to be double parked to gain access to property. There is often an over spill of vehicles from the existing industrial estate next to the proposed site. This situation causes problems for larger vehicles passing too close to parked vehicles have been damaged by other vehicles passing too close to parked vehicles causing damage to panels and mirrors. This also causes difficulty for pedestrians when vehicles are obstructing the footpath. There will also need to be future provisions for Electric car charging ports outside existing properties.</p> <p>There is an abundance of wildlife within the site, including rabbits, birds, bee's and many other creatures. Creating a corridor would be useless, as most if not all would be killed during construction work, the wildlife corridor would have to be alongside Grane Road to protect wildlife and buffer the site from residents.</p> <p>Having lived here for 70 years I can confirm there is a serious concern regarding land contamination, from the old gas works, and from the old bleach works. The area's affected were not cleaned up, they were just over filled to hide them. There is poison from the gasometer pits which were 40ft deep in the ground. On the bleach works site, there was a caustic settlement lake in front of the of works. On demolition it proved too expensive to remove, as it was over filled with a mound of earth. These dangerous chemicals are still in the ground. The density of build is too much, houses will be cramped together with only one access road.</p> <p>These plans are designed to maximise profit from the site, regardless of the safety and wellbeing of the present residents. Traffic has already reached Gridlock at peak times, the plans would add approx. 200 vehicle movements onto Grane Road. The disruption would be unbearable for residents and passing traffic.</p> <p>I therefore oppose the plans.</p>		
634	Christine	Wright	-		Object	<p>This site has been turned down for house building previously. - Access to Holcombe Rd and then onto Grane Rd is already under pressure and congested at the junction with Grane Rd. Increased traffic onto Grane Rd would lead to even more accidents than at p</p>		<p>Helmshore and Haslingden have had huge amounts of building in the last 40 years, no extra infrastructure has been added. No extra school places, shops or family facilities. - - This area can sustain no more.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
697	Julie	Woods	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277, hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
698	John	King	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
699	William	Woods	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277, hs276	Object	<p>Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
700	Thelma	King	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		-
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16402	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
964	Joanne	Smithson	-	SHLAA16304	Object	This is ridiculous. Grane road has many well documented issues with regard to traffic and you want to build more property?? - Where will these peoples children go to school? We already have issues with families not getting their choice of school due to oversubscription! - What little green land we have we need to preserve!	-	
998	Jill	Jihkson	-		Object	Helmshore is already overdeveloped thanks to the Taylor wimpey hideous estate on holcombe road. The roads are in a terrible state and too crowded you can't get off holcombe rd or up helmshore road. The schools are already at full capacity. There is not enough infrastructure to continually add hundreds more houses to this village. We have no train links. Just the bottle neck m66 - People need to listen to residents we have had enough we have no support from local council - Stop building in helmshore green belt before we have no green spaces left		Listen to the complaints that people are raising
1060	Stephen	Davies	Resident	SHLAA16304	Object	I agree housing needs to be built. But there are no plans to support infustructure in the area. Grane road for example has a lot of traffic issues since joining up to the M65. Another 160 homes on that road trying to get out and in to the development will be a nightmare. Also there are plenty of brown field site to build on especially in Blackburn. Helmshore is a village we pay premium prices for homes in the area to have this life style we don't not want it spoilt. Large firms/ housing contractors build quick homes cutting corners all the time. Where are the children going to go to school with all schools in the area full and some of our children already having to travel to bury for school.		
1254	Sian	Davies	-	SHLAA16304	Object	Objection to loss of green spaces in Helmshore		
1290	Deborah	Chapman	-	SHLAA16304	Object	The village of Helmshore has been steadily expanding and merging into Haslingden. The green spaces are disappearing and the character of the landscape is changing. These proposed developments will be detrimental to the environment and the wildlife in the area. The Greens lane site is already congested at school times and there is a wealth of wildlife on the golfcourse (I hear a rumour about more proposed building along the golf course backing onto Cherry Tree Way). There are foxes, hedgehogs, too many bird species to mention. - - The roads and parking are at a premium in this area. The land at Snig Hole and Curven Edge are places where children play - more houses would mean more traffic and parking problems. A new park has just been built and crossing as it was dangerous and parking at Snig Hole along Station Rd (Bowl Alley) is a problem already. - - The Grane site backs on to Grane Road which is already completed congested and a rat run to the M65. The road network, , drainage, schools and amenities cannot take any more in this area. The council do little to look after the area - - building more houses mean we would loose the beautiful walks around here.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1311	Joanne	Mellody	-	SHLAA16304	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1313	Jonathan	Hunt	-	shlaa16304	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1355	Rebekah	Haworth	-	SHLAA16304	Object	The area recently average speed check cameras have be implemented to improve the safety of the road, if you have ever tried to exit Holcombe road in peak traffic to either head to Blackburn or Haslingden you would would appreciate the 160 extra houses would only add to this problem. - I also am concerned by how local schools will be able to accommodate extra pupils. I myself moved closer to our local primary school, as I know that year on year there is increasing pressure on children to get a place in a good ofsted rated school, and each year there are more and more stories of children having to travel to ramsbottom as they have not been able to get a place in their local school. - Also currently our nearest NHS dentist is in rawtenstall a few miles down the road, and to try and get a appointment within a week at my local GPs is almost impossible. I am not against building more housing, however the current infrastructure will not support these extra houses. And will only lead to further problems.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1367	Nicola	Hardman	-		Object	<p>I am writing to put forward my objections to the proposed property development in Helmshore. - - I will address each of the sites separately below however my overall concern which applies to all of the proposed development sites in Helmshore is the lack of services, infrastructure, and erosion of valuable green space. - - Look at an aerial picture of Helmshore 'village' in 2017. Can this once beautiful village really be classed as a village anymore? There is hardly any green space with housing having been allowed to be crammed into every available space and Helmshore is no longer distinguishing from Haslingden. - - You refer to the government white paper, encouraging higher density 'where appropriate'. How can the destruction of a small village be classed as appropriate? - - Does anyone in the council commute outside the valley for work? Particularly the m66? You are encouraging the move to the countryside (cheshire based property developers at the Loom development) yet it is not reasonably possible for anyone who values family life and their time to commute to and from Manchester anymore with this journey now taking approx 90 minutes each way and the roads unable to cope. - - You address the serious concerns about the m66 and the m60 which are virtually gridlocked but do not propose any solutions. This is merely an afterthought. How you can even consider the building of so many new homes 'encouraging higher density' without addressing the lack of infrastructure and the gridlock is negligent. The travel issue such as re-opening the railway should be the starting point. - - No mention is made in the report of building extra schools or how Helmshore will cope with an influx of local residents when schools are already over subscribed with some people resorting to pay for their children to attend primary school due to be offered unsatisfactory schools outside of the area they reside. Again this should be a starting point. - - The lack of green space in the urban area of Helmshore is particularly sad for future generations. Yes, Helmshore is surrounded by beautiful hills, but is this a reason to remove all the green space within the 'village' itself and turn this into a concrete jungle? - - To turn to the particular proposed developments; - - - HS2 78 HOLDEN ARMS/HOLCOMBE RD - - the size of this proposed site would have a devastating impact on the local school admissions given the amount of children this would mean. - - devastation of wildlife in the area. - - the traffic on grane road is already horrendous and trying to turn right from Holcombe Road onto grane road in busy periods is barely achievable. How would the traffic flow here work? - - - I fail to see why any green belt should be released to meet the 'housing requirement'. Planning for future generations should require saving greenbelt, not amending urban boundaries as suits and developing other areas of brownfield or other less developed areas of rossendale. The ratio of what is being proposed in Helmshore is grossly out of proportion with the size of the village. - - It's shameful that these developments are even being proposed and I assume that</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						the council knew this given that the documented - Proposal does not have the confidence to clearly define the proposed building in 'Helmshore' in the contents and attempts to sneak these developments in under vague headings. Perhaps the council was aware of the upset anticipated from local residents. - This speaks volumes. Do you want your legacy to be ruining Helmshore for the future? -		
1424	Pamela	Beech	-	SHLAA16304	Object	I find it hard to believe that Rossendale council are planning to take away designated green spaces, which have been in place for many years. - The outlined plan for green belt land to have housing built on it is disgraceful. - They say there is a housing shortage in the Rossendale area, perhaps if the council looked at the many empty houses in the area and encouraged building company's to look at these rather than continually wanting to build new. - The Helmshore area is already over populated, the schools are over subscribed with children having to travel some distance to attend school. The traffic congestion in the area is getting worse, what should be a 20 minute drive to work takes me 40, 20 mins just to get out of Helmshore. - The proposed site at sing hole, I feel would lead to many accidents, even with the new crossing it is still a challenge to cross the road, 3 weeks ago when taking my granddaughter to the park when waiting to cross a bus was going so fast I did not think he was going to stop, he slammed is breaks on, then as we crossed a car over took the bus and nearly ran us down. - This would be even worse with cars trying to get out of the entry as well. - - Rossendale golf club seem to think that every time they run out of funding that it is ok to try sell off land and build houses, maybe they should look at the accounts team who manage there finances. - The impact of houses been built on the golf course, will affect not only the population increase but will have a major impact on the wildlife. - - Therefore as a resident of Helmshore I strongly object to the proposed plans. -		
1521	Barbara	Shaw		SHLAA16304	Object	This is a very busy area with considerable traffic already. Another 100 plus houses will greatly exacerbate this problem. Also the local schools are already oversubscribed as are the GP surgeries. Haslingden and Helmshore do not have enough facilities for more people to move into the area.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1589	David	Wise			Not Applicable	I would like to voice my opinion on the district plan HS2.78 to build up to 160 houses at the new Grane Village my main concern is the increased traffic to Holcombe Road and Grane Road. I live on Warburton Street and the amount of traffic using Grane Road is at saturation point trying to drive out of the street onto Grane Road is a nightmare it now takes on average 5-15 minutes to get out and trying to cross as a pedestrian is a nightmare. When considering this plan this should be taken into consideration, 160 homes two cars at least per house 320 cars going to Holcombe /Grane roads twice a day means an extra at least an extra 640 cars per day using these roads. Could you please explain does a semi detached building count as two houses or one if it counts as one the figures above would be double. I have enclosed a questionnaire regarding this plan. Which ever the entrance is situated i.e. Grane or Holcombe Road this will burden Grane Road with more traffic.		
1644		Muskett			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you? Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? Yes</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? Yes</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? Yes</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? Yes</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, if so please explain how? Yes Sometimes I feel intimidated by speeding traffic when walking along Grane Road. You cannot hold a conversation because of the noise.</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? No</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle? Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take? 5-10</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? Yes</p> <p>Further comments: My house will be surrounded by - FRONT - Grane Road SIDES and BACK SURROUNDED BY HOUSES. The proposed road from the estate goes along side 'my' drive. Have the planners really thought through this through.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1644		Muskett			Support	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road ?Yes It's a rat run to/from the motorway slip roads entrance and exit.</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you ?Yes The 'speed camera van' should try parking about the 'Valley Cantonese'</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes Yes it's terrible - we turn the volume up on our tv and radio</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pa? Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?No, it's only a matter of time.</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes, it's deafening and most unpleasant as well. You can't hold a conversation, it's so loud.</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes, all the time.</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes, severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes. Yes, because it causes stress! I've been hooted at whilst trying to get in my car. I worry about people who have children and pets!</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes. Better still would be traffic lights.</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?No</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Ro Yes, it's frightening. Also parallel parking is a nightmare!</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take?5-10</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?No. No, because then they will do something about it then.i.e. traffic lights. Houses would look far better than the units that are on Grane Road now. Residents directly opposite those must wish they were houses.</p> <p>Further comments: We didn't realise when we moved here how bad the traffic is. It's like the M6 with houses on it! If we had only known we wouldn't have moved here! It's downright dangerous! I would liken it walking on the hard-shoulder of a motorway, any day! Motorists even throw their rubbish from their moving cars, cans, bottles, paper cups etc. Horrible! My family don't call because its so bad to run round and park their cars so they expect us to go to them instead. We don't object to new houses being built they would look better than those units do, they are the result of what happened last time houses were proposed to be built on that land. Houses are being built everywhere you do in every town.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1645	I	Yearsley			Not Applicable	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road ?Yes It's a rat run to/from the motorway slip roads entrance and exit.</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you ?Yes The 'speed camera van' should try parking about the 'Valley Cantonese'</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes Yes it's terrible - we turn the volume up on our tv and radio</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pa? Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?No, it's only a matter of time.</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes, it's deafening and most unpleasant as well. You can't hold a conversation, it's so loud.</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes, all the time.</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes, severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes. Yes, because it causes stress! I've been hooted at whilst trying to get in my car. I worry about people who have children and pets!</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes. Better still would be traffic lights.</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?No</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Ro Yes, it's frightening. Also parallel parking is a nightmare!</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take?5-10</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?No. No, because then they will do something about it then.i.e. traffic lights. Houses would look far better than the units that are on Grane Road now. Residents directly opposite those must wish they were houses.</p> <p>Further comments: We didn't realise when we moved here how bad the traffic is. It's like the M6 with houses on it! If we had only known we wouldn't have moved here! It's downright dangerous! I would liken it walking on the hard-shoulder of a motorway, any day! Motorists even throw their rubbish from their moving cars, cans, bottles, paper cups etc. Horrible! My family don't call because its so bad to run round and park their cars so they expect us to go to them instead. We don't object to new houses being built they would look better than those units do, they are the result of what happened last time houses were proposed to be built on that land. Houses are being built everywhere you go in every town.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1646	H	Holden			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?No</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Definitely. 'Trouble' parking - enring main road.</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?No</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes?</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take?5-10</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments: Amenities - Schools - Doctors - Hospitals. Car parking - existing houses. Cars 160 plus? Cars from site on to Grane Road.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1647	Ron	Entwistle			Object	<p>Letter received 08.09.17: RE: PROPOSED HOUSING H84 ,Grane Rd Haslingden.</p> <p>The road access to the proposed site is to one of the busiest roads in Lancs. It is almost impossible to access the road even now from 6am to 7pm due to the constant flow of traffic. To add 160 houses, who may have more than one car is at least unrealistic and dangerous, Anyone who has travelled the Grane Rd during peak times must realise there is a serious problem. Many people have been killed in road accidents on this road.</p> <p>Being a resident opposite the proposed site, we have a serious problem parking our own vehicles which now have to be double parked to gain access to property. There is often an over spill of vehicles from the existing industrial estate next to the proposed site. This situation causes problems for larger vehicles using Grane Rd. Many vehicles have been damaged by other vehicles passing too close to parked vehicles causing damage to panels and mirrors. this also causes difficulty for pedestrians when vehicles are obstructing the footpath.</p> <p>There is an abundance of wildlife within the site, including rabbits, birds, bee's and many other creatures. Creating a corridor would be useless, as most if not all would be killed during construction work, the wildlife corridor would have to be alongside Grane Rd to protect wildlife and buffer the site from residents. Having lived here for 70yrs I can confirm there is a serious concern regarding land contamination, from the old gas works, and from the old bleach works. The area's affected were not cleaned up, they were just over filled to hide them. There is poison from the gasometer pits which were 40ft deep in the ground. On the old bleach works site, there was a caustic settlement lake in front of the works. On demolition, it proved too expensive to remove, so it was over filled with a mound of earth. These dangerous chemicals are still in the ground. The density of build is too much, houses will be cramped together with only one access road.</p> <p>These plans are designed to maximise profit from the site, regardless of the safety and wellbeing of the present residents. Traffic has already reached Gridlock at peak times, the plans would add approx. 200 vehicle movements onto Grane Rd. the disruption would be unbearable for residents and passing traffic.</p> <p>I therefore oppose the plans.</p> <p>Letter received 09/10/17:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes 4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes 5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>Constant stream of vehicles day and night.</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take?1-5</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>Build density - too high. No allowance for parking 160-approximately 240 extra vehicles, twice or more each day. Road already has grid lock at peak times and road repairs. This is an ill thought our plan, to destroy the area, and a nightmare for existing residents. Vehicle emissions are already affecting people's health.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1648	Joseph & Evelyn	West			Object	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?-</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?-</p> <p>10. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how? From 6.00am-9am lots then from 4.00pm to 7pm lots.</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? It would be better for access to cemetery from Haslingden, no road markings - like there is from Blackburn to Holcombe Road.</p> <p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?Varies</p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes Further comments: Trying to cross the road can be from 5-15 mins unless you go down to the crossing. Any older people around 317 Grane Road crossing with difficulty after alighting from the bus. Also traffic exiting from the bypass still think the speed is still 50-60-70 mph when it is only a 30 mph at all times of day. No signage to say it is only 30 mph exiting onto Grane Road only above cemetery coming from Blackburn. 160 houses plus 2-3 cars each house average 400 extra cars at all times through day!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1649	B	Holden			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?-</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how? Speed of traffic excessive</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on GraRoad?Yes</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this e? 5-10</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1650	Tom	Holden			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?No</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, if so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>I'm 87, can't get across quite anymore.</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?No</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>13. If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?</p> <p>14. How many minutes does this take?5-10. More</p> <p>15. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>Worry for myself crossing the road and my great grandkids, it is beyond a joke. Grane is nothing like it was. Born Holden Terrace 20/01/1930.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1651	Eric	Mizon			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>As indicated above</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?5-10, More</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1653	Margaret	Kerr			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?-</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?</p> <p>Plan ahead to exit Warburton Street onto Grane Road</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take?5-10, More</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>As a pensioner living in the side street on Grane Road</p> <p>1) I prefer to dirve to town to post a letter rather than cross the road.</p> <p>2) Also it can be very difficult exiting Warburton Street onto Grane Road (especially at peak times) and can take several minutes.</p> <p>3) Also the overspill of car parking on Grane Road means that resident parking is often take up by non-residents of Warburton Street and Buildings. Can anything be done for us residents in this situation?</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1654	Tammy	Gifford			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?No</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, if so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>Can't have window open at night due to noise traffic</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?5-10</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>Concerns for strains on current infrastructure - schools / health / utilities, flood risk, loss of greenspace, increased traffic on already busy roads, increased crime and pollution (including noise), loss of wildlife habitat.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1657	J	Donovan			Object	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? Yes</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? Yes</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you? Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? No</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? No</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? Yes</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? Yes</p> <p>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? Yes</p> <p>9. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? Yes</p> <p>10. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, if so please explain how?</p> <p>It's always too noisy, no silence ever, can't cross the road, too busy. Too many accidents. Ignored by people in charge, for years.</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?</p> <p>Not sure it would make much difference.</p> <p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle? Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take? 1-5</p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? Yes</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>Not enough effort is made to enforce speed limits. It's useless using radar, the worst speeders all have radar detectors, these should be made illegal. Pedestrian islands are urgently needed in order to be able to cross. The surface is worn out, this makes it noisy. It's 23-24 years since re-surfacing, it all needs taking up and doing again, replace with low-noise asphalt. Also, why aren't we allowed to know, despite exhaustive enquiries, the daily traffic count, or the current average speeds, or the kind of pollution levels we are subjected to daily. We've been ignored over these issues again and again.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1659	J B	Collinge			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?YES</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?YES</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?YES</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>Walking and crossing the road is nerve racking, plus the dangers emissions can cause over time.</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?-</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane d? YES</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take?5-10</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>A housing development would only enhance the traffic problem on the Grane Road, giving no peace of mind what so ever to residents or future residents, you first need to live in the areas to have a concept of the aggravation and potential danger to quality of life traffic brings. This is not a case of NIMBY just simply common sense that comes from residents who now suffer the present volume of cars, van HGV/s that use this road.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1661	J	Reger			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?No</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?No</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?No</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?No</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?No</p> <p>Only traffic turning into our private cul des sac!</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?1-5</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments: We never received a letter only told by our neighbour!</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1663	Yvonne	Hitchen			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?No</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?YES</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?No</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?No</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?No</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>13. If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>14. How many minutes does this take?1-5</p> <p>15. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments: Hedges along the whole of Crane Road from Heap Clough to cemetery desperately needs cutting back. People have to walk on road around them.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1664	Clifford	Riley			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how? yes More houses/cars/fumes?</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take? 5-10</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1665	Patricia	Foster			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Not sure</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?No</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>13. If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>14. How many minutes does this take?5-10</p> <p>15. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments: The proposal will have a detrimental effect on the locality. It will increase traffic, which is already a major problem on Grane Road. It will put pressure on the current infrastructure including schools, doctors etc.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1666	Diana	Barnes			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Can't get a proper nights for it!!!</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5-10 and more</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes If they build another 160 houses & every one has 2 cars 320 extra cars on Grane Road, it's a joke. Needs sorting out Blackburn end & send them over Hud Hey Rd!!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1667	Marjorie	Kay			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Not as yet</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?-</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?-</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Not sure</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?-</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?-</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?-</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?-</p> <p>The volume of traffic on this road is horrendous without adding more traffic due to more housing. Where are the speed bumps they are talking about.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1668	Mary	Garlick			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OPD</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Far, far too many vehicles</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>It would increase the traffic and we have enough NOW!!!</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1669	I	Entwistle			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, if so please explain how? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1670	F.B.	Knowles			Object	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>9. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>10. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>At times cars queuing outside windows, engines running giving us more fumes, lack of privacy. Rarely open windows</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5-10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The 50+30 speed limit signs should be at least 1/2 mile further up the road towards Blackburn. Also, when the 'average speed check' signs come into use, will the police be able to take the registration numbers of all the HGV which use Grane Rd?</p> <p>Could there be a possible radar camera on the 30 mph limit section of the road.</p> <p>Could the speed limit be 40 mph not 50mph?</p> <p>Could there be traffic lights instead of just a roundabout?</p> <p>This would help people to cross safely as well as slowing traffic.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1671	K	Pollard			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road ?<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you ?<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you ?<input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass ?<input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road ?<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?<input type="checkbox"/>No</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, if so please explain how?<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle ?<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p>13) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p>14) How many minutes does this take?<input type="checkbox"/>5-10</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal ?<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Yes</p> <p>We do need more houses but the volume of traffic they will create is very worrying. Most families these days have 2 cars.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1672	Mark	Foster			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, if so please explain how? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Cannot sit in garden in summer months</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take? <input type="checkbox"/> 1-5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21-30 <input type="checkbox"/> 31-45 <input type="checkbox"/> 46-60 <input type="checkbox"/> 61-75 <input type="checkbox"/> 76-90 <input type="checkbox"/> 91-105 <input type="checkbox"/> 106-120 <input type="checkbox"/> 121-135 <input type="checkbox"/> 136-150 <input type="checkbox"/> 151-165 <input type="checkbox"/> 166-180 <input type="checkbox"/> 181-195 <input type="checkbox"/> 196-210 <input type="checkbox"/> 211-225 <input type="checkbox"/> 226-240 <input type="checkbox"/> 241-255 <input type="checkbox"/> 256-270 <input type="checkbox"/> 271-285 <input type="checkbox"/> 286-300 <input type="checkbox"/> 301-315 <input type="checkbox"/> 316-330 <input type="checkbox"/> 331-345 <input type="checkbox"/> 346-360 <input type="checkbox"/> 361-375 <input type="checkbox"/> 376-390 <input type="checkbox"/> 391-405 <input type="checkbox"/> 406-420 <input type="checkbox"/> 421-435 <input type="checkbox"/> 436-450 <input type="checkbox"/> 451-465 <input type="checkbox"/> 466-480 <input type="checkbox"/> 481-495 <input type="checkbox"/> 496-510 <input type="checkbox"/> 511-525 <input type="checkbox"/> 526-540 <input type="checkbox"/> 541-555 <input type="checkbox"/> 556-570 <input type="checkbox"/> 571-585 <input type="checkbox"/> 586-600 <input type="checkbox"/> 601-615 <input type="checkbox"/> 616-630 <input type="checkbox"/> 631-645 <input type="checkbox"/> 646-660 <input type="checkbox"/> 661-675 <input type="checkbox"/> 676-690 <input type="checkbox"/> 691-705 <input type="checkbox"/> 706-720 <input type="checkbox"/> 721-735 <input type="checkbox"/> 736-750 <input type="checkbox"/> 751-765 <input type="checkbox"/> 766-780 <input type="checkbox"/> 781-795 <input type="checkbox"/> 796-810 <input type="checkbox"/> 811-825 <input type="checkbox"/> 826-840 <input type="checkbox"/> 841-855 <input type="checkbox"/> 856-870 <input type="checkbox"/> 871-885 <input type="checkbox"/> 886-900 <input type="checkbox"/> 901-915 <input type="checkbox"/> 916-930 <input type="checkbox"/> 931-945 <input type="checkbox"/> 946-960 <input type="checkbox"/> 961-975 <input type="checkbox"/> 976-990 <input type="checkbox"/> 991-1005 <input type="checkbox"/> 1006-1020 <input type="checkbox"/> 1021-1035 <input type="checkbox"/> 1036-1050 <input type="checkbox"/> 1051-1065 <input type="checkbox"/> 1066-1080 <input type="checkbox"/> 1081-1095 <input type="checkbox"/> 1096-1110 <input type="checkbox"/> 1111-1125 <input type="checkbox"/> 1126-1140 <input type="checkbox"/> 1141-1155 <input type="checkbox"/> 1156-1170 <input type="checkbox"/> 1171-1185 <input type="checkbox"/> 1186-1200 <input type="checkbox"/> 1201-1215 <input type="checkbox"/> 1216-1230 <input type="checkbox"/> 1231-1245 <input type="checkbox"/> 1246-1260 <input type="checkbox"/> 1261-1275 <input type="checkbox"/> 1276-1290 <input type="checkbox"/> 1291-1305 <input type="checkbox"/> 1306-1320 <input type="checkbox"/> 1321-1335 <input type="checkbox"/> 1336-1350 <input type="checkbox"/> 1351-1365 <input type="checkbox"/> 1366-1380 <input type="checkbox"/> 1381-1395 <input type="checkbox"/> 1396-1410 <input type="checkbox"/> 1411-1425 <input type="checkbox"/> 1426-1440 <input type="checkbox"/> 1441-1455 <input type="checkbox"/> 1456-1470 <input type="checkbox"/> 1471-1485 <input type="checkbox"/> 1486-1500 <input type="checkbox"/> 1501-1515 <input type="checkbox"/> 1516-1530 <input type="checkbox"/> 1531-1545 <input type="checkbox"/> 1546-1560 <input type="checkbox"/> 1561-1575 <input type="checkbox"/> 1576-1590 <input type="checkbox"/> 1591-1605 <input type="checkbox"/> 1606-1620 <input type="checkbox"/> 1621-1635 <input type="checkbox"/> 1636-1650 <input type="checkbox"/> 1651-1665 <input type="checkbox"/> 1666-1680 <input type="checkbox"/> 1681-1695 <input type="checkbox"/> 1696-1710 <input type="checkbox"/> 1711-1725 <input type="checkbox"/> 1726-1740 <input type="checkbox"/> 1741-1755 <input type="checkbox"/> 1756-1770 <input type="checkbox"/> 1771-1785 <input type="checkbox"/> 1786-1800 <input type="checkbox"/> 1801-1815 <input type="checkbox"/> 1816-1830 <input type="checkbox"/> 1831-1845 <input type="checkbox"/> 1846-1860 <input type="checkbox"/> 1861-1875 <input type="checkbox"/> 1876-1890 <input type="checkbox"/> 1891-1905 <input type="checkbox"/> 1906-1920 <input type="checkbox"/> 1921-1935 <input type="checkbox"/> 1936-1950 <input type="checkbox"/> 1951-1965 <input type="checkbox"/> 1966-1980 <input type="checkbox"/> 1981-1995 <input type="checkbox"/> 1996-2010 <input type="checkbox"/> 2011-2025 <input type="checkbox"/> 2026-2040 <input type="checkbox"/> 2041-2055 <input type="checkbox"/> 2056-2070 <input type="checkbox"/> 2071-2085 <input type="checkbox"/> 2086-2100 <input type="checkbox"/> 2101-2115 <input type="checkbox"/> 2116-2130 <input type="checkbox"/> 2131-2145 <input type="checkbox"/> 2146-2160 <input type="checkbox"/> 2161-2175 <input type="checkbox"/> 2176-2190 <input type="checkbox"/> 2191-2205 <input type="checkbox"/> 2206-2220 <input type="checkbox"/> 2221-2235 <input type="checkbox"/> 2236-2250 <input type="checkbox"/> 2251-2265 <input type="checkbox"/> 2266-2280 <input type="checkbox"/> 2281-2295 <input type="checkbox"/> 2296-2310 <input type="checkbox"/> 2311-2325 <input type="checkbox"/> 2326-2340 <input type="checkbox"/> 2341-2355 <input type="checkbox"/> 2356-2370 <input type="checkbox"/> 2371-2385 <input type="checkbox"/> 2386-2400 <input type="checkbox"/> 2401-2415 <input type="checkbox"/> 2416-2430 <input type="checkbox"/> 2431-2445 <input type="checkbox"/> 2446-2460 <input type="checkbox"/> 2461-2475 <input type="checkbox"/> 2476-2490 <input type="checkbox"/> 2491-2505 <input type="checkbox"/> 2506-2520 <input type="checkbox"/> 2521-2535 <input type="checkbox"/> 2536-2550 <input type="checkbox"/> 2551-2565 <input type="checkbox"/> 2566-2580 <input type="checkbox"/> 2581-2595 <input type="checkbox"/> 2596-2610 <input type="checkbox"/> 2611-2625 <input type="checkbox"/> 2626-2640 <input type="checkbox"/> 2641-2655 <input type="checkbox"/> 2656-2670 <input type="checkbox"/> 2671-2685 <input type="checkbox"/> 2686-2700 <input type="checkbox"/> 2701-2715 <input type="checkbox"/> 2716-2730 <input type="checkbox"/> 2731-2745 <input type="checkbox"/> 2746-2760 <input type="checkbox"/> 2761-2775 <input type="checkbox"/> 2776-2790 <input type="checkbox"/> 2791-2805 <input type="checkbox"/> 2806-2820 <input type="checkbox"/> 2821-2835 <input type="checkbox"/> 2836-2850 <input type="checkbox"/> 2851-2865 <input type="checkbox"/> 2866-2880 <input type="checkbox"/> 2881-2895 <input type="checkbox"/> 2896-2910 <input type="checkbox"/> 2911-2925 <input type="checkbox"/> 2926-2940 <input type="checkbox"/> 2941-2955 <input type="checkbox"/> 2956-2970 <input type="checkbox"/> 2971-2985 <input type="checkbox"/> 2986-3000 <input type="checkbox"/> 3001-3015 <input type="checkbox"/> 3016-3030 <input type="checkbox"/> 3031-3045 <input type="checkbox"/> 3046-3060 <input type="checkbox"/> 3061-3075 <input type="checkbox"/> 3076-3090 <input type="checkbox"/> 3091-3105 <input type="checkbox"/> 3106-3120 <input type="checkbox"/> 3121-3135 <input type="checkbox"/> 3136-3150 <input type="checkbox"/> 3151-3165 <input type="checkbox"/> 3166-3180 <input type="checkbox"/> 3181-3195 <input type="checkbox"/> 3196-3210 <input type="checkbox"/> 3211-3225 <input type="checkbox"/> 3226-3240 <input type="checkbox"/> 3241-3255 <input type="checkbox"/> 3256-3270 <input type="checkbox"/> 3271-3285 <input type="checkbox"/> 3286-3300 <input type="checkbox"/> 3301-3315 <input type="checkbox"/> 3316-3330 <input type="checkbox"/> 3331-3345 <input type="checkbox"/> 3346-3360 <input type="checkbox"/> 3361-3375 <input type="checkbox"/> 3376-3390 <input type="checkbox"/> 3391-3405 <input type="checkbox"/> 3406-3420 <input type="checkbox"/> 3421-3435 <input type="checkbox"/> 3436-3450 <input type="checkbox"/> 3451-3465 <input type="checkbox"/> 3466-3480 <input type="checkbox"/> 3481-3495 <input type="checkbox"/> 3496-3510 <input type="checkbox"/> 3511-3525 <input type="checkbox"/> 3526-3540 <input type="checkbox"/> 3541-3555 <input type="checkbox"/> 3556-3570 <input type="checkbox"/> 3571-3585 <input type="checkbox"/> 3586-3600 <input type="checkbox"/> 3601-3615 <input type="checkbox"/> 3616-3630 <input type="checkbox"/> 3631-3645 <input type="checkbox"/> 3646-3660 <input type="checkbox"/> 3661-3675 <input type="checkbox"/> 3676-3690 <input type="checkbox"/> 3691-3705 <input type="checkbox"/> 3706-3720 <input type="checkbox"/> 3721-3735 <input type="checkbox"/> 3736-3750 <input type="checkbox"/> 3751-3765 <input type="checkbox"/> 3766-3780 <input type="checkbox"/> 3781-3795 <input type="checkbox"/> 3796-3810 <input type="checkbox"/> 3811-3825 <input type="checkbox"/> 3826-3840 <input type="checkbox"/> 3841-3855 <input type="checkbox"/> 3856-3870 <input type="checkbox"/> 3871-3885 <input type="checkbox"/> 3886-3900 <input type="checkbox"/> 3901-3915 <input type="checkbox"/> 3916-3930 <input type="checkbox"/> 3931-3945 <input type="checkbox"/> 3946-3960 <input type="checkbox"/> 3961-3975 <input type="checkbox"/> 3976-3990 <input type="checkbox"/> 3991-4005 <input type="checkbox"/> 4006-4020 <input type="checkbox"/> 4021-4035 <input type="checkbox"/> 4036-4050 <input type="checkbox"/> 4051-4065 <input type="checkbox"/> 4066-4080 <input type="checkbox"/> 4081-4095 <input type="checkbox"/> 4096-4110 <input type="checkbox"/> 4111-4125 <input type="checkbox"/> 4126-4140 <input type="checkbox"/> 4141-4155 <input type="checkbox"/> 4156-4170 <input type="checkbox"/> 4171-4185 <input type="checkbox"/> 4186-4200 <input type="checkbox"/> 4201-4215 <input type="checkbox"/> 4216-4230 <input type="checkbox"/> 4231-4245 <input type="checkbox"/> 4246-4260 <input type="checkbox"/> 4261-4275 <input type="checkbox"/> 4276-4290 <input type="checkbox"/> 4291-4305 <input type="checkbox"/> 4306-4320 <input type="checkbox"/> 4321-4335 <input type="checkbox"/> 4336-4350 <input type="checkbox"/> 4351-4365 <input type="checkbox"/> 4366-4380 <input type="checkbox"/> 4381-4395 <input type="checkbox"/> 4396-4410 <input type="checkbox"/> 4411-4425 <input type="checkbox"/> 4426-4440 <input type="checkbox"/> 4441-4455 <input type="checkbox"/> 4456-4470 <input type="checkbox"/> 4471-4485 <input type="checkbox"/> 4486-4500 <input type="checkbox"/> 4501-4515 <input type="checkbox"/> 4516-4530 <input type="checkbox"/> 4531-4545 <input type="checkbox"/> 4546-4560 <input type="checkbox"/> 4561-4575 <input type="checkbox"/> 4576-4590 <input type="checkbox"/> 4591-4605 <input type="checkbox"/> 4606-4620 <input type="checkbox"/> 4621-4635 <input type="checkbox"/> 4636-4650 <input type="checkbox"/> 4651-4665 <input type="checkbox"/> 4666-4680 <input type="checkbox"/> 4681-4695 <input type="checkbox"/> 4696-4710 <input type="checkbox"/> 4711-4725 <input type="checkbox"/> 4726-4740 <input type="checkbox"/> 4741-4755 <input type="checkbox"/> 4756-4770 <input type="checkbox"/> 4771-4785 <input type="checkbox"/> 4786-4800 <input type="checkbox"/> 4801-4815 <input type="checkbox"/> 4816-4830 <input type="checkbox"/> 4831-4845 <input type="checkbox"/> 4846-4860 <input type="checkbox"/> 4861-4875 <input type="checkbox"/> 4876-4890 <input type="checkbox"/> 4891-4905 <input type="checkbox"/> 4906-4920 <input type="checkbox"/> 4921-4935 <input type="checkbox"/> 4936-4950 <input type="checkbox"/> 4951-4965 <input type="checkbox"/> 4966-4980 <input type="checkbox"/> 4981-4995 <input type="checkbox"/> 4996-5010 <input type="checkbox"/> 5011-5025 <input type="checkbox"/> 5026-5040 <input type="checkbox"/> 5041-5055 <input type="checkbox"/> 5056-5070 <input type="checkbox"/> 5071-5085 <input type="checkbox"/> 5086-5100 <input type="checkbox"/> 5101-5115 <input type="checkbox"/> 5116-5130 <input type="checkbox"/> 5131-5145 <input type="checkbox"/> 5146-5160 <input type="checkbox"/> 5161-5175 <input type="checkbox"/> 5176-5190 <input type="checkbox"/> 5191-5205 <input type="checkbox"/> 5206-5220 <input type="checkbox"/> 5221-5235 <input type="checkbox"/> 5236-5250 <input type="checkbox"/> 5251-5265 <input type="checkbox"/> 5266-5280 <input type="checkbox"/> 5281-5295 <input type="checkbox"/> 5296-5310 <input type="checkbox"/> 5311-5325 <input type="checkbox"/> 5326-5340 <input type="checkbox"/> 5341-5355 <input type="checkbox"/> 5356-5370 <input type="checkbox"/> 5371-5385 <input type="checkbox"/> 5386-5400 <input type="checkbox"/> 5401-5415 <input type="checkbox"/> 5416-5430 <input type="checkbox"/> 5431-5445 <input type="checkbox"/> 5446-5460 <input type="checkbox"/> 5461-5475 <input type="checkbox"/> 5476-5490 <input type="checkbox"/> 5491-5505 <input type="checkbox"/> 5506-5520 <input type="checkbox"/> 5521-5535 <input type="checkbox"/> 5536-5550 <input type="checkbox"/> 5551-5565 <input type="checkbox"/> 5566-5580 <input type="checkbox"/> 5581-5595 <input type="checkbox"/> 5596-5610 <input type="checkbox"/> 5611-5625 <input type="checkbox"/> 5626-5640 <input type="checkbox"/> 5641-5655 <input type="checkbox"/> 5656-5670 <input type="checkbox"/> 5671-5685 <input type="checkbox"/> 5686-5700 <input type="checkbox"/> 5701-5715 <input type="checkbox"/> 5716-5730 <input type="checkbox"/> 5731-5745 <input type="checkbox"/> 5746-5760 <input type="checkbox"/> 5761-5775 <input type="checkbox"/> 5776-5790 <input type="checkbox"/> 5791-5805 <input type="checkbox"/> 5806-5820 <input type="checkbox"/> 5821-5835 <input type="checkbox"/> 5836-5850 <input type="checkbox"/> 5851-5865 <input type="checkbox"/> 5866-5880 <input type="checkbox"/> 5881-5895 <input type="checkbox"/> 5896-5910 <input type="checkbox"/> 5911-5925 <input type="checkbox"/> 5926-5940 <input type="checkbox"/> 5941-5955 <input type="checkbox"/> 5956-5970 <input type="checkbox"/> 5971-5985 <input type="checkbox"/> 5986-6000 <input type="checkbox"/> 6001-6015 <input type="checkbox"/> 6016-6030 <input type="checkbox"/> 6031-6045 <input type="checkbox"/> 6046-6060 <input type="checkbox"/> 6061-6075 <input type="checkbox"/> 6076-6090 <input type="checkbox"/> 6091-6105 <input type="checkbox"/> 6106-6120 <input type="checkbox"/> 6121-6135 <input type="checkbox"/> 6136-6150 <input type="checkbox"/> 6151-6165 <input type="checkbox"/> 6166-6180 <input type="checkbox"/> 6181-6195 <input type="checkbox"/> 6196-6210 <input type="checkbox"/> 6211-6225 <input type="checkbox"/> 6226-6240 <input type="checkbox"/> 6241-6255 <input type="checkbox"/> 6256-6270 <input type="checkbox"/> 6271-6285 <input type="checkbox"/> 6286-6300 <input type="checkbox"/> 6301-6315 <input type="checkbox"/> 6316-6330 <input type="checkbox"/> 6331-6345 <input type="checkbox"/> 6346-6360 <input type="checkbox"/> 6361-6375 <input type="checkbox"/> 6376-6390 <input type="checkbox"/> 6391-6405 <input type="checkbox"/> 6406-6420 <input type="checkbox"/> 6421-6435 <input type="checkbox"/> 6436-6450 <input type="checkbox"/> 6451-6465 <input type="checkbox"/> 6466-6480 <input type="checkbox"/> 6481-6495 <input type="checkbox"/> 6496-6510 <input type="checkbox"/> 6511-6525 <input type="checkbox"/> 6526-6540 <input type="checkbox"/> 6541-6555 <input type="checkbox"/> 6556-6570 <input type="checkbox"/> 6571-6585 <input type="checkbox"/> 6586-6600 <input type="checkbox"/> 6601-6615 <input type="checkbox"/> 6616-6630 <input type="checkbox"/> 6631-6645 <input type="checkbox"/> 6646-6660 <input type="checkbox"/> 6661-6675 <input type="checkbox"/> 6676-6690 <input type="checkbox"/> 6691-6705 <input type="checkbox"/> 6706-6720 <input type="checkbox"/> 6721-6735 <input type="checkbox"/> 6736-6750 <input type="checkbox"/> 6751-6765 <input type="checkbox"/> 6766-6780 <input type="checkbox"/> 6781-6795 <input type="checkbox"/> 6796-6810 <input type="checkbox"/> 6811-6825 <input type="checkbox"/> 6826-6840 <input type="checkbox"/> 6841-6855 <input type="checkbox"/> 6856-6870 <input type="checkbox"/> 6871-6885 <input type="checkbox"/> 6886-6900 <input type="checkbox"/> 6901-6915 <input type="checkbox"/> 6916-6930 <input type="checkbox"/> 6931-6945 <input type="checkbox"/> 6946-6960 <input type="checkbox"/> 6961-6975 <input type="checkbox"/> 6976-6990 <input type="checkbox"/> 6991-7005 <input type="checkbox"/> 7006-7020 <input type="checkbox"/> 7021-7035 <input type="checkbox"/> 7036-7050 <input type="checkbox"/> 7051-7065 <input type="checkbox"/> 7066-7080 <input type="checkbox"/> 7081-7095 <input type="checkbox"/> 7096-7110 <input type="checkbox"/> 7111-7125 <input type="checkbox"/> 7126-7140 <input type="checkbox"/> 7141-7155 <input type="checkbox"/> 7156-7170 <input type="checkbox"/> 7171-7185 <input type="checkbox"/> 7186-7200 <input type="checkbox"/> 7201-7215 <input type="checkbox"/> 7216-7230 <input type="checkbox"/> 7231-7245 <input type="checkbox"/> 7246-7260 <input type="checkbox"/> 7261-7275 <input type="checkbox"/> 7276-7290 <input type="checkbox"/> 7291-7305 <input type="checkbox"/> 7306-7320 <input type="checkbox"/> 7321-7335 <input type="checkbox"/> 7336-7350 <input type="checkbox"/> 7351-7365 <input type="checkbox"/> 7366-7380 <input type="checkbox"/> 7381-7395 <input type="checkbox"/> 7396-7410 <input type="checkbox"/> 7411-7425 <input type="checkbox"/> 7426-7440 <input type="checkbox"/> 7441-7455 <input type="checkbox"/> 7456-7470 <input type="checkbox"/> 7471-7485 <input type="checkbox"/> 7486-7500 <input type="checkbox"/> 7501-7515 <input type="checkbox"/> 7516-7530 <input type="checkbox"/> 7531-7545 <input type="checkbox"/> 7546-7560 <input type="checkbox"/> 7561-7575 <input type="checkbox"/> 7576-7590 <input type="checkbox"/> 7591-7605 <input type="checkbox"/> 7606-7620 <input type="checkbox"/> 7621-7635 <input type="checkbox"/> 7636-7650 <input type="checkbox"/> 7651-7665 <input type="checkbox"/> 7666-7680 <input type="checkbox"/> 7681-7695 <input type="checkbox"/> 7696-7710 <input type="checkbox"/> 7711-7725 <input type="checkbox"/> 7726-7740 <input type="checkbox"/> 7741-7755 <input type="checkbox"/> 7756-7770 <input type="checkbox"/> 7771-7785 <input type="checkbox"/> 7786-7800 <input type="checkbox"/> 7801-7815 <input type="checkbox"/> 7816-7830 <input type="checkbox"/> 7831-7845 <input type="checkbox"/> 7846-7860 <input type="checkbox"/> 7861-7875 <input type="checkbox"/> 7876-7890 <input type="checkbox"/> 7891-7905 <input type="checkbox"/> 7906-7920 <input type="checkbox"/> 7921-7935 <input type="checkbox"/> 7936-7950 <input type="checkbox"/> 7951-7965 <input type="checkbox"/> 7966-7980 <input type="checkbox"/> 7981-7995 <input type="checkbox"/> 7996-8010 <input type="checkbox"/> 8011-8025 <input type="checkbox"/> 8026-8040 <input type="checkbox"/> 8041-8055 <input type="checkbox"/> 8056-8070 <input type="checkbox"/> 8071-8085 <input type="checkbox"/> 8086-8100 <input type="checkbox"/> 8101-8115 <input type="checkbox"/> 8116-8130 <input type="checkbox"/> 8131-8145 <input type="checkbox"/> 8146-8160 <input type="checkbox"/> 8161-8175 <input type="checkbox"/> 8176-8190 <input type="checkbox"/> 8191-8205 <input type="checkbox"/> 8206-8220 <input type="checkbox"/> 8221-8235 <input type="checkbox"/> 8236-8250 <input type="checkbox"/> 8251-8265 <input type="checkbox"/> 8266-8280 <input type="checkbox"/> 8281-8295 <input type="checkbox"/> 8296-8310 <input type="checkbox"/> 8311-8325 <input type="checkbox"/> 8326-8340 <input type="checkbox"/> 8341-8355 <input type="checkbox"/> 8356-8370 <input type="checkbox"/> 8371-8385 <input type="checkbox"/> 8386-8400 <input type="checkbox"/> 8401-8415 <input type="checkbox"/> 8416-8430 <input type="checkbox"/> 8431-8445 <input type="checkbox"/> 8446-8460 <input type="checkbox"/> 8461-8475 <input type="checkbox"/> 8476-8490 <input type="checkbox"/> 8491-8505 <input type="checkbox"/> 8506-8520 <input type="checkbox"/> 8521-8535 <input type="checkbox"/> 8536-8550 <input type="checkbox"/> 8551-8565 <input type="checkbox"/> 8566-8580 <input type="checkbox"/> 8581-8595 <input type="checkbox"/> 8596-8610 <input type="checkbox"/> 8611-8625 <input type="checkbox"/> 8626-8640 <input type="checkbox"/> 8641-8655 <input type="checkbox"/> 8656-8670 <input type="checkbox"/> 8671-8685 <input type="checkbox"/> 8686-8700 <input type="checkbox"/> 8701-8715 <input type="checkbox"/> 8716-8730 <input type="checkbox"/> 8731-8745 <input type="checkbox"/> 8746-8760 <input type="checkbox"/> 8761-8775 <input type="checkbox"/> 8776-8790 <input type="checkbox"/> 8791-8805 <input type="checkbox"/> 8806-8820 <input type="checkbox"/> 8821-8835 <input type="checkbox"/> 8836-8850 <input type="checkbox"/> 8851-8865 <input type="checkbox"/> 8866-8880 <input type="checkbox"/> 8881-8895 <input type="checkbox"/> 8896-8910 <input type="checkbox"/> 8911-8925 <input type="checkbox"/> 8926-8940 <input type="checkbox"/> 8941-8955 <input type="checkbox"/> 8956-8970 <input type="checkbox"/> 8971-8985 <input type="checkbox"/> 8986-9000 <input type="checkbox"/> 9001-9015 <input type="checkbox"/> 9016-9030 <input type="checkbox"/> 9031-9045 <input type="checkbox"/> 9046-9060 <input type="checkbox"/> 9061-9075 <input type="checkbox"/> 9076-9090 <input type="checkbox"/> 9091-9105 <input type="checkbox"/> 9106-9120 <input type="checkbox"/> 9121-9135 <input type="checkbox"/> 9136-9150 <input type="checkbox"/> 9151-9165 <input type="checkbox"/> 9166-9180 <input type="checkbox"/> 9181-9195 <input type="checkbox"/> 9196-9210 <input type="checkbox"/> 9211-9225 <input type="checkbox"/> 9226-9240 <input type="checkbox"/> 9241-9255 <input type="checkbox"/> 9256-9270 <input type="checkbox"/> 9271-9285 <input type="checkbox"/> 9286-9300 <input type="checkbox"/> 9301-9315 <input type="checkbox"/> 9316-9330 <input type="checkbox"/> 9331-9345 <input type="checkbox"/> 9346-9360 <input type="checkbox"/> 9361-9375 <input type="checkbox"/> 9376-9390 <input type="checkbox"/> 9391-9405 <input type="checkbox"/> 9406-9420 <input type="checkbox"/> 9421-9435 <input type="checkbox"/> 9436-9450 <input type="checkbox"/> 9451-9465 <input type="checkbox"/> 9466-9480 <input type="checkbox"/> 9481-9495 <input type="checkbox"/> 9496-9510 <input type="checkbox"/> 9511-9525 <input type="checkbox"/> 9526-9540 <input type="checkbox"/> 9541-9555 <input type="checkbox"/> 9556-9570 <input type="checkbox"/> 9571-9585 <input type="checkbox"/> 9586-9600 <input type="checkbox"/> 9601-9615 <input type="checkbox"/> 9616-9630 <input type="checkbox"/> 9631-9645 <input type="checkbox"/> 9646-9660 <input type="checkbox"/> 9661-9675 <input type="checkbox"/> 9676-9690 <input type="checkbox"/> 9691-9705 <input type="checkbox"/> 9706-9720 <input type="checkbox"/> 9721-9735 <input type="checkbox"/> 9736-9750 <input type="checkbox"/> 9751-9765 <input type="checkbox"/> 9766-9780 <input type="checkbox"/> 9781-9795 <input type="checkbox"/> 9796-9810 <input type="checkbox"/> 9811-9825 <input type="checkbox"/> 9826-9840 <input type="checkbox"/> 9841-9855 <input type="checkbox"/> 9856-9870 <input type="checkbox"/> 9871-9885 <input type="checkbox"/> 9886-9900 <input type="checkbox"/> 9901-9915 <input type="checkbox"/> 9916-9930 <input type="checkbox"/> 9931-9945 <input type="checkbox"/> 9946-9960 <input type="checkbox"/> 9961-9975 <input type="checkbox"/> 9976-9990 <input type="checkbox"/> 9991-10005 <input type="checkbox"/> 10006-10020 <input type="checkbox"/> 10021-10035 <input type="checkbox"/> 10036-10050 <input type="checkbox"/> 10051-10065 <input type="checkbox"/> 10066-10080 <input type="checkbox"/> 10081-10095 <input type="checkbox"/> 10096-10110 <input type="checkbox"/> 10111-10125 <input type="checkbox"/> 10126-10140 <input type="checkbox"/> 10141-10155 <input type="checkbox"/> 10156-10170 <input type="checkbox"/> 10171-10185 <input type="checkbox"/> 10186-10200 <input type="checkbox"/> 10201-10215 <input type="checkbox"/> 10216-10230 <input type="checkbox"/> 10231-10245 <input type="checkbox"/> 10246-10260 <input type="checkbox"/> 10261-10275 <input type="checkbox"/> 10276-10290 <input type="checkbox"/> 10291-10305 <input type="checkbox"/> 10306-10320 <input type="checkbox"/> 10321-10335 <input type="checkbox"/> 10336-10350 <input type="checkbox"/> 10351-10365 <input type="checkbox"/> 10366-10380 <input type="checkbox"/> 10381-10395 <input type="checkbox"/> 10396-10410 <input type="checkbox"/> 10411-10425 <input type="checkbox"/> 10426-10440 <input type="checkbox"/> 10441-10455 <input type="checkbox"/> 10456-10470 <input type="checkbox"/> 10471-10485 <input type="checkbox"/> 10486-10500 <input type="checkbox"/> 10501-10515 <input type="checkbox"/> 10516-10530 <input type="checkbox"/> 10531-10545 <input type="checkbox"/> 10546-10560 <input type="checkbox"/> 10561-10575 <input type="checkbox"/> 10576-10590 <input type="checkbox"/> 10591-10605 <input type="checkbox"/> 10606-10620 <input type="checkbox"/> 10621-10635 <input type="checkbox"/> 10636-10650 <input type="checkbox"/> 10651-10665 <input type="checkbox"/> 10666-10680 <input type="checkbox"/> 10681-10695 <input type="checkbox"/> 10696-10710 <input type="checkbox"/> 10711-10725 <input type="checkbox"/> 10726-10740 <input type="checkbox"/> 10741-10755 <input type="checkbox"/> 10756-10770 <input type="checkbox"/> 10771-10785 <input type="checkbox"/> 10786-10800 <input type="checkbox"/> 10801-10815 <input type="checkbox"/> 10816-10830 <input type="checkbox"/> 10831-10845 <input type="checkbox"/> 10846-10860 <input type="checkbox"/> 10861-10875 <input type="checkbox"/> 10876-10890 <input type="checkbox"/> 10891-10905 <input type="checkbox"/> 10906-10920 <input type="checkbox"/> 10921-10935 <input type="checkbox"/> 10936-1095</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1673	Mary	Nuttall			Object	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?-</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?-</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes I cannot sleep with my bedroom window open - traffic continually passing at all hours of the night.</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?</p> <p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?No</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?</p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal Yes</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1674	Ben and Gemma	Greenwod and Epstein			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?No</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>Can't cross the road, can't sleep, can't even think sometimes.</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this tak 5-10, More</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>It takes 10-15 minutes sometimes to get off the drive. Sometimes can't cross the road for 10 minutes plus +. Traffic on Grane is ruining our lives.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
1675	Victoria	Roles			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?No</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?No</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?No</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?No</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?No</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?No</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?5-10, does depend on the time of day</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1676	Margaret	Murray			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>Noisy, dusty and dangerous crossing the road</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>13. If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>14. How many minutes does this take?5-10, More at peak times</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? Yes</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>If there is to be housing designated by Planners on this site, is it not courteous and appropriate to obtain the view of local residents as well as land owners / developers, prior to such a designation being put forward, to ensure a satisfactory outcome for all parties?</p> <p>Letter received 09/10/2017:</p> <p>I write to you as a resident directly affected by the proposal to designate the above site for housing. I state my views in the following paragraphs.</p> <p>Loss of light or overshadowing/Noise and Disturbance/Nature and Conservation/Landscaping</p> <p>I would prefer to see the green fields undeveloped for reasons of habitat conservation and animal grazing, although they have been left to lie fallow for a number of years, possibly with the aim of allowing the land to deteriorate with a view to offering it for sale as suitable for development. This environment has been enjoyed by my family for the past 42 years. I accept however that some development is inevitable, as I understand that the majority of land owners are in agreement with such plans. We have over this period had uninterrupted views of Tor and the local countryside, which was one of the reasons for buying our property. My husband and I take a pride in</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>our garden which has been created over a long period, and which provides a quiet, peaceful and private area in which to relax. No doubt these reasons do not fit in with the legitimate planning objection criteria but I feel that they should be noted. The plans previously submitted and which are awaiting amendment by the prospective developer, will no doubt eliminate this and have an impact on privacy. A small number of properties directly overlook the site and I believe that sufficient distance should be provided between current and new properties to overcome this obstacle. The provision of a buffer between the perimeter of residents' gardens and new properties, with sufficient parking for current residents, would go some way to compensating for this concern.</p> <p>Highways Safety/Noise and Disturbance resulting from use/Hazardous Material Grane Road is notoriously busy, with the traffic travelling its length increasing year on year. I support the safety measures campaigned for by Grane Residents' Association and the improvements implemented to aid road safety, including the average speed cameras currently under construction along the length of Grane Road from Blackburn to Haslingden. We understand that Lancashire County Council is insistent that the access point for any housing development will not be situated on Grane Road.</p> <p>However, even if the access point should be re-located to Holcombe Road, the development of 160 houses, with an estimated 320 resident cars, plus service and emergency vehicles, will put enormous strain onto the already saturated Grane Road, reducing our quality of life even further. It must be remembered that this area is subject to many visitors accessing the cemetery, who currently wait to cross the road for up to 10 minutes due to the heavy flow of traffic. Current noise and disturbance from use of the road is high. Vibration in our house, caused by passing heavy vehicles, is quite substantial and detrimental to our property. An increase in the volume of traffic generated from the proposed development will add further problems in a major way, as the majority of vehicles will still be entering Grane Road from Holcombe Road if access to the site is changed. A roundabout at the Holden Arms junction would be beneficial generally and would aid the flow of traffic. I would however, oppose the implementation of traffic lights as a solution, on the grounds that this will cause disturbance to residents, impact on air quality and health due to idling vehicles waiting at the traffic lights, cause tailbacks at peak periods, take away parking facilities from outside our homes and create a danger to emergency services.</p> <p>In our response to the former housing development plan we stated that at the bottom end of the proposed site was a settling pool for the hazardous waste, created when the site was owned by the Bleach Works. Is there still to be a children's playground situated in this vicinity which is also adjacent to a water source and gas governor? If so, surely it would be better placed central to the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
						<p>site or nearer to Grane Road so that such a facility could be enjoyed by all residents of the wider "Grane Village," as would a village green. I trust that hours of working during any construction on the site would be such as to avoid disruption to residents in the surrounding area. A further consideration which should be taken into account is the question of building materials which should be sympathetic to the surrounding area and once agreed in the final plan be adhered to, unlike development of The Courtyard where building requirements were flaunted by the developer.</p> <p>I presume that a Council Tax rebate will be paid to local residents to compensate for noise, disturbance, dust, movement of heavy plant and machinery etc. should development take place.</p> <p>Loss of Trees/Visual Amenity</p> <p>The loss of trees and greenery which will result, should the current site plans go ahead, is a major loss as it is on the very edge of a truly beautiful area with a number of well used trails, the reservoirs and Tor. Rossendale's natural beauty needs to be conserved for residents and tourists alike. This is yet another green space which if developed, will change the village as we know it and make it unrecognisable. Future plans therefore must be sympathetically considered to meet the needs of local residents where ever possible.</p> <p>Drainage of site</p> <p>Drainage and flooding should be taken into account should the land be developed, to ensure that water running off the hillside is adequately carried away. The land is currently saturated, with water backing up into our gardens and with standing water on Grane Road during heavy downpours, adding further danger to the road.</p> <p>I trust that Grane Residents' Association will be provided with the developer's amended plans, together with the results of their site survey including air quality levels, traffic volume and water levels/flood risk analysis, prior to the site being designated for housing.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1677	Stewart	Pugh			Object	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?YES</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?YES</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?No</p> <p>10. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>Damage to our car and property</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?No</p> <p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?5-10</p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?YES</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>The house shakes with the HGV's that pass. The gable end rendering has fall off (8k to repair). We have seen fatal car crashes at junction of Holden Arms, not a nice sight to witness. This road cannot take more traffic from further development or housing.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1678	Kathy	Graham			Object	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?No</p> <p>10. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, if so please explain how?No Very noisy, unable to relax at home</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?No</p> <p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?More than ten minutes</p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments: From moving into my home 25 years ago living on a quiet B road it has not changed to living on the side of a motorway!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1679		Sumner			Object	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?Yes</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?Yes</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?Yes</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes</p> <p>Noise from and speed of traffic is a major concern.</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road?Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?1-5</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>The addition of vehicles from a new development will only increase congestion, noise and pollution to an already overly busy road and impinge on the quality of life for all who live here. The extra burden on an already over used road, one that was not designed or built for such usage, will be unthinkable.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1680	Alan	Raby			Object	<p>1. Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>2. Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>3. Does the traffic noise concern you? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>4. Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>5. Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>6. Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>7. Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>8. Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>9. Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>10. Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>11. Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>12. Do you drive a vehicle? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>a) If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>b) How many minutes does this take? <input type="checkbox"/> 1-5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5-10 <input type="checkbox"/> 10-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 15-20 <input type="checkbox"/> 20-30 <input type="checkbox"/> 30-45 <input type="checkbox"/> 45-60 <input type="checkbox"/> 60+</p> <p>13. Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Holcombe Rd is now becoming an arterial rd. it is feeding any new developments in Helmsore, Ramsbottom and beyond. It feeds certain parts of Bury, Bradshaw and Bolton. It also has numerous H.G.V. every day feeding Solomons apart from the H.G.V. they convert which are up and down Holcombe Rd all day and now you want it to feed a housing estate with a potential of 200-250 extra cars, really enough is enough.</p> <p>I am one of only two properties at the top of Holcombe Rd. I am already experiencing difficulty in accessing my property due to queuing traffic especially when I am stuck in the middle of the road waiting while traffic is building up behind me onto Grane Rd. Hope you rethink your plans and look at the long picture.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1681	Vera	Price			Object	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the amount of traffic using Grane Road?Yes</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the speed of traffic using Grane Road worry you?Yes</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the traffic noise concern you?Yes</p> <p>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can you feel the vibration in your property when HGV's pass?Yes</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Have you suffered any damage to your property due to vibration and/or impact from vehicles using Grane Road?No</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic make you feel afraid when walking along Grane Road?No</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you experience difficulty crossing Grane Road due to the amount of traffic?No</p> <p>8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is your property affected by excessive dust caused by passing traffic?No</p> <p>9. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you or a member of your household suffer from Bronchitis, Asthma or any other respiratory complaint?No</p> <p>10. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does the volume of traffic affect your quality of life, is so please explain how?Yes When in the garden unable to carry on a conversation because of the traffic noise</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you think a roundabout at the Cemetery would aid road safety?Yes</p> <p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do you drive a vehicle?No</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes to the above, do you experience any difficulty entering the flow of traffic on Grane Road-</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> How many minutes does this take?-</p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are you concerned about the Grane Village housing proposal?Yes</p> <p>Further comments: While each house will probably have a car and many 2 cars per house which is ridiculous in the already very large volume of traffic. I did a count of the traffic on 31.08.17 at 2.30pm-2.42pm number of vehicles was 205 both ways. 04.09.2017 4.45pm - 5pm 363 vehicles.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Support	<p>Site Status</p> <p>3.1 Taylor Wimpey have sole control over a 6 hectare site at Grane Road, Haslingden known as 'Grane Village' and have been working alongside the Council to promote the allocation of this site for residential development since 2012.</p> <p>3.2 This site was originally put forward for development as part of Council's 'Lives & Landscapes- Green Belt & Urban Boundary Review' consultation in December 2012, as it was recognised as being at the edge of the urban area and in poor condition; therefore making a limited contribution to the countryside. Taylor Wimpey fully supported this boundary change and have since provided further clarification to the Council on the site's suitability and deliverability through a Development Statement, submitted in January 2014 and this is attached at Appendix 1.</p> <p>3.3 The site (SHLAA Ref: 16304) is now proposed as a housing allocation (Site HS2.78) within Policy HS2 of the Draft Plan, although we note this also include another small parcel of land in separate ownership (SHLAA Ref: 16402).</p> <p>3.4 The attached Development Statement and evidence submitted to date have demonstrated that this is a sustainable and deliverable site in accordance with the NPPF, which is capable of delivering up to 160 units, commencing within the next 5 years.</p> <p>3.5 In light of this we would question why this site has been included in Table 1 as delivering in years 6-15, and ask that this be amended to years 1-5, as Local Plans should not be holding deliverable sites back, particularly where there is an existing 5-year supply shortfall as there is in Rossendale.</p> <p>3.6 We would also question the site area and capacity calculations for SHLAA 16304, given that the Taylor Wimpey have confirmed that they control 6 hectares that could deliver up to 160 units, so we would ask that this is amended as well.</p> <p>3.7 We also welcome the site's categorisation as 'mixed' which acknowledges that it is part brownfield.</p> <p>Evidence Base – Grane Village</p> <p>3.8 We now provide comments on the evidence base documents which consider the Grane Village site: Landscape Assessment</p> <p>3.9 We agree with many of the findings of this report, but have concerns with some of the conclusions in relation to the Grane Village Site. As such, Randall Thorp have provided a comprehensive rebuttal statement which provides commentary on the findings of the Landscape Report, which can be found in Appendix 2. The Randall Thorp note should be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

read in conjunction with these representations and can be summarised as follows:

- The Council’s Landscape Assessment recommended that planned gaps in the layout of the site should be used to retain views to Tor Hill. It is not considered that the existing view to Tor Hill from the identified viewpoint on Grane Road is of exceptional quality due to the visual influence of the large scale industrial buildings which dominate the foreground to the left of the view. As such, it is not considered that the quality of this existing view is high enough to require the entire view line to be kept free from development.

- Appropriately designed development can be delivered on the Grane Village site without resulting in significantly adverse effects upon landscape character, landscape features, or visual receptors.

3.10 This demonstrates that development of the Grane Village site will not generate any adverse landscape impacts, reinforcing its allocation in the Draft Plan.

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment- Stages 1 and 2 (May 2017)

3.11 The site was assessed in the SHLAA under site reference 16304. Whilst we agree that the site is suitable and achievable, we would question why it has been not been considered deliverable in the short term, and have a few comments on some of the findings. The Council already consider this site a suitable housing allocation, however, in our view, the site actually performs even better in certain categories of the SHLAA as explained below:

- Ecological value- The site is scored as red in this category, with the commentary explaining how a small strip of land in the site is located within woodland and grassland Stepping Stone. The Development Statement for this site considered all ecological matters, and concluded that there are no ecological or arboricultural constraints preventing the development of this site and appropriate mitigation will be provided where necessary. Additionally, the area of high ecological value to the south-east of the site has been excluded from development, and will therefore be protected by proposals. This is not considered to be an issue on site, therefore the site performs better than a red scoring in this category when taking into consideration the masterplan.

- Landscape value- In the Council’s 2015 Landscape Assessment, it is concluded that the Grane Village site is ‘suitable for development with mitigation’. As the 2015 Landscape Assessment conclusions were specific to the site, it is therefore unclear why the SHLAA has stated that this site has a high landscape impact. The Randall Thorp report contained at Appendix 2 further confirms that the site is suitable from a landscape perspective. It is therefore considered that the landscape scoring or the site is incorrect in the SHLAA, and should certainly not be categorised as red.

3.12 We also note that the scoring methodology and scope of the SHLAA does not allow for detailed considerations such as masterplanning and proposed design/mitigation. The Illustrative Masterplan for Grane Village (see Appendix

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.078	Further comment	
						<p>2) illustrates how the existing public right of way does not pose a constraint on site, on the contrary it can be well-integrated into development proposals.</p> <p>3.13 Therefore, the site will in reality score higher than amber in the recreational value category, when considering the design of development proposals. A similar comment can be made with regards to the flood risk category-the development proposals shown on the illustrative masterplan excludes the area at medium/high risk of surface water flooding. For clarity, the proposed development is located entirely within Flood Zone 1, representing the lowest level of flood risk.</p> <p>Conclusions on Grane Village</p> <p>3.14 Overall, Taylor Wimpey are wholly supportive of the Grane Village, Haslingden allocation (HS2.78), subject to a few comments on the delivery numbers outlined in Table 1 and the evidence base which assesses the site. In particular, it needs to be clarified in Table 1 of the Draft Local Plan that the Taylor Wimpey site can deliver 160 dwellings, not 106 as currently suggested.</p> <p>4. CONCLUSION</p> <p>4.1 Overall, Taylor Wimpey fully support the allocation of the Grane Village site (HS2.78), subject to the comments and suggestions made above, which note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall housing requirement should be increased to take account of economic aspirations and to provide flexibility to accommodate any unmet need generated by the adjacent authorities in Greater Manchester. • The Council should consider allocating additional sites, both as long term reserve sites to provide some headroom in their overall supply, and smaller short term sites to boost 5 year supply, given the current shortfalls. <p>4.2 This representation has shown that the site is deliverable and developable in line with the NPPF, and has also demonstrated its importance for housing delivery in Rossendale, representing over 4.4% of the total allocated dwelling numbers and will make a significant contribution to 5 year supply.</p> <p>4.3 Importantly, Taylor Wimpey have been promoting Grane Village for almost 5 years and will continue to work alongside the Council to demonstrate that it can begin delivering in the next 5 years.</p> <p>Please see appendix for development statement.</p>			
Number of comments						60	HS2.078		
Reference						HS2.079 Rossendale Golf Club			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
673	Rosemary	Kearney	-	SHLAA16285	Object	We strongly object to the above planning applications for a number of reasons. - - Helmshore as an area is struggling to cope providing the amenities at present with the residents there are at the moment. The local primary schools are already over subscribed and children from the area are having to attend school in other towns. - - There has been a lot of money (self funded) spent on Snig Hole play area which is a great place for children to play safely and away from the main road. If there are more houses built there, the new resident's cars will have to drive right past the area which is unsafe for children. - - The planning for Rossendale Golf Club on Greens Lane again affects local school children as Haslingden High School is located on Greens Lane. This road is already busy especially at school times and more housing will only exacerbate the situation. - - The land off Curven Edge is one of the only green grass areas that children can play on safely. Especially as the local playing fields have been fenced off on Helmshore Road. This area is known locally for holding water as a culvert flows directly under it so I would not expect it to be a good area for development.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
697	Julie	Woods	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277, hs276	Object	<p>Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rossendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
698	John	King	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
699	William	Woods	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	<p>Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rosendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
700	Thelma	King	-	HS279, hs278, hs278, hs277 hs276	Object	Helmshore village is being swamped with more and more houses and the roads and local services are becoming less and less able to cope. We have already seen huge building programmes including the Power Mill and the Loom on Holcombe Road, Weavers Dene, Alden Brook apartments and Broadway housing development which has only added to the pressure to all the local services. Trying to exit onto Helmshore Road from Fairhill or Curven Edge is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic at peak times and raises real safety concerns due to visitors and new residents cutting through the village. Trying to get a doctors appointment is already difficult. The proposal of 15 houses on Greens Lane is so impractical. The traffic around St Veronicas and Haslingden School is so congested people are blocking in drive ways and making it impossible for residents to park. The road on Brooklands Avenue is so narrow it is impossible to pass at peak times and residents are already complaining to the schools about the parking issues. My main concern is Rossendale Golf Club who are now holding a meeting on 7th October to discuss selling the land at the rear of the houses on Cherry Tree Way. They have already sold the land on Greens Lane and are now proposing to sell the land at this location, they are threatening the players that if they do not vote for it that they will put up their golf fees. They have no consideration for the people who live in the houses on Cherry Tree Way and are basically blackmailing the players into voting for the decision to go ahead. Should this proposal go ahead the roads on the estate will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, (we are unsure where they are proposing to gain access) not to mention the value of our houses decreasing. I am very worried about this proposal for obvious reasons and where will it all stop if they are allowed to continue. We moved to Helmshore more than 20 years ago and chose the area because of the village feel, it was relatively quiet but had all the local amenities. The Golf course provides us with a green space between the continual growth of our village and we would like reassurance that they will not be able to continue to sell of land to greedy developers		-
945	S	Mitton	-		Object	The area in question at Rossendale Golf Club on Greens Lane is the home to an array of insects, animals, bees, butterflies and bats. The line of trees which are semi mature house some of these insects, butterflies, bees and bats. Not only building homes on this lovely site but the impact of the traffic down Greens Lane, the privacy of the residents already on Greens Lane, their light and traffic congestion. Also the strain it will have on the local Schools and Medical services.		No, other than please reconsider using green belt land when there are plenty of brown field sites no in use.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16285	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -		
964	Joanne	Smithson	-	SHLAA16285	Object	The access to property already on greens lane and connecting Brooklands Ave is already a nightmare for access. Especially at peak times when owners of the proposed properties would be also be needing access/egress.		
973	Deborah	Haworth	-		Object	I object to more houses being built in Helmshore, and specifically on green belt land. It's already difficult to get an appointment at the doctors without more residents moving in. Our schools are already over subscribed. Our roads are already busy, the roads and pavements are already a disgrace they can't cope with more strain. Helmshore is supposed to be a village, it's fast becoming a town. We need to protect our green spaces, our wildlife and our clean air. We need to reduce carbon monoxide, road traffic accidents and the happiness and wellbeing of our residents. Is all you care about money? You need to listen to the residents of Helmshore, we live here, many of us were brought up here and are already shocked by how ,ugh it has changed. I'm only 45 but have lived here all my life and I'm shocked to see just how many more people and houses have appeared. Look after our heritage, if we need more residences then convert some of the old disused buildings rather than build on our green land killing wildlife and contributing to global warming.		
980	Julie	Cawtherley	-	SHLAA16285	Object	It is green belt land and should not be built on.		There are too many housing developments being considered. The infrastructure is Helmshore can not accommodate the new residents
983	Neil	Leeming	-	SHLAA16285	Object	The uprooting of 250 trees a wild animal oasis, will cause major disruption on Greens Lane which is all ready highly congested at school times.		by building on green belt sites you are taking away our village way of life and wildlife areas within the village.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
1049	wendy	boniface			Object	There are to many references to list - The house proposed behind cherry tree will cause problems with site entrance and traffic. The same is applicable for greens lane and the dip off cherry tree. - The last set of houses built in helmshore were supposed to be the last. You are compromising the integrity of the village. - I would like to point out that greens lane is already an unsafe road and should be one way. Heavy water that runs down that lane after rain will also be made worse by the removal of trees -		-
1060	Stephen	Davies	Resident	SHLAA16285	Object	I agree housing needs to be built. But there are no plans to support infrastructure in the area. Grane road for example has a lot of traffic issues since joining up to the M65. Another 160 homes on that road trying to get out and in to the development will be a nightmare. Also there are plenty of brown field site to build on especially in Blackburn. Helmshore is a village we pay premium prices for homes in the area to have this life style we don't not want it spoilt. Large firms/ housing contractors build quick homes cutting corners all the time. Where are the children going to go to school with all schools in the area full and some of our children already having to travel to bury for school.		We need homes but well thought out planned homes. With good investment in roads, gp surgerys, schools, parks etc. We can not keep cutting into our countryside for the sake of making shareholders rich they don't love here we do please don't have the wool pulled over your eyes for all our sakes and children's.
1116	Sheila	Farnell	-	SHLAA16285	Object	Brook lands Avenue is the route out of Greens Lane and is already over congested at peak times. The school attracts a lot of traffic making the exit dangerous. - Broadway is already a very busy road and so trying to get out at the junction can take a very long time.		-
1128	Joan	Burke	-	SHLAA16285	Object	Each day I walk along Greens Lane and I have seen the traffic steadily building up over the years.Access would have to be via Brooklands avenue.Houses are on both sides of the avenue with cars parked on the left.It is already a bottleneck as the High school uses it to drop the children off.The council seems to want to allow all the green spaces to be built on with no thought for future generations.I have seen numerous wild animals in the trees,where will they go now ?It would take 20 years plus to grow more trees to the height they are now. and we will never get the wild life back.		-
1143	Keith	Walker	-	SHLAA16285	Object	I object on the grounds that you plan to build on green belt and: this will destroy an area of semi mature woodland, increase traffic congestion, devalue current properties, detract from and spoil the peaceful habitat the current residents of Greens Lane currently enjoy, in general the continued encroachment into green belt areas in rossendale is detracting from the very thing that makes the area so special and valued by those that choose to live there.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
1145	Patricia	Walker	-	SHLAA16285	Object	I live on Greens Lane next to the proposed site and strongly object to the proposal of uprooting 250 trees and building houses on the golf course site. - The golf course is a much loved local green belt area and Greens Lane is already a very busy road without further houses and the disruption of building on a school access road. - I think it would be tragic to lose such a beautiful area and it would definitely be detrimental to house prices in the area. We treasure having an unspoilt outlook and was the main reason we bought our house. This would be completely ruined if the proposed houses went ahead. I also think with the vast number of school children walking up Greens Lane every day it would be dangerous and very disruptive to have this level of building going on in the area.		I wish to know if there is a proposed access road near our house so that there would be noise pollution from traffic near our garden
1202	Derek	Burke	-	SHLAA16285	Object	The trees opposite my cottage have now grown higher than the houses and are a haven for wildlife. Vehicle access via Brooklands Avenue can not cope with current usage. Will Brooklands Avenue be widened? Will there be any more school places? Is this the start of further development and will the current infrastructure ie Doctors cope? I am objecting on behalf of future generations.		-
1218	Jack	Bacon	-	SHLAA16285	Object	Local schools are full, facilities such as Doctors surgeries overstretched and all the council's plans are doing is elevating the risk. The aims of the council to systematically take away the green belt land which makes our Valley so special is despicable.		-
1224	Jack	Tattersall	-	Ref shlaa16285	Object	I strongly object to having to destroy 250 young and healthy trees which is also a haven for wildlife such as birds and deer and other small creatures.		There is the high school which is very close by and with the amount of traffic coming and going it is going to get very busy it is very congested now so building 15 new homes isn't going to help.
1232	Liam	Greenhalgh	-	SHLAA16285	Object	I object to the selection of this site to build housing as doing so would involve the destruction of the semi-mature woodland that is well established there. The site is home to a wide range of wildlife and destroying it would have a serious impact on the biodiversity of the area. In addition to this, Greens lane is the main access road to Haslingden High school and building houses on both sides could cause access issues if people were to park their cars on the road in front of their new properties. Currently parking is prohibited on that side of the road.		Generally speaking I believe that without significant investment in infrastructure building so many new houses in the area is unwise. School places, transport (in particular traffic on the M66) and overcrowding are already serious issues.
1254	Sian	Davies	-	SHLAA16285	Object	Objection to loss of green spaces in Helmshore		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
1290	Deborah	Chapman	-	SHLAA16285	Object	The village of Helmshore has been steadily expanding and merging into Haslingden. The green spaces are disappearing and the character of the landscape is changing. These proposed developments will be detrimental to the environment and the wildlife in the area. The Greens lane site is already congested at school times and there is a wealth of wildlife on the golfcourse (I hear a rumour about more proposed building along the golf course backing onto Cherry Tree Way). There are foxes, hedgehogs, too many bird species to mention. - The roads and parking are at a premium in this area. The land at Snig Hole and Curven Edge are places where children play - more houses would mean more traffic and parking problems. A new park has just been built and crossing as it was dangerous and parking at Snig Hole along Station Rd (Bowl Alley) is a problem already. - The Grane site backs on to Grane Road which is already completed congested and a rat run to the M65. The road network, , drainage, schools and amenities cannot take any more in this area. The council do little to look after the area - - building more houses mean we would loose the beautiful walks around here.		-
1294	Michael	Chapman	-	SHLAA16285	Object	These developments will alter the community feel of Helmshore. - The school infrastructure isn't suitable. - The green belt should be protected. - -		-
1299	David	Bemment	-	SHLAA16285	Object	There is too much development in and around Helmshore. The roads cannot cope with any increase in traffic volume.		I vigorously object to any further development in and around Helmshore. - The majority of the open spaces have been built on and the few remaining ones should be left alone, especially the one off Curven Edge, SHLAA16288. This area has been used by children as a play area since I moved here in 1990 and before that. - The local roads are gridlocked in the mornings and late afternoons, any increase in traffic volume would be intolerable. The other routes out of Helmshore are gridlocked as well e.g. Grane rd, M66 and Haslingden Rd. - The schools are full already and children from Helmshore can't always get into a school in Helmshore. - I think the development of Helmshore as a suburb of Manchester has gone far enough. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
1311	Joanne	Mellody	-	SHLAA16285	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		-
1313	Jonathan	Hunt	-	SHLAA16285	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		-
1337	Andrew	Holt	-	SHLAA16285	Object	I feel these developments are to large & would add to the ongoing congestion on the Edenfield bi pass leading to the M66 & on the already busyGrane Rd. - - Whilst I accept housing may be needed this should be on brown field sites but also aligned to improvements in infrastructure which currently is not being developed		-
1345	Gerard	Greenhalgh	-	SHLAA16285	Object	The Planning dept in the Plan just skims over the fact that 250 semi mature trees (30 Yrs old) will be destroyed for the sake of up to only 15 houses. I complete waste and what an upheaval it will cause! - There is numerous wildlife that uses the areas, birds nesting in the trees, deer are regularly see feeding in the copse, it will impact on the biodiversity of the area. - There will be further congestion in Greens Lane, already an issue at peak times. - It is beautiful rural quiet area just around the corner from busy Brooadway. - Greens Lane is the natural Green Belt Boundary. - Think again and leave this copse alone!		Not at this time
1348	Mary	Greenhalgh	-	SHLAA16285	Object	This will be the destruction of around 250 semi mature trees, all for the sake of 15 houses. - - There is wildlife that use the area including deer. - - The Green Belt forms the natural line of Greens Lane and shouldn't be extended. - - Will severely impact on the roads especially at Peak times. - -		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
1355	Rebekah	Haworth	-	SHLAA16285	Object	The area recently average speed check cameras have be implemented to improve the safety of the road, if you have ever tried to exit Holcombe road in peak traffic to either head to Blackburn or Haslingden you would would appreciate the 160 extra houses would only add to this problem. - I also am concerned by how local schools will be able to accommodate extra pupils. I myself moved closer to our local primary school, as I know that year on year there is increasing pressure on children to get a place in a good ofsted rated school, and each year there are more and more stories of children having to travel to ramsbottom as they have not been able to get a place in their local school. - Also currently our nearest NHS dentist is in rawtenstall a few miles down the road, and to try and get a appointment within a week at my local GPs is almost impossible. I am not against building more housing, however the current infrastructure will not support these extra houses. And will only lead to further problems.	-	
1359	Daniel	Greenhalgh	-	SHLAA16285	Object	There currently exist a large stretch of semi-mature woodland on Greens Lane. This woodland supports local wildlife and its removal will damage the local ecosystem even further. Greens Lane also serves as the main access road for Haslingden High School and currently, at school times, the road becomes extremely congested with parked cars and moving traffic. By building more houses (further increasing traffic on the road) and removing the no parking side of the road by the woodland, this congestion will only be increased further. Increasing congestion will pose a higher danger on greens lane to school children walking up the street as well.	-	
1408	Janet	Birkins	-	SHLAA16285	Object	I wish to object to the uprooting of 250 mature (not semi) trees. These trees form a conservation area for birds, deer, voles, hedgehogs and numerous wildlife.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
1424	Pamela	Beech	-	SHLA 16285	Object	I find it hard to believe that Rossendale council are planning to take away designated green spaces, which have been in place for many years. - The outlined plan for green belt land to have housing built on it is disgraceful. - They say there is a housing shortage in the Rossendale area, perhaps if the council looked at the many empty houses in the area and encouraged building company's to look at these rather than continually wanting to build new. - The Helmshore area is already over populated, the schools are over subscribed with children having to travel some distance to attend school. The traffic congestion in the area is getting worse, what should be a 20 minute drive to work takes me 40, 20 mins just to get out of Helmshore. - The proposed site at sing hole, I feel would lead to many accidents, even with the new crossing it is still a challenge to cross the road, 3 weeks ago when taking my granddaughter to the park when waiting to cross a bus was going so fast I did not think he was going to stop, he slammed is breaks on, then as we crossed a car over took the bus and nearly ran us down. - This would be even worse with cars trying to get out of the entry as well. - - Rossendale golf club seem to think that every time they run out of funding that it is ok to try sell off land and build houses, maybe they should look at the accounts team who manage there finances. - The impact of houses been built on the golf course, will affect not only the population increase but will have a major impact on the wildlife. - - Therefore as a resident of Helmshore I strongly object to the proposed plans. -		I feel that before any further decisions are made the people of Rossendale should be given the opportunity to speak. And given advance notice of any plans so they have time to reposond unlike this consultation which has not allowed people time to respond.
1427	Lee	Kershaw	-	SHLAA16285	Object	This is green belt land and it should not be allowed to be built on.		We live in a beautiful part of the World, packing houses onto any bit of spare land just so that we can say to the Government that we have completed our quota is a bloody crime. If we are not careful we will become another suburb of Manchester.
1491	Edward	Mercer	-		Object	Traffic is a problem already with access to the High School morning And afternoon with congestion on Greens Lane and Brooklands Ave. Also evenings with the Performing Arts centre on the High School campus.Residents have difficulty parking their cars with nowhere else to park. More housing with access on to Greens Lane will only add to this problem		The High with over a thousand children, and parents dropping off and picking up all creating a blockage on Brooklands Ave. On to Broadway is already a safety hazard that needs dealing with.more housing on Greens Lane will only add to this problem

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Support	<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>1.1 This representation is prepared by Turley on behalf of our client Peel Holdings (Land & Property) Limited (hereafter “Peel” or “our client”). It provides comments to Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) in respect of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan1 (July 2017) (‘DLP’) which is currently the subject of public consultation.</p> <p>1.2 This document relates exclusively to the promotion of land at Rossendale Golf Course, as a development opportunity. It should be considered in conjunction with the overarching representation submitted by Turley on behalf of Peel.</p> <p>Draft Rossendale Local Plan</p> <p>1.3 As set out in the overarching representation submitted, Peel has continuously and historically engaged with the plan-making process for Rossendale. This has included the submission of detailed representations to the previous Core Strategy and the draft Lives and Landscapes DPD (since withdrawn), including Development Frameworks that set out the development potential at four sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden (allocated in part) • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall (allocated in part) • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield (allocated) • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield (not allocated) <p>1.4 Peel welcomes the progress which has been made on the emerging Local Plan and supports, in principle, the proposals for development within it. In particular, Peel strongly supports the allocation of land at Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden, Haslam Farm in Rawtenstall, and Blackburn Road in Edenfield, which include some or all of three of the sites previously put forward (as above).</p> <p>1.5 It is noted, however, that additional work is required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is capable of meeting the full development needs of the Borough. Additional land will need to be allocated for residential development, above that which has been identified in the DLP.</p> <p>1.6 This opportunity is being taken to make representations in relation to the sites previously identified by Peel as capable of accommodating development in the Borough that have not been put forward in the DLP for allocation and/or Green Belt release. Peel is preparing updated Development Frameworks which will promote and justify its landholdings within Rossendale. Matters addressed below and in the overarching representation which directly affect its landholdings will be discussed in detail in each Development Framework.</p> <p>Additional Site Allocations</p> <p>1.7 In the context of the need for the Rossendale DLP to allocate additional land for development, Peel wish to reiterate the development opportunities at each of the four sites previously identified, as well as proposing a further</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
						<p>potential site at Rossendale Golf Club.</p> <p>1.8 These sites can each provide a deliverable housing development site in sustainable locations adjoining existing settlements. Initial reviews of site constraints and opportunities, landscape and highways have indicated that there are no significant barriers to development.</p> <p>Development Frameworks</p> <p>1.9 Further site appraisals are being undertaken to inform updated Development Frameworks which will be provided to the Council in due course.</p> <p>1.10 The updated Development Frameworks will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide analysis of the site constraints and opportunities. • Where relevant provide details of the findings of further technical assessment (such as highways, flood risk, ground conditions). • Consider the key principles for development of the site. • Present a proposed site layout plan illustrating development parcels, access, landscaping, etc. • Comment on the economic benefits of development. • Address comments / observations made within the recently published evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. <p>Proposed Development Opportunities</p> <p>1.11 In advance of the full Development Frameworks, the individual site representations are submitted providing initial reviews of the development opportunities.</p> <p>1.12 The Sites are represented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield • Land at Rossendale Golf Course, Helmshore (this document) <p>1.13 This representation relates to land at Rossendale Golf Course and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2: A description of the site and its location • Section 3: Details of the consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA)2 and a review of the planning policy context including the Draft Local Plan • Section 4: A Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review • Section 5: Concluding comments <p>1.14 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted here for residential development.</p> <p>2. Opportunity Site Site Description</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
						<p>2.1 Rossendale Golf Course is located immediately to the east of Helmshore. It extends to 97.13 ha in total, and the site for promotion by Peel is a c. 21.96 ha parcel of land at the north west corner of the golf course. The Site is an I-shaped plot of land adjoining Greens Lane to the north and to the rear of properties on East Street, Fair Hill and Cherry Tree Way to the west.</p> <p>2.2 The site is surrounded by residential development to the west and north west, and is opposite Haslingden High School to the north. The golf course extends to the east and south, beyond which is Lower Cockham Farm.</p> <p>Local Facilities</p> <p>2.3 The site is located within easy walking distance (400m/ 5 minutes) of Helmshore village centre which has a small number of services and amenities including a Post Office, general store, barbers and pharmacy.</p> <p>2.4 The town of Haslingden is 2 km north of the site and Rawtenstall is 3.5km to the east. These towns include a wide variety of traditional town centre uses including supermarkets, national banks and building societies, dentists, high street chemists and a number of restaurants and bars.</p> <p>2.5 St. Veronica's RC Primary School is immediately adjoining the site at the north west boundary. Haslingden High School is immediately opposite the site on Greens Lane site.</p> <p>2.6 There are bus stops located on Broadway, a few minutes' walk from the site. Services run north to Haslingden, Accrington and Blackburn, and east to Rawtenstall. Longer distance services also run south to Bury and Manchester.</p> <p>2.7 The site is well connected to both the local and national highway, with the A56 less than 1km from the site which connects to the M66 (4.5km) and in turn the M62 and M60 19km).</p> <p>3. Planning Policy Context</p> <p>Consideration in SHLAA</p> <p>3.1 The Draft Local Plan evidence base includes the 2017 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which aims to identify the land supply for housing within the administrative boundary of Rossendale within the next 15 years (2017 – 2032).</p> <p>3.2 The Site was not promoted by the SHLAA, it is noted as a potential site that was excluded after Stage 1 (Site Ref 16286) for the reason 'The site is currently in use as a golf course. The landowner has not expressed an interest to develop the site for another use.'</p> <p>Rossendale Draft Local Plan</p> <p>3.3 As discussed earlier in the overarching representation, the Draft Local Plan (DLP) recognises that some release of Green Belt land will be required to meet the housing requirements and the NPPF requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites (DLP, page 12).</p> <p>3.4 The evidence presented in the DLP indicates that 4,425 dwellings will need to be delivered over the period to 2034. Considering the under provision of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
						<p>425 dwellings since the adoption of the Core Strategy and the potential land supply from non- Green Belt sources of 2,907 dwellings, there is a significant gap of approximately 1,518 dwellings.</p> <p>3.5 The Draft Local Plan proposes areas for release from Green Belt, allowing for a delivery of a further 715 dwellings. It is therefore evident that the Green Belt releases proposed by the DLP need to be more than doubled - to accommodate 1,518 dwellings - if the emerging Local Plan is to be found sound.</p> <p>3.6 The DLP does not propose to include the majority of this land within the Urban Boundary and the site would remain designated Green Belt. Policy SD2: Urban Boundaries directs all development within such boundaries 'except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area.'</p> <p>3.7 A small allocation has been identified in the DLP (HS2.79) which Peel are supportive of. However, as above, it is clear that there is a significant gap between the housing land supply identified in the DLP and the demand, which cannot be met by non-Green Belt sites alone. Peel therefore proposes that land at the golf course can make a greater contribution to meeting the housing needs of the borough.</p> <p>3.8 Peel proposes that including this site as a housing allocation and its release from Green Belt would be in keeping with the NPPF and would assist in achieving the shortfall of land within the Borough for the necessary housing development to meet demand.</p> <p>3.9 The following section considers the role of the land in terms of its contribution to Green Belt purposes in greater detail.</p> <p>4. Green Belt Appraisal</p> <p>4.1 The Site is currently designated as Green Belt. A Green Belt review³ (GBR) forms part of the evidence base for the DLP which has informed the plan's proposed retention of the Site as Green Belt.</p> <p>4.2 The strategic purpose of the area of Green Belt which the Site forms part, is to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall in the north from Edenfield to the south.</p> <p>4.3 The Site sits to the east of Helmshore village centre, and to the south east of Haslingden. It corresponds with the north western corner of GBR Parcel P27, see below.</p> <p>4.4 The GBR rates the contribution of the land parcel to the five Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>4.5 It is important to note at the outset that there are very clear and accepted exceptional circumstances which justify the release of significant amounts of land from the Green Belt to meet Rossendale's needs. All land within the current Green Belt, fulfils at least some aspects of Green Belt purposes. As such, it will not be possible to meet the identified needs of Rossendale</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
						<p>without some impact on the Green Belt and its purposes.</p> <p>4.6 It is also important to note when considering what land to release from the Green Belt to be clear that the “golden thread” which runs through plan making and decision taking is the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF confirms this at paragraph 84 when it states that “...when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development...”. In considering the release of land from Green Belt it is therefore essential to consider what releases of land will achieve sustainable development while minimising the impacts on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p> <p>4.7 The GBR finds that this GB purpose is not applicable to the golf course because it lies adjacent to Helmshore, which is not considered to be a large built up area assessed against purpose 1. Therefore, the parcel is not considered to contribute towards checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.</p> <p>4.8 Peel agrees with this assessment and would support an allocation of a proportion of the golf course, closest to the existing settlement, for housing development.</p> <p>Purpose 2 - To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>4.9 The GBR considers that this parcel plays a ‘moderate’ role in respect of this purpose, forming part of the gap between Helmshore and Rawtenstall but it notes that the parcel does not lie directly between them and is not of critical importance to their separation.</p> <p>4.10 Additionally, it is noted that the parcel lies directly between the settlements of Helmshore and Edenfield, and Helmshore and Stubbins which at this point are approximately 2.5km apart with limited intervisibility. The parcel forms a good proportion of the gap between these settlements, but it is not considered to be of critical importance to their separation. However, any new development and subsequent loss of openness within the parcel could lead to the perception of reducing the physical and visual gap between Helmshore and Rawtenstall, Helmshore and Edenfield, and Helmshore and Stubbins.</p> <p>4.11 The release of a small part of the golf course for housing development would not compromise the role of the GB parcel as a whole in providing this separation. It is feasible that new homes could be accommodated on the west side of the golf course, immediately adjacent to existing development, forming a logical extension to the village of Helmshore. The remainder of the golf course would remain, continuing to provide a physical and visual gap between Helmshore and towns to the east and south.</p> <p>Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>4.12 The GBR finds that there is a sense of encroachment within the parcel as a result of the visual influence of the Helmshore to the west. The parcel</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment
						<p>contains little built development apart from the Rossendale Golf Course Club House in the west and a small industrial unit in the south. However, the majority of the landcover to the north comprises the Rossendale Golf Course and lacks rural character. The south of the parcel contains undulating farmland which displays characteristics of the open countryside and is typically rural in character. Overall the role is considered 'moderate' in respect of this purpose.</p> <p>4.13 Peel agrees with this assessment, in that the golf course does not display the characteristics of open countryside and is not of rural character, and therefore has no role to play in achieving this purpose. The development of a small proportion of the golf course, adjoining the village, would have no consequence in respect of protecting open countryside.</p> <p>Purpose 4 - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p> <p>4.14 The parcel was found to have no role in this respect as, in practice; it has very limited intervisibility with Ramsbottom only. The openness of the land within the parcel is not considered to be important to its setting or historic significance. Therefore, any new development that took place within the parcel is considered unlikely to affect the setting or special character of any historic settlements.</p> <p>4.15 Peel agrees with and supports this assessment.</p> <p>Purpose 5 - Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p> <p>4.16 The GBR considers that all parcels make an equally significant contribution to this purpose.</p> <p>4.17 The DLP proposes to optimise the re-use of brownfield sites to meet development needs and in doing so support ongoing urban regeneration.</p> <p>4.18 As noted above, and in the overarching representation, the supply of deliverable brownfield land is insufficient to deliver the number and type of new homes and employment land required to meet the needs of the borough. As such, the extent of urban regeneration/ brown field development which can be achieved is not sufficient to meet Rossendale's sustainable growth needs and must be accompanied by development on Green Belt land. Exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt release have been proven through the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. The release of land from the Green Belt will not therefore undermine this purpose.</p> <p>Green Belt Appraisal Conclusion</p> <p>4.19 The GBR makes an assessment of the contribution that is made by a parcel of land golf course site together with agricultural land to the south east (Lower Cockham Farm). It is found that the parcel makes no contribution to the purposes of avoiding urban sprawl, nor preserving historic towns.</p> <p>4.20 Whilst there is a moderate role played in preventing towns from merging, Peel asserts that development of a small area of the golf course, adjacent to the village of Helmshore, would be sensitive to this role and would not</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.079	Further comment	
						<p>compromise the contribution of the larger parcel. Furthermore, the release of such an area would have no impact on the role of the wider parcel on protection of open countryside, as the golf course is not of rural character.</p> <p>4.21 It is considered that this Site is suitable for development and is in a highly sustainable location. Its release from the Green Belt will therefore contribute to a sustainable pattern of development which makes the most of proximity to nearby highway infrastructure. There are therefore clear exceptional circumstances to justify its release from the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.22 Peel strongly supports the allocation of this land and recommends the Council allocate it to ensure sufficient land is allocated to support the housing needs of the borough.</p> <p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>5.1 This representation provides an initial review of the development opportunity at Rossendale Golf Course, including details of the site and its location, consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA); and a Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review which forms part of the evidence base to the DLP. A Development Framework will be provided to RBC in due course, setting out a clear vision and proposals for the development of the site.</p> <p>5.2 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted for residential development.</p> <p>5.3 This site is a more recent development opportunity being promoted by Peel, and has hence not been considered in the SHLAA or DLP. The site could reasonably for a discreet extension to the village of Helmshore. The Development Framework to follow this representation will further illustrate the opportunity for development of this site and give comfort that it could reasonably be released for development.</p> <p>5.4 Peel supports the allocation of HS2.79, but considers that the site could make a greater contribution to meeting the housing needs of the borough. Peel welcomes further discussion on the land at Rossendale Golf Course as a housing allocation.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>			
Number of comments						37	HS2.079		
Reference		HS2.080		Land off Lea Bank					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.080	Further comment
690	William	Hutchinson	-	HS2.53, HS2.54, HS2.56, HS2.80, HS2.82, HS2.83, HS2.86	Not Applicable	The seven sites listed above are all within areas adjacent to Newchurch Road and the assumption can be reasonably made that future residents of the 228 units projected will use Newchurch Road as their principal access. This could account for in the region of an additional 450 vehicles regularly using what is already a very busy stretch of highway. Considerable numbers of pupils of nearby schools either walk or are brought in cars to the Newchurch Rd./Union St./Hurst Lane vicinity to make their way to these schools. The current volume of traffic makes it dangerous for these young people. Elderly residents find it increasingly difficult to cross Newchurch Rd. in this area because of the volume and speed of traffic. Whilst local residents in vehicles can experience danger and frequent difficulty when negotiating the roads and junctions for the same reasons. - In my opinion it should be a condition of any of the proposed development that 'traffic calming' measures must be implemented to protect the safety, convenience and general well-being of all who live in or pass through this location whether on foot, on cycles or in vehicles. To not do so will be doing all concerned a great disservice and will be a dereliction of the 'duty of care' which is incumbent on all who may be deliberating on these proposed developments. - In terms of such 'traffic calming': 'speed-bumps', lower speed limit, road narrowing with priority restrictions and advance warning signs would all be measures I would hope to see introduced.		No
1323	Rachael	Gildert	Valley Heritage		Object	This is a very tight site and I would suggest wholly unsuitable for development. - houses on this site would fully block light from the houses set below at Lea Bank and Lea Bank road itself is very busy. The turning circle at the end of the road is used for parking already meaning access would be made more difficult through development		With regards to Conservation Areas, it was a shame Waterfoot Centre was not put forward. The town is slowly starting to regenerate and additional protection could help to prevent unsuitable shop fronts, UPVC windows and other inappropriate development
Number of comments				HS2.080	2			
Reference		HS2.082		Land adjacent Dark Lane football ground				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.082	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	HS2.82,HS2.86,H S2.53,HS2.54,HS 2.58,HS2.54,HS2 .57,HS2.54, HS2.56,HS2.84 , Land at Marl Pits.	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.082	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.082	Further comment
						<p>recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.082	Further comment
						established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -		
690	William	Hutchinson	-	HS2.53, HS2.54, HS2.56, HS2.80, HS2.82, HS2.83, HS2.86	Not Applicable	The seven sites listed above are all within areas adjacent to Newchurch Road and the assumption can be reasonably made that future residents of the 228 units projected will use Newchurch Road as their principal access. This could account for in the region of an additional 450 vehicles regularly using what is already a very busy stretch of highway. Considerable numbers of pupils of nearby schools either walk or are brought in cars to the Newchurch Rd./Union St./Hurst Lane vicinity to make their way to these schools. The current volume of traffic makes it dangerous for these young people. Elderly residents find it increasingly difficult to cross Newchurch Rd. in this area because of the volume and speed of traffic. Whilst local residents in vehicles can experience danger and frequent difficulty when negotiating the roads and junctions for the same reasons. - In my opinion it should be a condition of any of the proposed development that 'traffic calming' measures must be implemented to protect the safety, convenience and general well-being of all who live in or pass through this location whether on foot, on cycles or in vehicles. To not do so will be doing all concerned a great disservice and will be a dereliction of the 'duty of care' which is incumbent on all who may be deliberating on these proposed developments. - In terms of such 'traffic calming': 'speed-bumps', lower speed limit, road narrowing with priority restrictions and advance warning signs would all be measures I would hope to see introduced.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.082	Further comment
779	Alison	Squire	-		Object	<p>I wish to object to the above proposed sites for housing which are close to Newchurch Road on the grounds that: - i) increased traffic will be unacceptable on this main road through Rossendale - ii) erosion of greenfield sites instead of using brownfield sites in the Valley - iii) increased demand on already overloaded education and health services. - - As a resident of Waingate Village, I have objected several times to planning applications on a plot of land off Hurst Lane (Ref: 2015/0308) and am extremely displeased that this land has received planning approval despite it continuing to be beyond the Urban Boundary. There were no opportunities for local residents to raise further objections and no communications following approval having been given. I do not feel that the Council supported local residents and instead allowed developers greater importance. I am therefore worried that despite this opportunity to comment on the Local Plan, residents' opinions will not be taken into consideration. - - It appears that the Urban Boundary may be moved to Balladen Clough (a stream) to include a field behind Marl Pits road. An earlier application to build on this land was refused on the grounds of lack of road access. I hope that any future planning applications on this land will continue to be refused and the original Urban Boundary will remain in place. Any development on this land would further increase traffic onto Newchurch Road. - - Having witnessed the gridlock in Bank Street and Angouleme Way on Saturday I do wonder where the increased traffic from all the proposed new housing will go. I appreciate that it is National Government Policy to increase housing and that sites have to be found in the Valley but hope that more brownfield sites can be found, consideration of health and education demands and transport/traffic difficulties will be addressed before adopting the new Local Plan.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.082	Further comment
1303	JULIA	BARROW	-		Object	TRAFFIC IS APALLING IN NEWCHURCH ALREADY. I'VE LIVED HERE 34 YEARS AND FROM BEING A LOVELY VILLAGE IT HAS DEGENERATED INTO A RACE TRACK. HAS ANYONE ACTUALLY BEEN TO SEE THE DOUBLE PARKING ON STAGHILLS ROAD AND TOPBARN LANE EVERY NIGHT CURRENTLY? IF THEY HAVE, HOW ON EARTH CAN THEY EVEN THINK THIS IS A GOOD PLACE TO PLONK 105 NEW HOUSES - MOST OF WHICH WILL BE 3/4 BED HOUSES = 2/3 CARS PER HOUSE? HOW ARE THEY GOING TO GET OUT SAFELY IN A MORNING IN THE RUSH HOUR? THE LOCAL SCHOOL CREATES LOTS OF TRAFFIC IN A MORNING AND AT SCHOOL CLOSING TIME TOO. BUSES STRUGGLE UP STAGHILLS ROAD OUTSIDE THE CHURCH WHERE IT GOES TO SINGLE FILE - TRY GETTING THROUGH WHEN THERE'S A FUNERAL ON..! FOR GOODNESS' SAKE - THERE ARE PLENTY MORE BROWNFIELD SITES MORE SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT...!		I AM VERY AWARE THAT IN ALL THE PROPOSED PLANS NOWHERE HAS THERE BEEN ANY MENTION OF NEW/IMPROVED ROADS/INFRASTRUCTURE? I REMEMEBER THE EDENFIELD BY-PASS BEING OPENED IN 1968 - TO CARRY TRAFFIC AWAY FROM EDENFIELD VILLAGE. IT WAS BRILLIANT, LIVING IN THE VILLAGE BECAME A JOY ONCE AGAIN! THE SAME SMALL BY-PASS NOW HAS ALL THE TRAFFIC FROM BURNLEY/BLACKBURN/HASLINGDEN/ HELMSHORE/CRAWSHAWBOOTH/RA WTENSTALL EMPTYING INTO IT ON A DAILY BASIS. GRANE ROAD NOW HAS AVERAGE SPEED CAMERAS INSTALLED - AN INDICATION AS TO HOW MUCH TRAFFIC THE ROAD NOW CARRIES. - ON ANOTHER NOTE, WE HAVE NO FREE DOCTORS OR DENTISTS, NO POLICE STATION, SCHOOLS ARE FULL AND WE NOW HAVE TO TRAVEL TO BLACKBURN TO GO TO HOSPITAL! AND YOU ARE PROPOSING TO PUT 4/5000 NEW HOUSES UP? WE HAVE NO PUBLIC SERVICES!! THE REFUSE SERVICES ARE STRUGGLING TO COPE WITH WHAT WE HAVE NOW. OUR ROADS ARE APPALING. - IT REALLY DOES SCARE ME! - I THINK WE HAVE MORE BROWNFIELD AREAS WHICH SHOULD BE EXPLORED BEFORE WE LOSE A LOT OF OUR GREEN SPACES, AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE AN ASSESSMENT OF EMPTY PROPERTIES AVAILABLE IN THE VALLEY WHICH COULD GO TOWARDS THE 4/5000 PROPERTIES NEEDED?

Number of comments HS2.082

4

Reference HS2.083

Hareholme

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.083	Further comment
690	William	Hutchinson	-	HS2.53, HS2.54, HS2.56, HS2.80, HS2.82, HS2.83, HS2.86	Not Applicable	The seven sites listed above are all within areas adjacent to Newchurch Road and the assumption can be reasonably made that future residents of the 228 units projected will use Newchurch Road as their principal access. This could account for in the region of an additional 450 vehicles regularly using what is already a very busy stretch of highway. Considerable numbers of pupils of nearby schools either walk or are brought in cars to the Newchurch Rd./Union St./Hurst Lane vicinity to make their way to these schools. The current volume of traffic makes it dangerous for these young people. Elderly residents find it increasingly difficult to cross Newchurch Rd. in this area because of the volume and speed of traffic. Whilst local residents in vehicles can experience danger and frequent difficulty when negotiating the roads and junctions for the same reasons. - In my opinion it should be a condition of any of the proposed development that 'traffic calming' measures must be implemented to protect the safety, convenience and general well-being of all who live in or pass through this location whether on foot, on cycles or in vehicles. To not do so will be doing all concerned a great disservice and will be a dereliction of the 'duty of care' which is incumbent on all who may be deliberating on these proposed developments. - In terms of such 'traffic calming': 'speed-bumps', lower speed limit, road narrowing with priority restrictions and advance warning signs would all be measures I would hope to see introduced.		No

Number of comments HS2.083

1

Reference HS2.084 Land behind Myrtle Grove Mill

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.084	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	HS2.82,HS2.86,H S2.53,HS2.54,HS 2.58,HS2.54,HS2 .57,HS2.54, HS2.56,HS2.84 , Land at Marl Pits.	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.084	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.084	Further comment
						<p>recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.084	Further comment
						established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -		
1537	John	McGuinness	-		Object	I object to this site allocation for the following reasons: - - Loss of greenbelt land - This is only the first stage in a gradual loss of land as more houses will be built further up the hill - Issues with flooding - Increased traffic on Bacup Rd espec		You seem to be trying to implement a plan where nearly all patches of green within the urban boundary are built on. The hillsides may be green (for now) but all small breathing spaces seem to be a target for building on. Sustainable; how can building more houses on any green area be sustainable? Once land is lost to development, it's lost forever.
Number of comments						HS2.084	2	
Reference						HS2.085	Land off Peel Street	
1537	John	McGuinness	-		Object	This looks like a plan to "shoehorn" as many houses as possible on to any available land that seems fit for some sort of building - This is another loss of green area, albeit small in this particular case.		You seem to be trying to implement a plan where nearly all patches of green within the urban boundary are built on. The hillsides may be green (for now) but all small breathing spaces seem to be a target for building on. Sustainable; how can building more houses on any green area be sustainable? Once land is lost to development, it's lost forever.
Number of comments						HS2.085	1	
Reference						HS2.086	Land by St Peter's School	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.086	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	HS2.82,HS2.86,H S2.53,HS2.54,HS 2.58,HS2.54,HS2 .57,HS2.54, HS2.56,HS2.84 , Land at Marl Pits.	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.086	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.086	Further comment
						<p>recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.086	Further comment
						established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -		
690	William	Hutchinson	-	HS2.53, HS2.54, HS2.56, HS2.80, HS2.82, HS2.83, HS2.86	Not Applicable	The seven sites listed above are all within areas adjacent to Newchurch Road and the assumption can be reasonably made that future residents of the 228 units projected will use Newchurch Road as their principal access. This could account for in the region of an additional 450 vehicles regularly using what is already a very busy stretch of highway. Considerable numbers of pupils of nearby schools either walk or are brought in cars to the Newchurch Rd./Union St./Hurst Lane vicinity to make their way to these schools. The current volume of traffic makes it dangerous for these young people. Elderly residents find it increasingly difficult to cross Newchurch Rd. in this area because of the volume and speed of traffic. Whilst local residents in vehicles can experience danger and frequent difficulty when negotiating the roads and junctions for the same reasons. - In my opinion it should be a condition of any of the proposed development that 'traffic calming' measures must be implemented to protect the safety, convenience and general well-being of all who live in or pass through this location whether on foot, on cycles or in vehicles. To not do so will be doing all concerned a great disservice and will be a dereliction of the 'duty of care' which is incumbent on all who may be deliberating on these proposed developments. - In terms of such 'traffic calming': 'speed-bumps', lower speed limit, road narrowing with priority restrictions and advance warning signs would all be measures I would hope to see introduced.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.086	Further comment
779	Alison	Squire	-		Object	<p>I wish to object to the above proposed sites for housing which are close to Newchurch Road on the grounds that: - i) increased traffic will be unacceptable on this main road through Rossendale - ii) erosion of greenfield sites instead of using brownfield sites in the Valley - iii) increased demand on already overloaded education and health services. - - As a resident of Waingate Village, I have objected several times to planning applications on a plot of land off Hurst Lane (Ref: 2015/0308) and am extremely displeased that this land has received planning approval despite it continuing to be beyond the Urban Boundary. There were no opportunities for local residents to raise further objections and no communications following approval having been given. I do not feel that the Council supported local residents and instead allowed developers greater importance. I am therefore worried that despite this opportunity to comment on the Local Plan, residents' opinions will not be taken into consideration. - - It appears that the Urban Boundary may be moved to Balladen Clough (a stream) to include a field behind Marl Pits road. An earlier application to build on this land was refused on the grounds of lack of road access. I hope that any future planning applications on this land will continue to be refused and the original Urban Boundary will remain in place. Any development on this land would further increase traffic onto Newchurch Road. - - Having witnessed the gridlock in Bank Street and Angouleme Way on Saturday I do wonder where the increased traffic from all the proposed new housing will go. I appreciate that it is National Government Policy to increase housing and that sites have to be found in the Valley but hope that more brownfield sites can be found, consideration of health and education demands and transport/traffic difficulties will be addressed before adopting the new Local Plan.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.086	Further comment
1140	Cherry	Hughes	-		Object	<p>I have recently viewed the plans outlining proposals for housing (related to the Local Policy) in the Newchurch/Hareholme ward area and wish the following comments to be noted: - - * there is a proposed development of 7 - 9 houses at the top of St Peter's Road beyond St Peter's RC Primary School. A major concern is congestion particularly around school opening and closing times. The road becomes very congested as many children are dropped off/picked up by car (giiven the School's faith status and the catchment area). Frequently our driveway is blocked during the most congested periods as there is nowhere in the near vicinity for parents to park and walk their children the last few metres to the School Gate. Increased traffic past the School Gate will create a greater hazard. - - * the proposed site is part way down Seat Naze slope. There is already significant run off which impacts on the houses at the top of St Peter's Road and Heightside Avenue. There is also evidence of springs, one of which which percolates through the road that leads to the houses immediately above Newchurch Road. United Utililites has been called to this particular spot on numerous occassions and identified that it isn't a leak from a pipe. I am also aware of the proposed far more significant developments above Johnny Barn and below Marl Pits on land which has always been very wet (even in dry summers). How can developers guarantee good drainage both for the developments and for the existing developed areas downslope from them? How will that impact on the Irwell at the bottom of the Valley and the flooding dangers? - - * Finally I am really concerned that the area does not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional housing stock. Roads are already heavily congested at commuter times. The local primary schools have very limited capacity to take more students but there appears to be no planning for a new primary school. There is a 'play area' on Stacksteads, which I believe the Newchurch Village Association is planning to raise money to renovate, and this is the only one in the immediate area. The area is already due to have a significant development on what was the Rossendale Football Club Ground (up to 100 houses I believe) - and no mention has been made of infrastructure improvements for this development. - - * I live on a road where over the past 5 years, 3 properties were for sale and 2 of these were for sale for at least 4 years before they sold. The difficulty with sales does appear to have alleviated but there are always houses for sale in our immediate neighbourhood - so can we argue that there is a housing crisis in Rossendale (or at least in this part of Rossendale)?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.086	Further comment
1308	Emer	Killeen	-		Object	Access onto Ste Peter's Road and the roads off this is already very busy throughout the day. This is mainly due to existing school traffic and building additional houses will increase the already high risk of collision to pedestrians (including children) and car users alike. In addition, trying to turn right onto Newchurch Road from St Peter's Rd is already difficult at peak times and any additional vehicles, even from just 9 houses, will cause risks to pedestrians and car users alike. - - The green space around the existing houses is also precious and any additional properties will spoil the views up toward Seat Naze.		-
1323	Rachael	Gildert	Valley Heritage		Object	I feel this site has been put forward as a method to tidy up a scruffy site that is currently used for caravans and general 'waste'. It is bordered on 2 sites by a right of way and houses here would impede the views across the valley - St Peters is a busy school and access along St Peters Road and Newchurch Road at school times is really busy and already hectic for the existing residents. Adding 9 more houses to this site (and I imagine these would be 3-4 bed houses, each with around 3 cars) would significantly add to this trouble. St Peters Road is already often double parked too.		With regards to Conservation Areas, it was a shame Waterfoot Centre was not put forward. The town is slowly starting to regenerate and additional protection could help to prevent unsuitable shop fronts, UPVC windows and other inappropriate development
1619	Michael	Onley	Planning Sense NW		Object	(...)Clients fear cherry-picking of the most desirable sites. This is reflected in the abandonment of density target of 50+ dwellings per hectare appropriate to urban renewal [Rossendale Core Strategy policy 2, RBC 2011] in favour of a suburban 30+ figure [Rossendale Draft Local Plan policy HS5, RBC 2017]. Clients oppose planning blight upon precious greenfield sites such as achingly lovely meadows east of Johnny Barn (variously identified as HS2.53 and duplicated as HS2.54), and cinematic quality, rail-side pasture at Haslam Farm (HS2.60). Access and road safety concerns have been raised in respect of allocation HS2.86 (St Peter's School) - photos attached. (...)•Draft policy HS2 and specifically the proposed allocations of sites HS2.54/54 (east of Johnny Barn, north of Newchurch Road) HS2.86 (St Peter's School) and HS2.60 (Haslam Farm) in respect of unnecessary greenfield allocations(...)		
Number of comments					HS2.086	7		
Reference		HS2.091	Park Road Garage Site					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.091	Further comment
1246	Colin	Brennan	-		Object	Reasons for objection - 1) Flood Risk, the whole area below the designated building proposal is already a major flood risk, this occurs due to the stream and the culvert running down from Fearn Moss, which is itself a flood plain causes a serious overflow which causes the houses known locally as "the red brick row" to be flooded by raw sewage in times of heavy rainfall and snow melt. This will be exacerbated by covering the existing natural soak away with houses and drives. During the flooding many years ago where the underpinning of the bungalow at 22 Park Road was washed away, the contractors repairing the damaged road informed the local people that the Culvert under Park Road was the maximum it could ever be. - 2) The present car parking situation on Park road is already at full capacity especially at peak times since the school on Wolfenden Green was built. Just removing the garage colony would require at least having to find roadside parking for at least 20+ assorted vehicles, building 11 new properties with each having an allocated 1 parking space when in reality it should at least be 2/3.the threat of this development going ahead is deterring people from applying for permission to have a garage on the site, so consequently adding to the street parking which currently blights us all. - Park Road from the junction with Booth Road to the entrance to the Park has 32 houses which because of the era they were built have no facility and never could have to park cars, surely taking away the facility of the garage site and additional use of land for off road parking makes a mockery of new housing planning regulations which requires the provision of parking - 3) The upper part of the site is also currently used has a play area for young children who are too young to be allowed to cross the very busy Park Road to play in the park -		I would need an explanation at a later date if this was to go ahead and so would others as to why the planning officer only one week before the 2019/2034 future plan was announced gave me permission to build a double garage on the site which because I have built to all the latest building regs has cost me £9000, surely given the time scale and the obvious size of the plan it would have been prudent if not ethical to have pointed the proposals out prior to planning consent.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.091	Further comment
1562	Simon	Stanworth			Object	<p>I would like to object strongly to the proposed housing development of hs2.91, waterfoot garage site objection reasons as follows.</p> <p>1/Risk of flooding from the culvert running under the middle of the site from fearns moss.</p> <p>2/Inadequate sewer drainage for development which has backed up several times and flooded houses on park road.</p> <p>3/Parking congestion.</p> <p>4/nature conservation Open green space for wildlife loss of trees.</p> <p>5/Garage colony .</p> <p>6/existing play area .</p> <p>7/Loss of light and overshadowing loss of privacy</p> <p>8/visual amenity</p> <p>1/Risk of flooding from the culvert running under the middle of the site from fearns moss which has overflowed several times the culvert which is of flag construction has caused subsidence in the imediate area and has been repaired in the past</p> <p>2/ The houses on park road are already on the national flood register from past flooding events from 2005 onwards one as recent as august 2017 please see dvd due to the backing up of the sewer system whi ch is already compromised from the intrusion of flood water from the belvadere close area of which united utilities have substantially investigated this issue . Inadequate road surface drainage from low view area and edgeside park which leads to the flooding of park road several times</p> <p>3/ Parking congestion along park road has increased due to the new infants school entrance at wolfenden close and parental parking all along park road at school times the housing development will only exasperate the problem with no consideration for emergency services acessss.</p> <p>4/ The rear of 53 park road has a sustantial amont of trees/woodland with bird boxes planted by residents some 38 years ago comprising of birch sycamore and elderflower resident to a number of wild bird including blackbirds,thushes,chaffinch ,bluetit etc also english bluebells protected in 1998 underschedule 8 of the act and other wild flowers in this wooded area.</p> <p>5/ The garrage colony reduses the parking congestion on park road i am sure other residents in the area would use this but are discouraged by an increasing liability for removal at 3 months notice and with such building development proposals as in 2885 detures the building of a 3888 pound structure</p> <p>6/ This area is also an existing play area for the children of park road and surrounding area in plain veiw of parents as a safe area under supervision</p> <p>7/ The proposed development will block light and cause overshadowing at the rear also noise and loss of privacy would have a detrimental affect on my</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.091	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

property
8/ The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners please take into account these reasons for my objection.

Please see appendix for photos

Number of comments HS2.091

2

Reference HS2.097 Isle of Man Mill and Garage

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.097	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED		Support	<p>WE SUPPORT THE PROPOSED MIXED USE ALLOCATION FOR THIS SITE. PLEASE SEE REPRESENTATION LETTER FOR MORE DETAILS.</p> <p>Email received 10/11/2017: SUBMISSION TO THE ROSSENDALE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 18) CONSULTATION ISLE OF MAN MILL, WATER</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. This consultation is the first public consultation stage in the production of the Local Plan (Regulation 18) and includes the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement) and its accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Hourigan Connolly is instructed by B and E Boys Limited to submit and provide comment on the above site in support of its future development for mixed uses. We have previously submitted representations in response to consultation relating to the Local Plan Part 2 in 2015 and subsequently the 'Call for Sites' exercise relating to the preparation of the new Local Plan in 2016.</p> <p>Along with this letter, we have also submitted an electronic consultation form via the Council's website and this letter should be read in conjunction with the submitted form. A site plan is also enclosed for information.</p> <p>Submissions</p> <p>We note that within the draft Local Plan, Isle of Man Mill in Water has a proposed allocation for mixed uses under draft policy references HS2.97 and EMP2.52. Our client supports the proposed allocation of this site for mixed uses – the mill building is currently in employment use and is suitable to be retained as such whereas the greenfield land adjacent to the mill building is more suitable for residential development. The location of the site is such that it lends itself to a mix of uses to ensure that the vitality of the area is maintained.</p> <p>We reserve the right to provide further supporting statements and evidence during the preparation of the Plan process and ask that we continue to be informed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		

Number of comments HS2.097

1

Reference HS2.100 Land opposite Baptist Church

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.100	Further comment
625	John	Kardasz	N/A		Support	I fully support the proposal to utilise the land at HS2.100 for housing development. - The proposal offers an opportunity to expand housing and residential provision for the local community especially at a time when society is facing the social economic demands of an increasing ageing population and national housing stock shortages. The land HS2.100 provides potential opportunities for further residential expansion that would address the future modern housing needs of the area.		I believe that the approval of the proposals within the Rossendale Local Plan (Summer 2017) which proposes the development of land (HS2.100) which serves to increase the much needed housing stock in the Lumb area. The proposals will also benefit all Lumb, Rossendale residents as it will enable local growing families to remain in their local residential areas thus strengthening inter- generational communities therefore preserving local identity and community cultures.

Number of comments HS2.100

1

Reference HS2.102 Barlow Bottoms and land north of King Street

5	Kimberley	Ashworth	-		Object	I am writing to object against the proposed local plan for Whitworth. - - I am unable to attend the meeting tomorrow night due to illness but I have looked at the proposal as stated below: - - http://www.rossendale.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/3700/whitworth_map_with_street_names - - I'm disappointed to see that a number of green spaces are being considered to build houses on. The green spaces behind Tonacliffe School are used by many for walking. To build on this space would be detrimental to the green space due to wildlife and other conversation in that area. - Building houses would also see an increase in traffic which is at demand during peak times at the moment. - - Other green spaces on the plans are also being considered. In a village that is at full capacity I am unsure why Rossendale Council see the need to build in places that already has adequate housing. - - There are no plans to look at new recreational and family facilities which the town needs. The closure of the children's centre means that new parents and young families have nowhere to go. The plans don't take any such new facility into consideration and I urge Rossendale Council to look at this. - - I know I speak on behalf of many in the Town when I say the option for Whitworth is option 1 'Do nothing' - - Kind regards -		I am extremely disappointed that a meeting has been arranged in Whitworth for tomorrow evening when all the other consultation meetings are taking place in September
---	-----------	----------	---	--	--------	--	--	---

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
11	Alan	Pilling	-		Object	<p>I disagree totally with these plans of housing to be built at the back of king street in whitworth. I purchased my property here as I had started a young family I wanted my children to grow up in a safe street and environment over looked by trees and wildlife as there are not many places or streets that still remain with these benefits. Also the area that is proposed for building is a excellent link road to connect the main road to the moorland for many cyclist , a sport I am very passionate about and intend my family to also take part in as a healthy way of life. From looking at the plans this "cycle track" will become a street or main road linking to market street unless I am mistaken? Also this proposed area is also a Greenland for deer and many other wildlife that is often sighted down there. These comments above may seem trivial but these are what make growing up enjoying not living within a building site or city environment that's why we chose to live in a village not a town or city. Not to mention the infrastructure within the village, it is already a problem to see GP's for emergencies due to increased population, my children are not yet at school but I am already worried about them getting a position at local school of my choice due to overcrowding. Traffic is already at rush hour times surely more cars on the single road in and out of the village is going too cause many more problems. Many thanks hope my views are considered . Alan Pilling.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
27	Michael	Chianca	-		Object	<p>HS2.102 - King Street - HS2.104 - Old Lane - HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens - HS2.105 - Albert Street - HS2.107 Fern Isle Close - HS2.106 Moorland Cres - HS2.109 Horsefield Av - - All these proposed sited are unsuitable for the following reasons. 1. Wildlife - This greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest area at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest itself would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action when we have other areas within Whitworth to build on that would not require the destruction of trees. 3. The local school at both dropping of and collection time around this area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists, Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative affect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. 9. Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" can you explain what those exceptional circumstances are when we have other areas more suitable for building houses on. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental affect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others would be overlooked. 14. As the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including school children. 16. This area and the surrounding area has already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost.</p>	-	
42	Jennifer	Earnshaw	-		Not Applicable	I would like to know what is happening on King Street whitworth and how it will affect my daughter who lives on King street		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
56	Valerie	McDonald	-		Object	<p>Whilst I recognise the need for further housing within the area, I am concerned about the siting of so many proposed dwellings in this particular valley. The roads are already clogged at rush hour and as there is only one road through, movement of traffic, should there be an accident or roadworks, becomes frustratingly unpredictable. What provision is there to maintain and develop the road system in the valley? - - Whitworth High School has become more popular over the past couple of years with waiting lists existing. What provision will be made to expand the school, and will this be done with a long term objective in mind and not just a sticking plaster effort to put up some portable classrooms? - - Local services such as the Children's Centre have just been lost. What plans may be afoot to reinstate such necessary provision? I feel it is morally wrong to simply build new houses and forget about the infrastructure to support this development. - - There is a wealth of wildlife on the moors where you are proposing to site many homes. Presumably there will be checks in place to ensure some of these species are not endangered? - - Finally, there are already plenty of properties on the market at very affordable prices (in comparison with some surrounding areas). Some of these have been on the market a while? Why, if there is already affordable housing, is there a need to build more? -</p>		
98	Jacqueline	Butterworth	-		Object	<p>I am objecting to proposed development of all the above houses around the Whitworth area. The area is overrun with traffic as it is. One way in and one way out. The schools are overloaded as are the GP surgery. It is inconceivable to build more houses and allowing more traffic to use our roads which are in a terrible state. We are already experiencing burst water pipes and our water pressure has already been reduced. We are experiencing more power cuts since all the new houses have been built on Cowm Park Way. Surely there must be someone in the planning department with some common sense and will prevent any further building of houses in Whitworth</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
131	Christine	Greenwood	-		Object	I am objecting to plans to allow the building of over £350 properties on various sites around Whitiworth and Shawforth over the next 15 years. - Not only am I concerned about the building on our greenbelt sites which is part of the attraction of the area. I can understand the wind farm and can support renewable energy sources but not the creation of a collection of housing estates - whether social/affordable or not . The awful collection in Britannia speaks for itself! We have already had several builds across Rossendale but the extra Council Tax revenue does not seem to have brought many benefits to the borough. - As it stands at present the infrastructure can just about support the current residents - schools are already over subscribed and getting an appointment at our one GP surgery is already a mammoth undertaking. Planning to build or reopen a school by any chance? - Traffic is already an issue with one road in and out and a bus service that has to be one of the most unreliable in the surrounding areas ! There are next to no facilities for young people/children and a library fighting to survive so I think that this needs to be given serious consideration before you go ahead.		-
153	G.N	Royds			Not Applicable	As I have indicated before, a prerequisite for a community is sustainable employment. A complete hash has been made by not providing this. Former mill sites have been used for housing, such as Orama Mill, Facit Mill, Albert Mill and the mill near Spodden Fold (which I think may have been called Old Kays). Most of these are easily accessible. Now Spring Mill is proposed for similar treatment! On the other hand, peripheral businesses have been allowed, e.g. tattoo parlours and tanning centres, which debase the human body; the type of potentially smelly fast food outlets that encourage unhealthy eating. Housing without local employment means commuting, causing traffic congestion and pollution. The kind of industry needed is that involved in green energy, recycling, sensible clothing and the production of healthy food. The former site of Spring Mill is a place where a sensitively designed industrial estate might be possible. It is already surrounded by trees and has foundations remaining but it is not on a regular public transport route and is less accessible than previously mentioned sites that have been precluded. It is absurd to think of building on HS2.102/103/106/109 and on that part of HS2.107 not formerly occupied by Spring Mill. These are large areas of countryside enjoyed at present as part of the natural environment. HS2.104 also appears to be countryside, with a few established houses, and also should be protected from further building. Cowm Water Treatment Works (HS2.108) is ideal for industrial development. Let us have local jobs and ensure adequate facilities are available before any more houses are built in Whitworth.		P.S. I did not make this response online because it was mandatory to provide an e-mail address. Please change this, so that more people are encouraged to respond. P.P.S. Please keep me informed of developments.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
155	Jo	Furtado			Object	HS2.102 - appears to straddle Barlow Bottoms and a small area of land north of King Street. Methane? Green Belt? Will any development involve some sort of land-swap to join the two sections of the cycleway? And is that land not reserved in some way against the need to have a second route into Facit Quarries? Personally I'd rather have extra houses than landfill, but... Oppose		
195	Janet	King	-	HS.102, HS2.104-9 inclusive	Object	Whitworth' infrastructure cannot support almost 400 new properties - it is already nigh impossible to obtain a doctors appointment and my father has had to wait iver 6 months to obtain a podiatry appointment as there is only one who has been on long term sick and no replacement cover available. The fact that there is only one main arterial road into and out of Whitworth, which already has weekly road works delaying the already totally congested road does not bear thinking about. With an extra 400 properties and the increase in traffic that these will bring and as there is no large employer in the area most of these occupants will be commuting one way or another. We lost access to an A&E in Rochdale and now the nearest is either Fairfield or Oldham with the additional traffic these proposals would create the congested roads Could be catastrophic in an emergency. - - On a personal note, my family moved to Whitworth 12 years ago, from Oldham, due to its naturally beautiful countryside and I see the addition of these properties into areas of greenery (extending Wallbank estate etc.,) is the very short end of the stick. I can see that if these are accepted, encroaching on to green belt areas, slowly but surely the green belt areas will get smaller and smaller until eventually Whitworth just becomes another concrete plot with ever creaking infrastructure. - - Finally, I understand the need for affordable housing but there are plenty of mills/brown field that could be developed. However, I feel strongly that before any proposals are accepted it is of the utmost importance that the infrastructure is in place to support them, that includes roads, schools and NHS access.	-	
258	Fiona	Harrisson			Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village oversubscribed schools and GP Services with one road in and one road out. The pressure on the infrastructure would be immense, plus travelling to or from anywhere especially at peak times is already horrendous, nevermind with another approx 400 houses being built. Our skyline and beautiful views and countryside are also going to be lost.	-	
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	This is an unbelievable plan that will stretch amenities in the area even further. - - The new estate near Cowm has already increased traffic congestion on the one road in and out of the village and schools are already struggling to cope. - - There is also the issue of wildlife and the impact it will have on their environment. - - I for one will be leaving if this idiotic plan goes through. -		This smells of greed over common sense

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
268	Michaela	Radford	-		Object	Whitworth has had numerous instances recently regarding the roadworks for the infrastructure repair and maintenance. As an employee of all 4 major utility asset owners in the area, I am very concerned regarding the houses proposed. We only have one road throughout the valley and this is impacted severly when roadworks are planned. My concerns are that these are not managed correctly by LCC at present, therefore; more houses and more infrastructure would have a massive impact on the people living in the village. People face unemployment now due to the frequent issues we face getting into work. - Not to mention over crowded schools and doctors as we stand at present. - - I request, here in writing, to be informed of any planned meetings regarding the houses in whitworth and notification be sent in writing to my address above.		
286	Christina	Pieper	-	- King Street	Object	39% increase in crime in Whitworth not enough policing to cover already new built houses in Whitworth which more or less proves the more houses the more crime. - Doctors surgery already full and Bacup and Healey not taking more patients. We already have difficulty getting appointments without any more overcrowding. Also schools are already full. - The one road into Rochdale already impossible to reach work and appointments on time in the mornings as Whitworth Road is gridlocked and not suitable for any more traffic. - Water pressure is very low on King Street more houses in the area will take the pressure far too low. - Wildlife would disappear with houses built on Barlow Bottom, deer can regularly be seen around Barlow Bottom. - Facit was a pretty part of Whitworth already spoilt with the front of the new houses all with unkempt gardens. - King Street ia a cul-de-sac with a public footpath at the top end. Foot traffic has increased with the already new built houses mainly with dog walkers. King Street would be the main walkway for pedestrians to houses built above it. We all purchased our houses on a quite cul-de-sac under the Human Rights Act Additionally, Article 8 "a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life" this is what we purchased our houses for. Obviously building of houses above King Street takes away our privacy. - Furthermore King Street sits low down and we have very wet gardens and would be in danger of flooding with houses build immediately above it.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
297	Lindsay	Fairhurst			Object	<p>Poor access along the length of Main Rd (Market Street) one narrow road lined with parked cars , as only access into & out of whitworth. No alternative route.</p> <p>No trains or trams. Buses won't must travel on same one access road both in and out as cars.</p> <p>No motorway access under 20 min journey both ways</p> <p>insufficient work in area means people must travel to Manchester, leeds, bury, Rochdale etc.</p> <p>Current public transport unrealistic.</p> <p>Traffic at peak times currently gridlocked & congested.</p> <p>Increased housing will add to this burden.</p> <p>Utilities infrastructure unable to cope currently leading to repeated remedial roadworks.</p> <p>Schools full</p> <p>Doctors full</p> <p>Rossendale Council Lancashire Council needs to address transport & roadways access + education access beofer building homkes where people will be unable to travel to employment and school</p>		
298	Andrew	Fairhurst			Object	<p>the number of houses proposed in this local plan for infrastructure can support. Whitworth has only one road in abd out and already this is constantly being dug up by utility companies often resulting in temporary traffic lights that cause massives queues of traffic in rush hours. Not only is the road narrow and conjested but there is no alternative train service - only the bus (on the same road) This is totall useless for the number of people wo commute to Manchester, Oldham and Bury every working day. Our schools, doctors and dentists are already close to capacity. There are very few options to travel to other facilities apart from along the one road through the valley.</p>		<p>Without robust and achievable plans to increase the support infrastructure for travel (a train for example) and health and education and culture this building should not go ahead. For people to afford these houses they need jobs first. Currently you need to move out of the valley to commute to work. Regeneration of the area and existing housing stock should come first.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
446	Paula	Todd	-		Object	Whitworth is a small community with only one main road to access it. I feel that if all these purposed houses are built the traffic congestion for commuting will be very difficult for the local residents. Other than the bus service residents have no alternative to drive to and from work. - - My children go to local Tonnacliffe school and the traffic and parking is extremely heavy and if more houses are built in that area the roads would not be able to cope. - - Flooding is a massive problem at present in Whitworth, united utilities are constantly out trying to fix problems, having more houses I believe would make the flooding worse. - - Whitworth is also known for its beauty, walks and wildlife and to purpose building on the greenbelt areas of Whitworth would cause a detrimental effect on this. - - Whitworth does not have access to a local A&E dept, Rochdale hospital only has a urgent care centre as does Burnley. Residents of Whitworth closes A&E is either Oldham or Blackburn. Having more residents in Whitworth with limited healthcare facility's could increase morbidity rate. Along side no local A&E we only have one GP practice in the area, having more residence would cause strain on their service, this also includes only one dental practice. - - Will there be enough places in the schools for all the new children to the area? The local high school is only small and as I believe was over subscribed this school year. - -		
590		Ashworth			Object	Absolutely ridiculous One way in and out of whitworth no extra schools or doctors when you have two or three cars per household. This is ruining our villages. We strongly object to this. Listen to the people who vote you in, as we have long memories		
743			Whitworth Town Council		Object	At a meeting of Whitworth Town Council last night (Thursday 28 September 2017), it was resolved that I should contact you with the comments of the Town Council to feed into the current Local Plan consultation: HS2.102 Barlow Bottoms, HS2.102 Land North of King Street and HS2.103 Land Behind Buxton Street Council have concerns that this area is on a flood plain and part of this site is already allocated to a specialist care unit. This is currently the largest undeveloped site locally and if more homes are to be built in Whitworth in the future then the deficiency in social facilities would need to be addressed and this site would be the most appropriate for a school or health centre.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
773	Susan	Worrall	-		Object	Whitworth is a village, a small community. Building these housing developments will change Whitworth into a town. - There is not the infrastructure to support this additional housing. There is one road in and out of Whitworth which is already struggling to cope with the increasing volume of traffic. Especially at peak times. If there are any traffic disruptions it can take 1-2 hours to get to Rochdale . We do not need more cars and the pollution they bring! - - There are limited school places both secondary and primary and local children born in the village will struggle to get places. - The one and only GP practice can not manage to provide the necessary health care for patients with no appointments pre bookable for weeks in advance. This healthcare will be diluted further. Living in Whitworth if A&E treatment is required which is often a life or death situation your chances of survival are reduced add more traffic on market street and your chance of survival diminishes further - - The people who live in Whitworth , live here because it is a village , it is quiet and the countryside is on the door step. Yet the plans want to destroy the village life, increase demands on existing services and increase pollution - - To consider building on greenbelt land in Whitworth is unbelievable and irresponsible, Planning has already - spoil the view of the countryside at the side of Daneswood ave and the wind farms are also affecting the views and countryside. - - Whitworth has lots of wildlife from deer, owls, herons, wild ponies as well as lots of insect life butterflies, bees etc which will all be at risk if the countryside is used for housing. - - There is empty housing all over the borough - fill these , not build more especially in our little village -		Stop putting profits first and put existing residents first

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
793	Victoria	Roberts	-		Object	<p>I would like to object to the site for in total 35 houses based on north of king st on a site that was previous a landfill site. I would like to raise a few points these being -</p> <p>1. The site used to be a landfill and I was under the understanding it couldn't be built on due to gases etc. As a parent of 3 young children would they be put in danger from the gases in that location. -</p> <p>2 in that area there is many animals like deer, badgers, bats what effect would this have on the animals if trees etc are cut down to make room for the houses? -</p> <p>3 The schools are already over subscribed as it not just whitworth children esp tonacliffe its children from Rochdale taking places. the schools in that area have been extended to the full building capacity and to add more house mean less spaces in local schools. The streets are narrow and to add more parents if extended will cause major issues with parking and traffic management with all schools. The high school there is only one for whitworth which again have had people appealing as not enough room as again Rochdale are sending pupils in to the school. -</p> <p>4. There is an issue with getting appointments with the gp its could be weeks as there isn't enough doctors. The doctors is small and inadequate building in centre of whitworth. then in turn causing parking issues and access as it up a hill double parking etc. They cant expand the doctors in whitworth and on the plans there isn't anything to replace with a bigger centre etc. other service like dentist is over subscribed they also accept patients from out of whitworth causing issues to get appointments -</p> <p>5 the roads in and out of whitworth isn't adequate for the current volume off traffic never mind the 300+ more houses on listed if built. -</p> <p>6 The current plans showed that the cycle path goes past slinco based on station road but as far as im aware the company wont allow them to buy the land so access to the cycle path is down barlow bottoms then causing more issues if houses where to be built. -</p> <p>7 Are they going to provide adequate drainage as currently the road at times is bad and to add more concrete it there going to be a better drainage system in place to direct the water as work carried out in another area caused flooding. Locals have said there is a culvert running through that land and as I am on lower land is my house at risk of flooding? -</p> <p>8 Pollution adding more cars taking down the trees and not replacing them. the carbon foot print -</p> <p>9 the service ie water, electric, gas have not been upgraded to accept all the buildings houses etc casuing problems like power cuts low water pressure flooding no correct drange in place or for it to run off as grass etc replaced with concrete. -</p> <p>10 the roads are an issue more cars means more pot holes as traffic up and down the road is constant with big lorries ie already for the quarry. to add a hell of a lot more houses, people who live here and then people passing through Is going to make it a lot worse and unsafe for children as the road is already a race track . -</p> <p>11 What affects would building the houses on the resale value of mine. As I bought it for the location and the access to he countryside for my children ? - -</p>		<p>whitworth facit Is a small village that current cant take any more traffic and homes . it one in and out and god forbid if traffic lights or bad weather journies increase by 1hrs just to get in and out of whitworth. animals will be loosing homes to make way for more homes. roads unsuitable and more holes then anything -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
793	Victoria	Roberts	-		Object	the area has wildlife ie deer tht wih the building of the cycle track - the traffic volume on the road currently is a nightmar esp in bad weather - the area is an old tip so what pollution would come from that and may seep in to the river - the land is currently water logged at times and adding more concrete would affect the areas as land drains arnt able to take water away now. - the gp schools local are already over subscribed - the animals will loose there natural habitiat like deer bats etc - the turning is on to a main road that is currently busy and the roads can not take anymore traffic and is becoming more holey - the houses arnt affordable houses -		whitworth facit Is a small village that current cant take any more traffic and homes . it one in and out and god forbid if traffic lights or bad weather journies increase by 1hrs just to get in and out of whitworth. animals will be loosing homes to make way for more homes. roads unsuitable and more holes then anything -
803	Marietta	Galbraith	-		Object	My objections for the proposed building of housing on the above sites is based on a number of reasons: - 1. Infrastructure. The current housing situation is already at (possibly beyond) capacity with regards to schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists, employment and traffic. There are no more schools planned and no way to expand the ones already here. Some children have to travel miles to schools out of the area due to oversubscribed local schools. This is the same for doctor's surgeries and many other amenities. - 2. Traffic. There is one main road in and out of Whitworth that already has issues with raised levels of traffic. In the four years we have lived here, there have been many occasions where traffic has been an issue due to constant roadworks (for various reasons relating to increased housing and traffic) which has caused major problems. Also, most people are employed outside of Whitworth so traffic is high anyway. More housing would increase this issue with no solution being given as to how it could be rectified. - 3. Utilities. More and more power cuts have been happening recently in Whitworth due to new housing as well as burst water pipes and problems with drainage. This has contributed to the traffic issues with roads having to be dug up every few weeks to 'fix' the problem. - 4. More housing would mean taking up land that is natural drainage for flooding. Recently, my area was put into the 'flood risk' catagory (although we haven't flooded), significantly increasing my home insurance. If more homes are built, this would increase risk of flooding to many homes around Whitworth, which would cause loss of market value and would reduce the chances of being able to sell the property. - 5. Much of the 'green land' would be lost which is detrimental to the wildlife around Whitworth. The Government have a duty to protect greenbelt land and our environment! The carbon footprint would be horrific! - In conclusion, building over 300 houses in Whitworth would causes issues beyond repair! Environment, traffic, pollution, infrastructure, drainage etc. would all be dramatically affected in the most negative and damaging way. Whitworth was not meant for so much housing and so many people.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
875	Margaret	Banham	-		Object	This was a small Village"Town* My family were born and bred here going back to the 1800s,I know what Progress is, But all these Houses with out Building New Sewers, Schools, Doctors ,Roads etc i s Ridiculous ,and it's to busy now with Facit Fold and Grogan Close and many more.... Mr and Mrs Banham.		-
886	Michael	Banham	-	HS2.102 to HS2.109	Object	The infrastructure of whitworth is over stretched as it is,the school's cannot cater for such an undertaking. Theres only one road in or out of whitworth any problems on this road causes absolute mayhem. The winter months are an absolute nightmare just to get onto market street.		I cannot understand why anyone would want to over populate an area that is already struggling.
889	Derek	Lord	-	HS 102, HS105, HS104, HS106, HS107, HS108, HS109.	Object	We in Whitworth are sure that there are enough houses here at the present time.There are large estates at Cowm Park, Tonacliffe, Wain Gap, Wallbank, Knot Hill, Orama Mill Site, Edgemoor Close, and a small estate at Facit. The exits onto the one main road are at present full of traffic. The Doctors, Schools etc are now at bursting point. We in Whitworth have done our share in housing. Please think again before building any more. Thank You.		-
892	Mandy	Sanderson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105,HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2108, HS2.109	Object	The transport system around Whitworth cannot cope with the volume of traffic . Also local amenities are already at braking point..		No
911	Julie	Latham	-		Object	In principle I don't object to more houses or people. However I will until I am convinced that the planners are committed to the infrastructure improvements required to support the extra influx of people and cars . - The main bottlenecks caused by Whitworth traffic happen in the Rochdale Borough at the bottom of Whitworth Road and on Shawclough Road. These areas are controlled by Rochdale Council who are under no obligation to improve traffic flow to improve the lives of the people of Whitworth. There are changes could be made in these areas which would help greatly. Unless Rossendale Planners can work with Rochdale Planners to create new roads and implement better traffic flow measures the extra cars generated by this and other proposed housing projects in Whitworth will mean journey times to get to Rochdale, Manchester and the M62 Motorway network at f peak times will be so long that people who commute this way to work will have to give up their jobs or move away from the village. I really don't think that this issue is being taken on board by either Borough. - The medical centre is also over-subscribed and I believe that the schools are too. I appeal to the planners to find funds and solutions to these concerns before adding more pressure.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
913	Michelle	Ashcroft	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108 & HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a geographical challenge at the best of times, positioned in a valley, consisting of ONE main road with multiple roads stemming from this leading to many properties that are built on the hillside. There are many green areas which are used by local farmers for their livestock. During times of heavy rain many of the roads are flooded, and during winter many roads are very dangerous in the snow. It is not uncommon for Whitworth to be gridlocked as there are far too many cars on the roads, all it needs is one set of road works and the town becomes inaccessible. The local schools are now over subscribed, the High school has had to turn away many children who only live a couple of miles away. The primary schools are also subscribed making it very difficult for teachers to provide a good education to the children. The local doctors are unable to cope with the number of patients, trying to get a same day appointment is nigh on impossible these days. We have issues with anti social behaviour due to lack of amenities available for teenagers, the local youth club has been closed down. There is a lack of police presence (the PSCO tries her best), people don't feel as safe as they should. The library is still under threat of closure, the pool is only open because of the people of Whitworth who run it. Building more houses brings more people, more cars, more strain on the infrastructure. I appreciate housing is needed but the number of houses that has been suggested will bring this town to it's knees.		I would suggest you come to Whitworth during the morning school run and see how difficult it is around Horsefield Avenue. Come sit in the traffic jams during rush hour. - - The government has spoken about creating new towns, this is a great idea, there are places that can accommodate thousands and thousands of houses. Build there not here!!!
916	Jane	Trudgeon	-	HS2.102 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	We are already an overstretched village infrastructure, the roads would not cope with an extra amount of traffic and would make the already difficult commute to exit/enter the village impossible. There are not enough schools nor would the doctor's surgery be able to cope as even now it is almost impossible to get a reasonable appointment time, - - The housing developments would impact on wildlife		-
918	Marion	Ashworth	-	HS2.107 , ALL.	Object	I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.		I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
935	Christine	Fallon		HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	1 Whitworth has one main road which is often gridlocked the smaller access roads are grossly un suitable e.g Tonacliffe. - 2 Schools are already oversubscribed parking at drop off times would be more chaotic and dangerous. - 3 Doctors and dentists are already at capacity. - 4 Services of gas electricity and water would require major upgrade. - 5 We are seeing flooding due to inadequate drainage this would be increased. - 6 Is this acceptable use of greenbelt land where previous planning permission has been refused the effect on wildlife and trees would be immense.		-
939	Geoffrey	Fallon	-	HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a small village with one already inadequate road. Doctors dentists and schools are already oversubscribed parking in school areas is dangerous already and would be far worse. - Gas electricity and water services would need major upgrade. - This is inappropriate use of greenbelt land causing damage to wildlife and the environment drainage is a major problem now with frequent flooding.		-
955	Janet	Whitehead	-	HS2.102, HS2.104,HS2.10 5, HS2.106,HS2.10 7, HS2.108,HS2.10 9	Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village, oversubscribed schools and Doctors We have one road in and one road out which is almost impossible during peak times in the morning - The houses already exceed the heights up the sides of the valley - Our green belt is very important to wildlife and the the people the live here - If we let one builder onto greenbelt it opens the doors to far too many others - Our population is big enough and we cannot accommodate many more		- Our Councillors are voted in by us and now need to stand up and fight for us - - 400 houses is a ridiculous amount of new houses for a tiny village - - We have had 2 different sites where new houses have been built in recent years we've done our bit for Government figures - - Please find somewhere else
962	Kathryn	Gill	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2104, HS2106, HS2107, HS2108, HS2109	Object	I object to any changes in use of local greenbelt land to build houses. Also, there is only one road through Whitworth and it is already congested. We have only 1 doctors surgery, and not enough school places to accommodate hundreds of additional families. Greenbelt land cannot be restored once built on, and these proposals would change the landscape of Whitworth. I am also concerned about the building of 20 properties around Cowm. This is a resource continually used for recreation by the people of Whitworth and should be preserved.		No
979	Marie	Pye	-		Object	All of these developments will contribute to already existing traffic problems as there is one road in and one road out of the area. The high school is already oversubscribed with local children not being offered places.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
992	Susan	Farrell		HS2: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109	Object	I strongly object to the building of houses on all the above mentioned sites for the following reasons: - Greenbelt land is of importance to all the wildlife of Whitworth and Shawforth . Deer and bats live in the forests in the area. Many badgers and foxes inhabit the countryside and rare species of wildlife live in the ponds. - The forest area at Tonacliffe would be cut down having a negative impact on the environment. - Tonacliffe road is already dangerous for children with cars parked along the length of the road at school dropping off and picking up time. The increased number of cars if more houses were built in the area would be worse for the children and residents. - Local amenities such as dentists and GPs could not cope with the increased population. It is almost impossible at the moment to get a GP appointment in less than two weeks. More housing would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Whitworth and Shawforth. - Facilities such as water, gas and electricity are already stretched and a major upgrade of the infrastructure would be required to support increased housing. - Local drainage cannot cope with the current usage. More housing could have an impact on flooding. - Public footpaths could be lost reducing the number of rights of way for walkers. - The road network both ways from Rochdale to Bacup is already gridlocked. More housing would put an increased strain on traffic and the already poor public transport in the area. - The only high school in the area is already oversubscribed. With increased housing parents may have even less chance of a first choice school for their children. They may have to travel miles to school. - I understood it is government policy to protect Greenbelt land except for 'Exceptional Circumstances'. What are the exceptional circumstances that enable housing to be built on the greenbelt land in Whitworth and Shawforth?		Summary - - Whitworth and Shawforth are already busy villages with oversubscribed schools and GP services with one road in and out between Rochdale and Bacup. - - Can we accommodate more housing that will put pressure on already overstretched amenities, increase traffic and change the beautiful landscape forever?
1011	Paul	Williams	-		Object	Loss of habitat for wildlife. Deer and badgers live in the area. - More housing will increase the traffic on the roads .		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1029	Angela	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2108; HS2 109	Object	1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? -7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1107	Keith	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. GP services and other related support services are already overstretched and inadequate. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 5. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 6. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 7. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 7.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 7.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 7.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 8. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		-
1109	Jane	Gadsby	-		Object	<p>I wholly object to more housing being built in Whitworth!! We are a small(ish) village that can not cope already with the amount of new houses and people moving into it!! Our schools are already over subscribed; they are turning people away that don't live overly far away that a few years ago would have had no problem getting a place. The Doctors surgery can't cope with the number of patients wanting appointments. You are also increasing the risks of flooding. My house is already at risk and has already flooded twice. The main road (one road in and out) is gridlocked most mornings with commuters trying to get out of the village but most of all you are taking our beautiful green areas that Whitworth is so lucky and honoured to have. We have lots of empty properties that can't be filled already!! Please leave us and our village alone!!</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1134	Abigail	Leyland	-		Object	WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE HOUSING IN WHITWORTH! The schools are already oversubscribed, our local doctors can not possibly take on any more patients as it is already a struggle to get an appointment currently. We only have one road in and out of the village which gets badly effected by rush hour traffic, making it difficult for the locals to get to work/school etc. We have such a lovely view of greenery surrounding our little village and we do not want our sight ruined by building ugly, unnecessary housing.		-
1152	angela	Jordan	-		Object	I do not think whitworth has enough resources to sustain further housing estates .The one and only road is already impossible at peak times,our doctors surgery is bursting with no appointments,and our school children cant get a place at our local school. - The wildlife is also important to whitwoth people but is being pushed further and further out of its natural habitat.		No
1166	Brendan	Doherty	-	HS2, 102,104,108,105 ,107,106,109.	Object	WHITWORTH IS FULL. This statement encapsulates all the issues surrounding any expansion of dwelling houses in the township of Whitworth. - - The negative impact of any developments in the town cannot be overstated. - - The whole nature of this small township will be irreversibly destroyed if development are allowed. - - Flora and fauna will be the first to suffer. This valley is home to an exceptional and expanding variety of animals and trees and flowers. This growth has taken decades to achieve and would by totally reversed by the stroke of a pen. - - To say that all the ingredients which go to make up Whitworth as a place for people to live are overloaded is indeed an understatement. - - Congestion of traffic and people is at its limit, any increase can only be detrimental to the health and quality of life of residents. - - Local services, schools, doctors, civic amenities are already at their serviceable optimum. - - The existing utilities of electricity,gas and water only just maintain service. There are often cuts in these making it seem that we are a third world town. - - Whitworth is a linear town with no bypass or possibility of such. Most of the day traffic is heavy and at peak times chaotic. This combined with the nature of HGV traffic leaves the roads in constant need of repair. Add a very poor public transport system and the certain increases proposed then the result is guaranteed to be disastrous.		Listen to the people of Whitworth.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1185	Shauna	Hamer-pieper	-		Object	I live on king street and the land you are proposing to build on is boggy that would require draining and would lead to water draining down hill onto king street as it is just below the proposed housing site, it's a rather quiet street just how resident like it so the noise from the housing is a no no especially considering most people on king street are elderly. The road you would have To open up has from since when I can remember been a closed road it's now a bike path and they used to put horses on the fields at the bottom it's a nice quiet walk for residents of whitworth also so placing housing there would disrupt peace. Also privacy of the houses on king street the new proposed houses would be over looking king street I for one want to keep privacy in my own home and garden at summer time. We don't want your houses whitworth can't cope with the capacity you want to build it's only a small village with little amenities. We especially don't want immigrants or refugees moving here. Whitworth people like to stick to what they know and you are disrupting people way of life ! Go and build somewhere else like Bacup or further up		We don't want your houses there isn't enough room to accommodate more people. Also it's called a green belt for a reason meaning no building ! You can't change something to suit yourselves. Build houses else where we don't want this kind of change. leave the small town of whitworth alone !
1190	Nathan	Worrall	-	HS2.107 , HS2.108, HS2.109, HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104,HS2.106	Object	Whitworth doesn't have the infrastructure to sustain the construction of these new houses. The local doctors and schools would struggle to meet the needs of the increased population. There is bad traffic in Whitworth already, this will only make it worse and these traffic problems are highlighted when there are roadworks and there are large queues. The proposed sites are located on greenbelt land, and this will have a negative effect on the local wildlife as well as destroying the natural beauty of this land.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1272	Michala	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS102.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	I am objecting in general to the proposed house building in various sites around Whitworth and specifically in relation to the proposed sites t Tonacliffe. My objections are based on a number of reasons: 1. Wildlife in the local area. Deer, badgers, foxes and hares live within the forest areas. Rare protected newts live in the pond. Bats nest in the forest. The importance in f this green belt land for the wildlife cannot be over emphasised. - 2. Tonacliffe forest would need to be cut down adversely affecting the local environment. - 3. The impact of more cars around local schools, especially Tonacliffe School, is of great concern due to the already high volume of traffic. Increasing this would be unacceptable. - 4. Local amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already to capacity. I have concerns that more houses will have a negative impact on the lives of current residents in relation to these amenities. - 5. Has the infrastructure of our small village been considered in relation to electricity, gas and water supply if more houses are built? Whitworth already experiences power cuts and seems to be worse since other recent building developments have been completed. - 6. The road network into Rochdale is already gridlocked. More houses will increase this problem. Public transport from Whitworth is limited to buses and I consider that if this proposed building goes ahead there will also be a negative impact on the poor public transport in and out of our village. - 7. Local drainage already struggles to cope with usage now, if the volume of residents increases would the drainage system be able to deal with the added strain? - 8. We bought our property because it is located on the last cul de sac of a small estate with no through traffic. This proposed building work will completely alter this into drive through roads. Plus the volume of traffic will - Increase which I consider to be unacceptable. - 9. I am very concerned that we may have loss of privacy as we are not currently overlooked and this was a major consideration when we bought our house.	-	
1283	Jonathan	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	Whitworths infrastructure is already at near full capacity. The single main road through Whitworth is, at times, grid-locked. Streets around the primary schools is chaotic. There is a definite flood issue through the valley. Crime is rising unchallenged. The rich and diverse wildlife is flourishing around Whitworth. - Any of the development projects would have a negative and detrimental implication on Whitworth and it's residents.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1298	Carol	Williams	-		Object	Same reasons as HS2.109 and HS2.106 except for the additional traffic/cars parking near the school		I believe the council is going against the Government policies on planning and green belt conservation - - A high level of protection should be given to most valued landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - I object to the policy itself and the proposed housing developments on individual sites mentioned namely HS2.109 Horsefield Avenue, HS2.106 Moorland Crescent, HS2.102 king Street and HS2.104 Quarry Street
1310	Richard	Dolan	-	HS2.101-109	Object	<p>We are vehemently opposed to all housing allocation in Whitworth. Our group has decided to vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. We will withhold our votes and encourage family, friends, and community to do likewise. - We are outraged by this proposal, especially HS2.107 that will encroach on Healy Dell. On this point we will be contacting the National Trust and other such organisations to make them away of the proposed desecration to the Green Belt. Furthermore, we are now investigating possible financial links between all Councillors, MPs, and RBC employees involved in this issue with the proposed contractors. This senseless proposal for a village far too small to accommodate a possible 300 new homes suggest an ulterior motive. No one in our community that we have spoken to is in favour of this plan and we will use our sizeable influence. - There has been more than enough housing development in Whitworth. This new proposal will destroy our green spaces and necessitate a new schools, doctors' surgery, dentist, shops, and possible a new road. All future housing development must stop. Our community can not accommodate any more. - In light of the fact that this proposal has not been advertised to a great extent (we have spoken to people who know nothing of it), we will be conducting a petition again this proposal and encouraging everyone to sigh the following statement: - We will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community.</p>		To reiterate, we will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community. - - The people's power will be felt if this plan in authorised.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1336	Maureen	O'Mara	-	HS2.102,105,104,106,107,108,109	Object	Whitworth is already struggling with oversubscribed schools. There is only 1 small GP surgery and 1 dentist. The village cannot cope with stretching the existing amenities. - One of the main objections I have is the traffic and parking, which is already dire. Streets are almost impossible to drive down safely due to double parking. There is only one main road, which when closed for any reason means driving via Todmorden to get around - this has happened on a number of occasions. Most roads have very steep inclines which are regularly not gritted in winter. To increase parking and traffic would destroy Whitworth. Where would access roads be and how would this affect current residents.		Put quality of people's lives before profit.
1363	Gareth	Dolan	-	HS2.101 to 109	Object	I do not live in Whitworth but spend a lot of time there with my family. I am deeply concerned by this proposed loss of green belt and will do my utmost to object against it. - - I strongly urge RBC to re-consider its proposal. Whitworth cannot handle any more development. - - Thanks		If this destruction of the green belt in Whitworth is passed then I shall simply take my family and my money elsewhere as there will no longer be the same attraction Whitworth now offers.
1365	Michael	Whitehead	-		Object	The doctors is overcrowded, the schools are overcrowded and there is one road in and out. All three of the mentioned cannot cope in the current state. Whitworth has too many houses for the current infrastructure. If the proposal goes through, which I sincerely hope it does not, there will be 300+ more homes within Whitworth. This means 650+ more people needing a doctor, 300+ more children who need schools and 300+ more cars on the roads. If the current infrastructure is struggling I dread to think how the village would end up with that amount of extra people. - There are also many deer which have recently returned to the greenbelt land on either side of the valley. Moving any sort of greenbelt/urban borders is highly likely to destroy their habitat and force them away.		-
1365	Michael	Whitehead	-		Object	The doctors is overcrowded, the schools are overcrowded and there is one road in and out. All three of the mentioned cannot cope in the current state. Whitworth has too many houses for the current infrastructure. If the proposal goes through, which I sincerely hope it does not, there will be 300+ more homes within Whitworth. This means 650+ more people needing a doctor, 300+ more children who need schools and 300+ more cars on the roads. If the current infrastructure is struggling I dread to think how the village would end up with that amount of extra people. - There are also many deer which have recently returned to the greenbelt land on either side of the valley. Moving any sort of greenbelt/urban borders is highly likely to destroy their habitat and force them away.		-
1371	Daniela	Ripa	-		Support	I support the allocation of HS2.102 for housing at Market Street, Whitworth and would encourage the Council to actively support the development of the land through bids for funding to address contamination issues that may inhibit the development of the land.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1397	John	Cavanagh		king street	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve
1398	Joshua	Hopwood Mairs		king street	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1402	JOANNE	WHITWORTH	-	king street	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. -		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling with make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth who have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for now and for our future generations.
1405	GARETH	WHITWORTH	-	king street	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for our children and our childrens children.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1417	Gillian	Middlemas	Whitworth Community High School	HS1.102 HS2.103 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	As Headteacher of the only secondary school in the Whitworth area, I am concerned that the proposals to build considerable numbers of new dwellings take no account of educational provision in the local area. - The school is already oversubscribed: for 2017 entry into Y7 over 40 families were unsuccessful in gaining a place, despite Whitworth Community High School being their first preference; over 40 families went onto on the Local Authority's waiting list for a place; over 25 families went to Appeal for a place, and very few of them were successful. The school now has 640 students and, without extra classroom space, has no capacity to increase the admissions number, nor to take additional students into existing year groups. - Likewise, many local primary schools are also full / oversubscribed, suggesting there is insufficient educational provision in the local area already. - This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed number of new dwellings goes ahead, unless the developers or Lancashire County Council are prepared to increase the school's capacity by funding additional classroom / learning / social space. The school is over 50 years old, largely of Langspan pre-tensioned concrete construction (intended life expectancy already exceeded) with HAC (high alumina cement) - In addition, the school experiences ongoing issues with the provision of utilities: the water main up the school drive is at risk of collapse; the water supply to the area has recently been affected on a number of occasions, and presumably further demand from new building would increase these issues. - The proposals for new housing does not appear to be linked to any plans to improve the traffic situation in the Whitworth area: lengthy queues heading towards Rochdale each morning already create issues for students travelling to school.		Whilst it is excellent news that there is demand for additional housing in the Whitworth area, I am particularly concerned about the infrastructure which is essential to support this kind of development. Education, and raising aspirations, is essential to improving the future for our young people and I have concerns regarding school capacity; increased traffic; increased demand on local services generally; impact on provision of utilities; and whether or not this has all been factored into the planning process. The infrastructure needs to be in place before the planning is agreed. I also have concerns about the impact of further building on wildlife, the village ethos, and greenbelt areas.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1420	Julie	bower	-	king street	Object	<p>I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. - This already over saturated with people for the small community resources there are. - There is not enough road space, and only a little amount of moorland available. We try to encourage our young in the community to go outside and be 'heathy'. There won't be anywhere left. I find the lack of advertising this proposal unacceptable. There are many more areas of fields elsewhere. Why add to an over exhausted community already? I dont understand why Whitworth has to be the target for this.</p>		<p>Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve. It isn't alot but it is valued and appreciated beyond your knowledge or understanding - all of these below would be affected adversely. - - Wildlife - Loss of trees - The local school - Landscaping - - Local amenities - Infrastructure - - - We deserve our voices to be heard.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1440	Helen	Banham	-	HS2.102 - King Street	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

unbearable strain on this network.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1442	Tracy	Thompson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105 & HS2.109	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen within this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1444	John	Hopkins	-	Hs2.102 King Street	Object	<p>residents put an unbearable strain on this network. -</p> <p>This area of fact has been redeveloped after years of quarry work and was once a landfill site. - The amount of wildlife that has now made this area a home would suffer if the bulldozers moved and started to build houses. - The village it self can not cope with extra vehicles, neither can the schools and Doctors. - The area is also popular with dog walkers, the area's to exercise animals are limited, without going up on to the moorland, which is not practical in Autumn and winter.</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1453	Jordan	Collier			Object	Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						residents put an unbearable strain on this network. -		
1469	George	Salt	-		Object	Whitworth is located in a valley, this in itself presents issues with the amount of space available. 7,500 people lived in Whitworth according to the data from the 2011 Census and this is a large amount of people if you look at the services and infrastructure in Whitworth. To start off with there is one GP surgery that has 7,248 people registered with them. Whitworth Medical Centre has 4 GPs which means that for one GP there are 1,812 people. There is not any more capacity available for more people to register with the practice. - - Schools are also busy especially with just one school for secondary education. With more people living in Whitworth that would mean a greater demand on schools and could result in some children living in Whitworth not going to school there. - - Going back to Whitworth being a valley this physical feature means that infrastructure being put in can be difficult. Whitworth has one road in and out and during peak hours this is a very busy road. Most new people would probably be using a car as their main mode of transport adding more pressure to Market Street and its tributary roads. Public transport is also very poor in Whitworth meaning that it is not really a viable alternative for any new people who would come to Whitworth. - - As shown with a few of these arguments Whitworth does not have the capacity to accommodate an extra 359 houses over the next 15 years. For example an average of 3 people per house would result in 1,077 more people living in Whitworth. It is not going to work.		
1497	Wendy	Rose	-	HS2.102 Barlow Baottoms, Land North King St HS2.105 Albert Mill HS2.104 South Quarry St HS2.106 Tonacliffe HS2.107 Eastgate HS2.108 Cowm Water Works HS2.109 Horsefield Ave	Object	The infrastructure of Whitworth cannot support or sustain further development. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth. Congestion is a serious problem now due to the volume of traffic. When there are roadworks the situation is bordering on dangerous as emergency vehicles are hindered. Further residential development would only compound this issue with higher levels of vehicles. - - Power cuts are a regular occurrence in this area, one can only assume this would get worse with the extent of the proposed developments - - Doctors surgeries are fully to capacity and cannot adequately serve the community at the moment. Waiting times for appointments is ludicrous. Schools are over subscribed. Parking around schools is dangerous and any increase in school children would seriously impact on this. - - All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - - Proposed land in some cases is not viable as parts are prone to flooding. Culverts running through a proposed sight would impact on flood defences in the area. - - -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1502	Danielle	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	
1504	Timothy	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1505	Pat	Stewart	na		Object	<p>I object to all the listed sites in whitworth. - - HS2.102 - King Street, HS2.104 - Old Lane, HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens, - HS2.105 - Albert Street, HS2.107 Fern Isle Close, HS2.106 - Moorland Cres, - HS2.109 - Horsefield Av - - 1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in</p>		Please can you inform me of how many people object to the whitworth sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - - Plus please note - - Human Rights Act - Responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, - In particular - Protocol 1, Article 1. - This states that "a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land." - Additionally, Article 8 - The Human Rights Act states that "a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life." - - In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1538	Mike	Burgess		HS2.102 - King Street, HS2.104 - Old Lane, HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens,	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
					unbearable strain on this network.			<p>accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
								<p>footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - DON'T FORGET EACH ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CAN PUT IN THEIR OWN OBJECTION FORM TO THE BUILDING WORK. Extract from the Governments Planning Policy Statement - Protection and Enhancement of the Environment 17. The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. Those with national and international designations should receive the highest level of protection. 18. The condition of our surroundings has a direct impact on the quality of life and the conservation and improvement of the natural and built environment brings social and economic benefit for local communities. Planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design, conservation and the provision of public space. 19. Plan policies and planning decisions should be based on: –up-to-date information on the environmental characteristics of the area; – the</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
								<p>potential impacts, positive as well as negative, on the environment of development proposals (whether direct, indirect, cumulative, long-term or short-term); and, – recognition of the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage. Planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, planning authorities and developers should consider possible mitigation measures. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. In line with the UK sustainable development strategy, environmental costs should fall on those who impose them – the “polluter pays” principle.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1545	Robert	Hesten		SHLAA16020	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam. Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1545	Robert	Hesten		SHLAA16019	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam. Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1546	Sandra	Hesten		SHLAA16019	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam.</p> <p>Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions?</p> <p>Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS.</p> <p>There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village.</p> <p>Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed?</p> <p>In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area.</p> <p>Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF.</p> <p>Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
1546	Sandra	Hesten		SHLAA16020	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam.</p> <p>Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.102	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		
1744	Keren	Szelesi		King Street	Object	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Infrastructure is already at breaking point in this area. 2) Road system, water supply, medical centre, schools are at full capacity. 3) Encroach on green spaces. 4) Whitworth will no longer be a village but an urban sprawl. 		Not enough publicity has been given regarding these proposals.
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS 2:102 - Barlow Bottoms, Whitworth – The existing access onto Market Street appears suitable and could be designed to accommodate the potential mixed use for residents and quarry traffic. 		
1822	Richard	Sharples	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>It has just been brought to my attention that one of the housing allocations in your draft local plan, HS2.102 in Whitworth, is on land safeguarded in the minerals and waste local plan for an alternative access to Whitworth quarry (MRT12 under policy SA2). This wasn't noticed previously hence wasn't referred to in our response to your regulation 18 consultation this autumn. I think the 2 designations are probably in conflict, has the safeguarded land been overlooked or do you feel it can be accommodated within the housing allocation?</p>		
Number of comments		HS2.102				78		
Reference		HS2.103		Land behind Buxton Street				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
56	Valerie	McDonald	-		Object	<p>Whilst I recognise the need for further housing within the area, I am concerned about the siting of so many proposed dwellings in this particular valley. The roads are already clogged at rush hour and as there is only one road through, movement of traffic, should there be an accident or roadworks, becomes frustratingly unpredictable. What provision is there to maintain and develop the road system in the valley? - - Whitworth High School has become more popular over the past couple of years with waiting lists existing. What provision will be made to expand the school, and will this be done with a long term objective in mind and not just a sticking plaster effort to put up some portable classrooms? - - Local services such as the Children's Centre have just been lost. What plans may be afoot to reinstate such necessary provision? I feel it is morally wrong to simply build new houses and forget about the infrastructure to support this development. - - There is a wealth of wildlife on the moors where you are proposing to site many homes. Presumably there will be checks in place to ensure some of these species are not endangered? - - Finally, there are already plenty of properties on the market at very affordable prices (in comparison with some surrounding areas). Some of these have been on the market a while? Why, if there is already affordable housing, is there a need to build more? -</p>		
131	Christine	Greenwood	-		Object	<p>I am objecting to plans to allow the building of over £350 properties on various sites around Whitiworth and Shawforth over the next 15 years. - Not only am I concerned about the building on our greenbelt sites which is part of the attraction of the area. I can understand the wind farm and can support renewable energy sources but not the creation of a collection of housing estates - whether social/affordable or not . The awful collection in Britannia speaks for itself! We have already had several builds across Rossendale but the extra Council Tax revenue does not seem to have brought many benefits to the borough. - As it stands at present the infrastructure can just about support the current residents - schools are already over subscribed and getting an appointment at our one GP surgery is already a mammoth undertaking. Planning to build or reopen a school by any chance? - Traffic is already an issue with one road in and out and a bus service that has to be one of the most unreliable in the surrounding areas ! There are next to no facilities for young people/children and a library fighting to survive so I think that this needs to be given serious consideration before you go ahead.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
153	G.N	Royds			Not Applicable	<p>As I have indicated before, a prerequisite for a community is sustainable employment. A complete hash has been made by not providing this. Former mill sites have been used for housing, such as Orama Mill, Facit Mill, Albert Mill and the mill near Spodden Fold (which I think may have been called Old Kays). Most of these are easily accessible. Now Spring Mill is proposed for similar treatment! On the other hand, peripheral businesses have been allowed, e.g. tattoo parlours and tanning centres, which debase the human body; the type of potentially smelly fast food outlets that encourage unhealthy eating.</p> <p>Housing without local employment means commuting, causing traffic congestion and pollution. The kind of industry needed is that involved in green energy, recycling, sensible clothing and the production of healthy food. The former site of Spring Mill is a place where a sensitively designed industrial estate might be possible. It is already surrounded by trees and has foundations remaining but it is not on a regular public transport route and is less accessible than previously mentioned sites that have been precluded. It is absurd to think of building on HS2.102/103/106/109 and on that part of HS2.107 not formerly occupied by Spring Mill. These are large areas of countryside enjoyed at present as part of the natural environment. HS2.104 also appears to be countryside, with a few established houses, and also should be protected from further building. Cowm Water Treatment Works (HS2.108) is ideal for industrial development. Let us have local jobs and ensure adequate facilities are available before any more houses are built in Whitworth.</p>		<p>P.S. I did not make this response online because it was mandatory to provide an e-mail address. Please change this, so that more people are encouraged to respond.</p> <p>P.P.S. Please keep me informed of developments.</p>
155	Jo	Furtado			Support	HS2.103 - the specialist (old people's) accommodation being built near Buxton Street is also welcomed. Support.		
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	<p>This is an unbelievable plan that will stretch amenities in the area even further. - - The new estate near Cowm has already increased traffic congestion on the one road in and out of the village and schools are already struggling to cope. - - There is also the issue of wildlife and the impact it will have on their environment. - - I for one will be leaving if this idiotic plan goes through. -</p>		This smells of greed over common sense

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
268	Michaela	Radford	-		Object	Whitworth has had numerous instances recently regarding the roadworks for the infrastructure repair and maintenance. As an employee of all 4 major utility asset owners in the area, I am very concerned regarding the houses proposed. We only have one road throughout the valley and this is impacted severly when roadworks are planned. My concerns are that these are not managed correctly by LCC at present, therefore; more houses and more infrastructure would have a massive impact on the people living in the village. People face unemployment now due to the frequent issues we face getting into work. - Not to mention over crowded schools and doctors as we stand at present. - - I request, here in writing, to be informed of any planned meetings regarding the houses in whitworth and notification be sent in writing to my address above.		-
446	Paula	Todd	-		Object	Whitworth is a small community with only one main road to access it. I feel that if all these purposed houses are built the traffic congestion for commuting will be very difficult for the local residents. Other than the bus service residents have no alternative to drive to and from work. - - My children go to local Tonnacliffe school and the traffic and parking is extremely heavy and if more houses are built in that area the roads would not be able to cope. - - Flooding is a massive problem at present in Whitworth, united utilities are constantly out trying to fix problems, having more houses I believe would make the flooding worse. - - Whitworth is also known for its beauty, walks and wildlife and to purpose building on the greenbelt areas of Whitworth would cause a detrimental effect on this. - - Whitworth does not have access to a local A&E dept, Rochdale hospital only has a urgent care centre as does Burnley. Residents of Whitworth closes A&E is either Oldham or Blackburn. Having more residents in Whitworth with limited healthcare facility's could increase morbidity rate. Along side no local A&E we only have one GP practice in the area, having more residence would cause strain on their service, this also includes only one dental practice. - - Will there be enough places in the schools for all the new children to the area? The local high school is only small and as I believe was over subscribed this school year. - -		-
590		Ashworth			Object	Absolutely ridiculous One way in and out of whitworth no extra schools or doctors when you have two or three cars per household. This is ruining our villages. We strongly object to this. Listen to the people who vote you in, as we have long memories		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
743			Whitworth Town Council		Object	At a meeting of Whitworth Town Council last night (Thursday 28 September 2017), it was resolved that I should contact you with the comments of the Town Council to feed into the current Local Plan consultation: HS2.102 Barlow Bottoms, HS2.102 Land North of King Street and HS2.103 Land Behind Buxton Street Council have concerns that this area is on a flood plain and part of this site is already allocated to a specialist care unit. This is currently the largest undeveloped site locally and if more homes are to be built in Whitworth in the future then the deficiency in social facilities would need to be addressed and this site would be the most appropriate for a school or health centre.		
886	Michael	Banham	-	HS2.102 to HS2.109	Object	The infrastructure of whitworth is over stretched as it is,the school's cannot cater for such an undertaking. Theres only one road in or out of whitworth any problems on this road causes absolute mayhem. The winter months are an absolute nightmare just to get onto market street.		I cannot understand why anyone would want to over populate an area that is already struggling.
918	Marion	Ashworth	-	HS2.107 , ALL.	Object	I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.		I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
1029	Angela	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? -7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
1107	Keith	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. GP services and other related support services are already overstretched and inadequate. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 5. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 6. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 7. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 7.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 7.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 7.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 8. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		
1109	Jane	Gadsby	-		Object	<p>I wholly object to more housing being built in Whitworth!! We are a small(ish) village that can not cope already with the amount of new houses and people moving into it!! Our schools are already over subscribed; they are turning people away that don't live overly far away that a few years ago would have had no problem getting a place. The Doctors surgery can't cope with the number of patients wanting appointments. You are also increasing the risks of flooding. My house is already at risk and has already flooded twice. The main road (one road in and out) is gridlocked most mornings with commuters trying to get out of the village but most of all you are taking our beautiful green areas that Whitworth is so lucky and honoured to have. We have lots of empty properties that can't be filled already!! Please leave us and our village alone!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
1134	Abigail	Leyland	-		Object	WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE HOUSING IN WHITWORTH! The schools are already oversubscribed, our local doctors can not possibly take on any more patients as it is already a struggle to get an appointment currently. We only have one road in and out of the village which gets badly effected by rush hour traffic, making it difficult for the locals to get to work/school etc. We have such a lovely view of greenery surrounding our little village and we do not want our sight ruined by building ugly, unnecessary housing.		
1152	angela	Jordan	-		Object	I do not think whitworth has enough resources to sustain further housing estates .The one and only road is already impossible at peak times,our doctors surgery is bursting with no appointments,and our school children cant get a place at our local school. - The wildlife is also important to whitwoth people but is being pushed further and further out of its natural habitat.		No
1310	Richard	Dolan	-	HS2.101-109	Object	We are vehemently opposed to all housing allocation in Whitworth. Our group has decided to vote against and actively campaign against all Counillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. We will withhold our votes and encourage family, friends, and community to do likewise. - We are outaged by this proposal, especially HS2.107 that will encroach on Healy Dell. On this point we will be contacting the National Trust and other such organisations to make them away of the proposed desecration to the Green Belt. Furthermore, we are now investigating possible financial links between all Councillors, MPs, and RBC employees involved in this issue with the proposed contractors. This senseless proposal for a village far too small to accommodate a possible 300 new homes suggest an ulterior motive. No one in our community that we have spoken to is in favour of this plan and we will use our sizeable influence. - There has been more than enough housing development in Whitworth. This new proposal will destroy our green spaces and necessitate a new schools, doctors' surgery, dentist, shops, and possible a new road. All future housing development must stop. Our community can not accommodate any more. - In light of the fact that this proposal has not been advertised to a great extent (we have spoken to people who know nothing of it), we will be conducting a petition again this proposal and encouraging everyone to sigh the following statement: - We will vote against and actively campaign against all Counillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community.		To reiterate, we will vote against and actively campaign against all Counillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community. - - The people's power will be felt if this plan in authorised.
1363	Gareth	Dolan	-	HS2.101 to 109	Object	I do not live in Whitworth but spend a lot of time there with my family. I am deeply concerned by this proposed loss of green belt and will do my utmost to object against it. - - I strongly urge RBC to re-consider its proposal. Whitworth cannot handle any more development. - - Thanks		If this destruction of the green belt in Whitworth is passed then I shall simply take my family and my money elsewhere as there will no longer be the same attraction Whitworth now offers.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
1417	Gillian	Middlemas	Whitworth Community High School	HS1.102 HS2.103 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	As Headteacher of the only secondary school in the Whitworth area, I am concerned that the proposals to build considerable numbers of new dwellings take no account of educational provision in the local area. - The school is already oversubscribed: for 2017 entry into Y7 over 40 families were unsuccessful in gaining a place, despite Whitworth Community High School being their first preference; over 40 families went onto on the Local Authority's waiting list for a place; over 25 families went to Appeal for a place, and very few of them were successful. The school now has 640 students and, without extra classroom space, has no capacity to increase the admissions number, nor to take additional students into existing year groups. - Likewise, many local primary schools are also full / oversubscribed, suggesting there is insufficient educational provision in the local area already. - This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed number of new dwellings goes ahead, unless the developers or Lancashire County Council are prepared to increase the school's capacity by funding additional classroom / learning / social space. The school is over 50 years old, largely of Langspan pre-tensioned concrete construction (intended life expectancy already exceeded) with HAC (high alumina cement) - In addition, the school experiences ongoing issues with the provision of utilities: the water main up the school drive is at risk of collapse; the water supply to the area has recently been affected on a number of occasions, and presumably further demand from new building would increase these issues. - The proposals for new housing does not appear to be linked to any plans to improve the traffic situation in the Whitworth area: lengthy queues heading towards Rochdale each morning already create issues for students travelling to school.		Whilst it is excellent news that there is demand for additional housing in the Whitworth area, I am particularly concerned about the infrastructure which is essential to support this kind of development. Education, and raising aspirations, is essential to improving the future for our young people and I have concerns regarding school capacity; increased traffic; increased demand on local services generally; impact on provision of utilities; and whether or not this has all been factored into the planning process. The infrastructure needs to be in place before the planning is agreed. I also have concerns about the impact of further building on wildlife, the village ethos, and greenbelt areas.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
1469	George	Salt	-		Object	Whitworth is located in a valley, this in itself presents issues with the amount of space available. 7,500 people lived in Whitworth according to the data from the 2011 Census and this is a large amount of people if you look at the services and infrastructure in Whitworth. To start off with there is one GP surgery that has 7,248 people registered with them. Whitworth Medical Centre has 4 GPs which means that for one GP there are 1,812 people. There is not any more capacity available for more people to register with the practice. - - Schools are also busy especially with just one school for secondary education. With more people living in Whitworth that would mean a greater demand on schools and could result in some children living in Whitworth not going to school there. - - Going back to Whitworth being a valley this physical feature means that infrastructure being put in can be difficult. Whitworth has one road in and out and during peak hours this is a very busy road. Most new people would probably be using a car as their main mode of transport adding more pressure to Market Street and its tributary roads. Public transport is also very poor in Whitworth meaning that it is not really a viable alternative for any new people who would come to Whitworth. - - As shown with a few of these arguments Whitworth does not have the capacity to accommodate an extra 359 houses over the next 15 years. For example an average of 3 people per house would result in 1,077 more people living in Whitworth. It is not going to work.		-
1502	Danielle	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.103	Further comment
1504	Timothy	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	

Number of comments HS2.103

22

Reference HS2.104 Land south of Quarry Street, Shawforth

5	Kimberley	Ashworth	-		Object	I am writing to object against the proposed local plan for Whitworth. - - I am unable to attend the meeting tomorrow night due to illness but I have looked at the proposal as stated below: - - http://www.rossendale.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/3700/whitworth_map_with_street_names - - I'm disappointed to see that a number of green spaces are being considered to build houses on. The green spaces behind Tonacliffe School are used by many for walking. To build on this space would be detrimental to the green space due to wildlife and other conversation in that area. - Building houses would also see an increase in traffic which is at demand during peak times at the moment. - - Other green spaces on the plans are also being considered. In a village that is at full capacity I am unsure why Rossendale Council see the need to build in places that already has adequate housing. - - There are no plans to look at new recreational and family facilities which the town needs. The closure of the children's centre means that new parents and young families have nowhere to go. The plans don't take any such new facility into consideration and I urge Rossendale Council to look at this. - - I know I speak on behalf of many in the Town when I say the option for Whitworth is option 1 'Do nothing' - - Kind regards -	I am extremely disappointed that a meeting has been arranged in Whitworth for tomorrow evening when all the other consultation meetings are taking place in September
---	-----------	----------	---	--	--------	--	---

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
19	Simon	Johnson	-		Object	This can not cope with the amount of cars in this area as it is - the entrance off - the main road is narrow and will not cope with building trucks going up and down -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
27	Michael	Chianca	-		Object	<p>HS2.102 - King Street - HS2.104 - Old Lane - HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens - HS2.105 - Albert Street - HS2.107 Fern Isle Close - HS2.106 Moorland Cres - HS2.109 Horsefield Av - - All these proposed sited are unsuitable for the following reasons. 1. Wildlife - This greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest area at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest itself would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action when we have other areas within Whitworth to build on that would not require the destruction of trees. 3. The local school at both dropping of and collection time around this area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists, Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative affect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. 9. Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" can you explain what those exceptional circumstances are when we have other areas more suitable for building houses on. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental affect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others would be overlooked. 14. As the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including school children. 16. This area and the surrounding area has already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
56	Valerie	McDonald	-		Object	Whilst I recognise the need for further housing within the area, I am concerned about the siting of so many proposed dwellings in this particular valley. The roads are already clogged at rush hour and as there is only one road through, movement of traffic, should there be an accident or roadworks, becomes frustratingly unpredictable. What provision is there to maintain and develop the road system in the valley? - - Whitworth High School has become more popular over the past couple of years with waiting lists existing. What provision will be made to expand the school, and will this be done with a long term objective in mind and not just a sticking plaster effort to put up some portable classrooms? - - Local services such as the Children's Centre have just been lost. What plans may be afoot to reinstate such necessary provision? I feel it is morally wrong to simply build new houses and forget about the infrastructure to support this development. - - There is a wealth of wildlife on the moors where you are proposing to site many homes. Presumably there will be checks in place to ensure some of these species are not endangered? - - Finally, there are already plenty of properties on the market at very affordable prices (in comparison with some surrounding areas). Some of these have been on the market a while? Why, if there is already affordable housing, is there a need to build more? -		-
58	COLIN	SHEPHERD	WHITWORTH -OLD LANE ACTION AND GREEN GROUP		Object	When there is heavy rainfall the rainwater drains and culverts cannot cope and this gets into the sewers and causes problems of raw sewage at 6 and 7 garth edge shawforth. and across the road in the old Red Lion pub - - God knows where the sewage from any other new properties will end up in the insufficient services in our area causing more flooding and sewage leakage on garth edge etc, - - For info please contact United utilities who have a long history of call outs to these premises on old lane		STRONGLY OBJECT
98	Jacqueline	Butterworth	-		Object	I am objecting to proposed development of all the above houses around the Whitworth area. The area is overrun with traffic as it us. One way in and one way out. The schools are overloaded as are the GP surgery. It is inconceivable to build more houses and allowing more traffic to use our roads which are in a terrible state. We are already experiencing burst water pipes and our water pressure has already been reduced. We are experiencing more power cuts since all the new houses have been built on Cowm Park Way . Surely there must be someone in the planning department with some common sense and will prevent any further building of houses in Whitworth		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
131	Christine	Greenwood	-		Object	I am objecting to plans to allow the building of over £350 properties on various sites around Whithworth and Shawforth over the next 15 years. - Not only am I concerned about the building on our greenbelt sites which is part of the attraction of the area. I can understand the wind farm and can support renewable energy sources but not the creation of a collection of housing estates - whether social/affordable or not . The awful collection in Britannia speaks for itself! We have already had several builds across Rossendale but the extra Council Tax revenue does not seem to have brought many benefits to the borough. - As it stands at present the infrastructure can just about support the current residents - schools are already over subscribed and getting an appointment at our one GP surgery is already a mammoth undertaking. Planning to build or reopen a school by any chance? - Traffic is already an issue with one road in and out and a bus service that has to be one of the most unreliable in the surrounding areas ! There are next to no facilities for young people/children and a library fighting to survive so I think that this needs to be given serious consideration before you go ahead.		-
155	Jo	Furtado			Object	HS2.104-Green Belt, and a real Greta Garbo site. The exact location is unclear on the map, because it is difficult to make out the path and boundary markings. Oppose		
188	Paul	Prophet	-		Object	This area is already a flood risk with inadequate drainage.. - Additional housing would cause increased flooding and cause sewerage to affect properties at the base of Garth Edge.. - This area cannot cope with additional houses with the current infrastructure..		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
195	Janet	King	-	HS.102, HS2.104-9 inclusive	Object	Whitworth' infrastructure cannot support almost 400 new properties - it is already nigh impossible to obtain a doctors appointment and my father has had to wait iver 6 months to obtain a podiatry appointment as there is only one who has been on long term sick and no replacement cover available. The fact that there is only one main arterial road into and out of Whitworth, which already has weekly road works delaying the already totally congested road does not bear thinking about. With an extra 400 properties and the increase in traffic that these will bring and as there is no large employer in the area most of these occupants will be commuting one way or another. We lost access to an A&E in Rochdale and now the nearest is either Fairfield or Oldham with the additional traffic these proposals would create the congested roads Could be catastrophic in an emergency. - - On a personal note, my family moved to Whitworth 12 years ago, from Oldham, due to its naturally beautiful countryside and I see the addition of these properties into areas of greenery (extending Wallbank estate etc.,) is the very short end of the stick. I can see that if these are accepted, encroaching on to green belt areas, slowly but surely the green belt areas will get smaller and smaller until eventually Whitworth just becomes another concrete plot with ever creaking infrastructure. - - Finally, I understand the need for affordable housing but there are plenty of mills/brown field that could be developed. However, I feel strongly that before any proposals are accepted it is of the utmost importance that the infrastructure is in place to support them, that includes roads, schools and NHS access.		-
222	Lynne	Corey	-		Object	- - Access to the site is bad roads already in poor state . The facilities in the area are already to capacity. This would spoil an area which has been improved over the years by the coal board.		- - - - There is no shortage of houses in the valley.
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	This is an unbelievable plan that will stretch amenities in the area even further. - - The new estate near Cowm has already increased traffic congestion on the one road in and out of the village and schools are already struggling to cope. - - There is also the issue of wildlife and the impact it will have on their environment. - - I for one will be leaving if this idiotic plan goes through. -		This smells of greed over common sense

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
268	Michaela	Radford	-		Object	Whitworth has had numerous instances recently regarding the roadworks for the infrastructure repair and maintenance. As an employee of all 4 major utility asset owners in the area, I am very concerned regarding the houses proposed. We only have one road throughout the valley and this is impacted severly when roadworks are planned. My concerns are that these are not managed correctly by LCC at present, therefore; more houses and more infrastructure would have a massive impact on the people living in the village. People face unemployment now due to the frequent issues we face getting into work. - Not to mention over crowded schools and doctors as we stand at present. - - I request, here in writing, to be informed of any planned meetings regarding the houses in whitworth and notification be sent in writing to my address above.		
297	Lindsay	Fairhurst			Object	<p>Poor access along the length of Main Rd (Market Street) one narrow road lined with parked cars , as only access into & out of whitworth. No alternative route.</p> <p>No trains or trams. Buses won't must travel on same one access road both in and out as cars.</p> <p>No motorway access under 20 min journey both ways</p> <p>insufficient work in area means people must travel to Manchester, leeds, bury, Rochdale etc.</p> <p>Current public transport unrealistic.</p> <p>Traffic at peak times currently gridlocked & congested.</p> <p>Increased housing will add to this burden.</p> <p>Utilities infrastructure unable to cope currently leading to repeated remedial roadworks.</p> <p>Schools full</p> <p>Doctors full</p> <p>Rossendale Council Lancashire Council needs to address transport & roadways access + education access beofer building homkes where people will be unable to travel to employment and school</p>		
298	Andrew	Fairhurst			Object	the number of houses proposed in this local plan for infrastructure can support. Whitworth has only one road in abd out and already this is constantly being dug up by utility companies often resulting in temporary traffic lights that cause massives queues of traffic in rush hours. Not only is the road narrow and conjested but there is no alternative train service - only the bus (on the same road) This is totall useless for the number of people wo commute to Manchester, Oldham and Bury every working day. Our schools, doctors and dentists are already close to capacity. There are very few options to travel to other facilities apart from along the one road through the valley.		Without robust and achievable plans to increase the support infrastructure for travel (a train for example) and health and education and culture this building should not go ahead. For people to afford these houses they need jobs first. Currently you need to move out of the valley to commute to work. Regeneration of the area and existing housing stock should come first.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
590		Ashworth			Object	Absolutely ridiculous One way in and out of whitworth no extra schools or doctors when you have two or three cars per household. This is ruining our villages. We strongly object to this. Listen to the people who vote you in, as we have long memories		
754	debra	lee	-		Object	loss of developed wildlife habitat, trees, - added pressure to current infrastructure schools,roads, dentists - - landscaping has a land survey been done?? already floods and issues with sewerwage and drains further building would exacerbate these known issues		-
755	ROCKIE	LEE	-	OLD LANE	Object	A GREN BELT SITE WITH ALREADY INVESTED MONEY BY THE COUNCIL TO PROVIDE WILDLIFE HABITAT AND TREES IF BUILT UPON WOULD ALL GO TO WASTE. - - HOUSES ON THIS SITE WOULD ADD TO THE ALREADY PROBLEMATIC SEWARGE AND WATER DRAIN ISSUES OF THE AREA THAT IS ALREADY PRONE TO FLOODING AND ISSUES, THE SITE IS ON A HILLSIDE THAT POTENTIALLY COULD BE PRONE TO LANDSLIDING DOWN - HAS A FULL LAND SURVEY BEEN DONE INTO THE PRACTICALITIES OF THIS?? - - WOULD JUST ADD TO THE ALREADY STRETCH AMMENITIES SCHOOL DENTISTS ROAD WAYS		-
773	Susan	Worrall	-		Object	Whitworth is a village, a small community. Building these housing developments will change Whitworth into a town. - There is not the infrastructure to support this additional housing. There is one road in and out of Whitworth which is already struggling to cope with the increasing volume of traffic.Especially at peak times. If there are any traffic disruptions it can take 1-2 hours to get to Rochdale . We do not need more cars and the pollution they bring! - - There are limited school places both secondary and primary and local children born in the village will struggle to get places. - The one and only GP practice can not manage to provide the necessary health care for patients with no appointments pre bookable for weeks in advance. This healthcare will be diluted further. Living in Whitworth if A&E treatment is required which is often a life or death situation your chances of survival are reduced add more traffic on market street and your chance of survival diminishes further - - The people who live in Whitworth , live here because it is a village , it is quiet and the countryside is on the door step. Yet the plans want to destroy the village life, increase demands on existing services and increase pollution - - To consider building on greenbelt land in Whitworth is unbelievable and irresponsible, Planning has already - spoil the view of the countryside at the side of Daneswood ave and the wind farms are also affecting the views and countryside. - - Whitworth has lots of wildlife from deer, owls, herons, wild ponies as well as lots of insect life butterflies, bees etc which will all be at risk if the countryside is used for housing. - - There is empty housing all over the borough - fill these , not build more especially in our little village -		Stop putting profits first and put existing residents first

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
803	Marietta	Galbraith	-		Object	My objections for the proposed building of housing on the above sites is based on a number of reasons: - 1. Infrastructure. The current housing situation is already at (possibly beyond) capacity with regards to schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists, employment and traffic. There are no more schools planned and no way to expand the ones already here. Some children have to travel miles to schools out of the area due to oversubscribed local schools. This is the same for doctor's surgeries and many other amenities. - 2. Traffic. There is one main road in and out of Whitworth that already has issues with raised levels of traffic. In the four years we have lived here, there have been many occasions where traffic has been an issue due to constant roadworks (for various reasons relating to increased housing and traffic) which has caused major problems. Also, most people are employed outside of Whitworth so traffic is high anyway. More housing would increase this issue with no solution being given as to how it could be rectified. - 3. Utilities. More and more power cuts have been happening recently in Whitworth due to new housing as well as burst water pipes and problems with drainage. This has contributed to the traffic issues with roads having to be dug up every few weeks to 'fix' the problem. - 4. More housing would mean taking up land that is natural drainage for flooding. Recently, my area was put into the 'flood risk' category (although we haven't flooded), significantly increasing my home insurance. If more homes are built, this would increase risk of flooding to many homes around Whitworth, which would cause loss of market value and would reduce the chances of being able to sell the property. - 5. Much of the 'green land' would be lost which is detrimental to the wildlife around Whitworth. The Government have a duty to protect greenbelt land and our environment! The carbon footprint would be horrific! - In conclusion, building over 300 houses in Whitworth would cause issues beyond repair! Environment, traffic, pollution, infrastructure, drainage etc. would all be dramatically affected in the most negative and damaging way. Whitworth was not meant for so much housing and so many people.		-
886	Michael	Banham	-	HS2.102 to HS2.109	Object	The infrastructure of whitworth is over stretched as it is,the school's cannot cater for such an undertaking. Theres only one road in or out of whitworth any problems on this road causes absolute mayhem. The winter months are an absolute nightmare just to get onto market street.		I cannot understand why anyone would want to over populate an area that is already struggling.
889	Derek	Lord	-	HS 102, HS105, HS104, HS106, HS107, HS108, HS109.	Object	We in Whitworth are sure that there are enough houses here at the present time.There are large estates at Cowm Park, Tonacliffe, Wain Gap, Wallbank, Knot Hill, Orama Mill Site, Edgemoor Close, and a small estate at Facit. The exits onto the one main road are at present full of traffic. The Doctors, Schools etc are now at bursting point. We in Whitworth have done our share in housing. Please think again before building any more. Thank You. -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
892	Mandy	Sanderson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105,HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The transport system around Whitworth cannot cope with the volume of traffic . Also local amenities are already at braking point..		No
902	sean	campbell	-		Object	There is no sufficient access and egress to the proposed site. During rush hour it is often difficult to exit coppice drive and during adverse weather such as snow, gritting is not sufficient, you therefore have to leave your car along market street. The two local schools, Tonnacliffe and Whitworth High are currently oversubscribed, Whitworth High last year for example was oversubscribed by 140 applicants for 600 places. - The current amenities, GP surgery, dentist, post office, pharmacist would be unable to support an increase in personnel, the impact on roads, local infrastructure and amenities will be disastrous to the village and is totally unacceptable,		no
913	Michelle	Ashcroft	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108 & HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a geographical challenge at the best of times, positioned in a valley, consisting of ONE main road with multiple roads stemming from this leading to many properties that are built on the hillside. There are many green areas which are used by local farmers for their livestock. During times of heavy rain many of the roads are flooded, and during winter many roads are very dangerous in the snow. It is not uncommon for Whitworth to be gridlocked as there are far too many cars on the roads, all it needs is one set of road works and the town becomes inaccessible. The local schools are now over subscribed, the High school has had to turn away many children who only live a couple of miles away. The primary schools are also subscribed making it very difficult for teachers to provide a good education to the children. The local doctors are unable to cope with the number of patients, trying to get a same day appointment is nigh on impossible these days. We have issues with anti social behaviour due to lack of amenities available for teenagers, the local youth club has been closed down. There is a lack of police presence (the PSCO tries her best), people don't feel as safe as they should. The library is still under threat of closure, the pool is only open because of the people of Whitworth who run it. Building more houses brings more people, more cars, more strain on the infrastructure. I appreciate housing is needed but the number of houses that has been suggested will bring this town to it's knees.		I would suggest you come to Whitworth during the morning school run and see how difficult it is around Horsefield Avenue. Come sit in the traffic jams during rush hour. - - The government has spoken about creating new towns, this is a great idea, there are places that can accommodate thousands and thousands of houses. Build there not here!!!
916	Jane	Trudgeon	-	HS2.102 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	We are already an overstretched village infrastructure, the roads would not cope with an extra amount of traffic and would make the already difficult commute to exit/enter the village impossible. There are not enough schools nor would the doctor's surgery be able to cope as even now it is almost impossible to get a reasonable appointment time, - - The housing developments would impact on wildlife		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
918	Marion	Ashworth	-	HS2.107 , ALL.	Object	I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.		I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.
935	Christine	Fallon		HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	1 Whitworth has one main road which is often gridlocked the smaller access roads are grossly un suitable e.g Tonacliffe. - 2 Schools are already oversubscribed parking at drop off times would be more chaotic and dangerous. - 3 Doctors and dentists are already at capacity. - 4 Services of gas electricity and water would require major upgrade. - 5 We are seeing flooding due to inadequate drainage this would be increased. - 6 Is this acceptable use of greenbelt land where previous planning permission has been refused the effect on wildlife and trees would be immense.		-
939	Geoffrey	Fallon	-	HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a small village with one already inadequate road. Doctors dentists and schools are already oversubscribed parking in school areas is dangerous already and would be far worse. - Gas electricity and water services would need major upgrade. - This is inappropriate use of greenbelt land causing damage to wildlife and the environment drainage is a major problem now with frequent flooding.		-
955	Janet	Whitehead	-	HS2.102, HS2.104,HS2.10 5, HS2.106,HS2.10 7, HS2.108,HS2.10 9	Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village, oversubscribed schools and Doctors - We have one road in and one road out which is almost impossible during peak times in the morning - The houses already exceed the heights up the sides of the valley - Our green belt is very important to wildlife and the the people the live here - If we let one builder onto greenbelt it opens the doors to far too many others - Our population is big enough and we cannot accommodate many more		- Our Councillors are voted in by us and now need to stand up and fight for us - - 400 houses is a ridiculous amount of new houses for a tiny village - - We have had 2 different sites where new houses have been built in recent years we've done our bit for Government figures - - Please find somewhere else
962	Kathryn	Gill	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2104, HS2106, HS2107, HS2108, HS2109	Object	I object to any changes in use of local greenbelt land to build houses. Also, there is only one road through Whitworth and it is already congested. We have only 1 doctors surgery, and not enough school places to accommodate hundreds of additional families. Greenbelt land cannot be restored once built on, and these proposals would change the landscape of Whitworth. I am also concerned about the building of 20 properties around Cowm. This is a resource continually used for recreation by the people of Whitworth and should be preserved.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
979	Marie	Pye	-		Object	All of these developments will contribute to already existing traffic problems as there is one road in and one road out of the area. The high school is already oversubscribed with local children not being offered places.		-
992	Susan	Farrell		HS2: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109	Object	I strongly object to the building of houses on all the above mentioned sites for the following reasons: - Greenbelt land is of importance to all the wildlife of Whitworth and Shawforth . Deer and bats live in the forests in the area. Many badgers and foxes inhabit the countryside and rare species of wildlife live in the ponds. - The forest area at Tonacliffe would be cut down having a negative impact on the environment. - Tonacliffe road is already dangerous for children with cars parked along the length of the road at school dropping off and picking up time. The increased number of cars if more houses were built in the area would be worse for the children and residents. - Local amenities such as dentists and GPs could not cope with the increased population. It is almost impossible at the moment to get a GP appointment in less than two weeks. More housing would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Whitworth and Shawforth. - Facilities such as water, gas and electricity are already stretched and a major upgrade of the infrastructure would be required to support increased housing. - Local drainage cannot cope with the current usage. More housing could have an impact on flooding. - Public footpaths could be lost reducing the number of rights of way for walkers. - The road network both ways from Rochdale to Bacup is already gridlocked. More housing would put an increased strain on traffic and the already poor public transport in the area. - The only high school in the area is already oversubscribed. With increased housing parents may have even less chance of a first choice school for their children. They may have to travel miles to school. - I understood it is government policy to protect Greenbelt land except for 'Exceptional Circumstances'. What are the exceptional circumstances that enable housing to be built on the greenbelt land in Whitworth and Shawforth?		Summary - - Whitworth and Shawforth are already busy villages with oversubscribed schools and GP services with one road in and out between Rochdale and Bacup. - - Can we accommodate more housing that will put pressure on already overstretched amenities, increase traffic and change the beautiful landscape forever?
1000	carol	Thomson	-		Object	I object to the amount of houses that will be built affecting the countryside. Are there any more schools being built to accommodate?		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1029	Angela	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2 108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? -7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1107	Keith	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. GP services and other related support services are already overstretched and inadequate. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 5. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 6. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 7. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 7.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 7.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 7.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 8. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		-
1109	Jane	Gadsby	-		Object	<p>I wholly object to more housing being built in Whitworth!! We are a small(ish) village that can not cope already with the amount of new houses and people moving into it!! Our schools are already over subscribed; they are turning people away that don't live overly far away that a few years ago would have had no problem getting a place. The Doctors surgery can't cope with the number of patients wanting appointments. You are also increasing the risks of flooding. My house is already at risk and has already flooded twice. The main road (one road in and out) is gridlocked most mornings with commuters trying to get out of the village but most of all you are taking our beautiful green areas that Whitworth is so lucky and honoured to have. We have lots of empty properties that can't be filled already!! Please leave us and our village alone!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1118	Gary	Calderbank	-		Object	<p>There are a great number of reasons why Whitworth township should not be blighted with further development, particularly on land which has been designated as green belt for a large number of years. I wish to summarise these as below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Traffic - Whitworth is served by one road from both the north and south and is a major arterial route to people accessing the m62 and surrounding towns from the valley, Burnley and beyond. It is therefore very busy all of the time without even considering the effect of increasing local traffic even further. This route is regularly disrupted as a result of failing infrastructure resulting in severe delays and tailbacks. - - Schools - The existing schools in the town are already over subscribed and there is no capacity for further children without again significant development of schools. The road where I live is already gridlocked by vehicles dropping off children twice a day, illegally parked and causing obstructions. In relation to developments at Tonacliffe and Horsefield the thought of construction traffic too would be completely unmanageable and dangerous. Further development would exacerbate the problem. - - Policing - Whitworth already suffers from insufficient community policing resulting in many issues which do not get resolved, from burglary to bad behaviour and fly tipping. The town can not afford a further increase of population on this scale bringing with it its percentage of problems. - - Planning Policy - Brown Field Sites - Whitworth and the valley in general is a town built on industrial heritage and just like other cities should be primarily developing brownfield developments not green belt. There are many derelict spaces which can be developed to improve the area whilst providing suitable additional housing. There is no real justification for building on moorland in lieu of this. - - Construction Difficulties - Much of Whitworth moorland is unsuitable to build on, primarily due to poor access to the developments earmarked, mine shafts, poorly drained ground, sloping sites, poor infrastructure, marshland and biodiversity issues. - - Biodiversity - The land surrounding Whitworth is a haven for many wild animals which can be seen on a daily basis. From our house we can regularly observe, a family of foxes, badgers, deer, birds of prey, pipistrelle bats, cows, horses and sheep. This is a gift without price. - - Infrastructure - We regularly have power cuts, water bursts and the A671 is constantly being dug up as existing services are updated resulting in major delays. The drains in our road are currently running 24/7 as a result of water run off off the moors even when it has not rained for a number of days. When it does rain the water backs up out of the covers as the drains are undersize and cannot cope. This would be totally unsuitable for further development, especially considering a greater amount of hard surfacing. 	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1134	Abigail	Leyland	-		Object	WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE HOUSING IN WHITWORTH! The schools are already oversubscribed, our local doctors can not possibly take on any more patients as it is already a struggle to get an appointment currently. We only have one road in and out of the village which gets badly effected by rush hour traffic, making it difficult for the locals to get to work/school etc. We have such a lovely view of greenery surrounding our little village and we do not want our sight ruined by building ugly, unnecessary housing.		
1152	angela	Jordan	-		Object	I do not think whitworth has enough resources to sustain further housing estates .The one and only road is already impossible at peak times,our doctors surgery is bursting with no appointments,and our school children cant get a place at our local school. - The wildlife is also important to whitwoth people but is being pushed further and further out of its natural habitat.		
1166	Brendan	Doherty	-	HS2, 102,104,108,105 ,107,106,109.	Object	WHITWORTH IS FULL. This statement encapsulates all the issues surrounding any expansion of dwelling houses in the township of Whitworth. - - The negative impact of any developments in the town cannot be overstated. - - The whole nature of this small township will be irreversibly destroyed if development are allowed. - - Flora and fauna will be the first to suffer. This valley is home to an exceptional and expanding variety of animals and trees and flowers. This growth has taken decades to achieve and would by totally reversed by the stroke of a pen. - - To say that all the ingredients which go to make up Whitworth as a place for people to live are overloaded is indeed an understatement. - - Congestion of traffic and people is at its limit, any increase can only be detrimental to the health and quality of life of residents. - - Local services, schools, doctors, civic amenities are already at their serviceable optimum. - - The existing utilities of electricity,gas and water only just maintain service. There are often cuts in these making it seem that we are a third world town. - - Whitworth is a linear town with no bypass or possibility of such. Most of the day traffic is heavy and at peak times chaotic. This combined with the nature of HGV traffic leaves the roads in constant need of repair. Add a very poor public transport system and the certain increases proposed then the result is guaranteed to be disastrous.		Listen to the people of Whitworth.
1190	Nathan	Worrall	-	HS2.107 , HS2.108, HS2.109, HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104,HS2.10 6	Object	Whitworth doesn't have the infrastructure to sustain the construction of these new houses. The local doctors and schools would struggle to meet the needs of the increased population. There is bad traffic in Whitworth already, this will only make it worse and these traffic problems are highlighted when there are roadworks and there are large queues. The proposed sites are located on greenbelt land, and this will have a negative effect on the local wildlife as well as destroying the natural beauty of this land.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1272	Michala	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS102.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	I am objecting in general to the proposed house building in various sites around Whitworth and specifically in relation to the proposed sites t Tonacliffe. My objections are based on a number of reasons: 1. Wildlife in the local area. Deer, badgers, foxes and hares live within the forest areas. Rare protected newts live in the pond. Bats nest in the forest. The importance in f this green belt land for the wildlife cannot be over emphasised. - 2. Tonacliffe forest would need to be cut down adversely affecting the local environment. - 3. The impact of more cars around local schools, especially Tonacliffe School, is of great concern due to the already high volume of traffic. Increasing this would be unacceptable. - 4. Local amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already to capacity. I have concerns that more houses will have a negative impact on the lives of current residents in relation to these amenities. - 5. Has the infrastructure of our small village been considered in relation to electricity, gas and water supply if more houses are built? Whitworth already experiences power cuts and seems to be worse since other recent building developments have been completed. - 6. The road network into Rochdale is already gridlocked. More houses will increase this problem. Public transport from Whitworth is limited to buses and I consider that if this proposed building goes ahead there will also be a negative impact on the poor public transport in and out of our village. - 7. Local drainage already struggles to cope with usage now, if the volume of residents increases would the drainage system be able to deal with the added strain? - 8. We bought our property because it is located on the last cul de sac of a small estate with no through traffic. This proposed building work will completely alter this into drive through roads. Plus the volume of traffic will - Increase which I consider to be unacceptable. - 9. I am very concerned that we may have loss of privacy as we are not currently overlooked and this was a major consideration when we bought our house.	-	
1283	Jonathan	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	Whitworths infrastructure is already at near full capacity. The single main road through Whitworth is, at times, grid-locked. Streets around the primary schools is chaotic. There is a definite flood issue through the valley. Chime is rising unchallenged. The rich and diverse wildlife is flourishing around Whitworth. - Any of the development projects would have a negative and detrimental implication on Whitworth and it's residents.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1298	Carol	Williams	-		Object	Same as HS2.109 without the cars and traffic relating to the local school		I believe the council is going against the Government policies on planning and green belt conservation - - A high level of protection should be given to most valued landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - I object to the policy itself and the proposed housing developments on individual sites mentioned namely HS2.109 Horsefield Avenue, HS2.106 Moorland Crescent, HS2.102 king Street and HS2.104 Quarry Street
1310	Richard	Dolan	-	HS2.101-109	Object	We are vehemently opposed to all housing allocation in Whitworth. Our group has decided to vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. We will withhold our votes and encourage family, friends, and community to do likewise. - We are outraged by this proposal, especially HS2.107 that will encroach on Healy Dell. On this point we will be contacting the National Trust and other such organisations to make them away of the proposed desecration to the Green Belt. Furthermore, we are now investigating possible financial links between all Councillors, MPs, and RBC employees involved in this issue with the proposed contractors. This senseless proposal for a village far too small to accommodate a possible 300 new homes suggest an ulterior motive. No one in our community that we have spoken to is in favour of this plan and we will use our sizeable influence. - There has been more than enough housing development in Whitworth. This new proposal will destroy our green spaces and necessitate a new schools, doctors' surgery, dentist, shops, and possible a new road. All future housing development must stop. Our community can not accommodate any more. - In light of the fact that this proposal has not been advertised to a great extent (we have spoken to people who know nothing of it), we will be conducting a petition again this proposal and encouraging everyone to sigh the following statement: - We will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community.		To reiterate, we will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community. - - The people's power will be felt if this plan in authorised.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1336	Maureen	O'Mara	-	HS2.102,105,104,106,107,108,109	Object	Whitworth is already struggling with oversubscribed schools. There is only 1 small GP surgery and 1 dentist. The village cannot cope with stretching the existing amenities. - One of the main objections I have is the traffic and parking, which is already dire. Streets are almost impossible to drive down safely due to double parking. There is only one main road, which when closed for any reason means driving via Todmorden to get around - this has happened on a number of occasions. Most roads have very steep inclines which are regularly not gritted in winter. To increase parking and traffic would destroy Whitworth. Where would access roads be and how would this affect current residents.		
1363	Gareth	Dolan	-	HS2.101 to 109	Object	I do not live in Whitworth but spend a lot of time there with my family. I am deeply concerned by this proposed loss of green belt and will do my utmost to object against it. - - I strongly urge RBC to re-consider its proposal. Whitworth cannot handle any more development. - - Thanks		If this destruction of the green belt in Whitworth is passed then I shall simply take my family and my money elsewhere as there will no longer be the same attraction Whitworth now offers.
1365	Michael	Whitehead	-		Object	The doctors is overcrowded, the schools are overcrowded and there is one road in and out. All three of the mentioned cannot cope in the current state. Whitworth has too many houses for the current infrastructure. If the proposal goes through, which I sincerely hope it does not, there will be 300+ more homes within Whitworth. This means 650+ more people needing a doctor, 300+ more children who need schools and 300+ more cars on the roads. If the current infrastructure is struggling I dread to think how the village would end up with that amount of extra people. - There are also many deer which have recently returned to the greenbelt land on either side of the valley. Moving any sort of greenbelt/urban borders is highly likely to destroy their habitat and force them away.		-
1397	John	Cavanagh			Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1398	Joshua	Hopwood Mairs		Albert Mill	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve
1402	JOANNE	WHITWORTH -		Quarry street	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. -		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling with make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth who have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for now and for our future generations.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1405	GARETH	WHITWORTH	-	Quarry street	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for our children and our childrens children.
1417	Gillian	Middlemas	Whitworth Community High School	HS1.102 HS2.103 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	As Headteacher of the only secondary school in the Whitworth area, I am concerned that the proposals to build considerable numbers of new dwellings take no account of educational provision in the local area. - The school is already oversubscribed: for 2017 entry into Y7 over 40 families were unsuccessful in gaining a place, despite Whitworth Community High School being their first preference; over 40 families went onto on the Local Authority's waiting list for a place; over 25 families went to Appeal for a place, and very few of them were successful. The school now has 640 students and, without extra classroom space, has no capacity to increase the admissions number, nor to take additional students into existing year groups. - Likewise, many local primary schools are also full / oversubscribed, suggesting there is insufficient educational provision in the local area already. - This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed number of new dwellings goes ahead, unless the developers or Lancashire County Council are prepared to increase the school's capacity by funding additional classroom / learning / social space. The school is over 50 years old, largely of Langspan pre-tensioned concrete construction (intended life expectancy already exceeded) with HAC (high alumina cement) - In addition, the school experiences ongoing issues with the provision of utilities: the water main up the school drive is at risk of collapse; the water supply to the area has recently been affected on a number of occasions, and presumably further demand from new building would increase these issues. - The proposals for new housing does not appear to be linked to any plans to improve the traffic situation in the Whitworth area: lengthy queues heading towards Rochdale each morning already create issues for students travelling to school.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1420	Julie	bower	-	Quarry street	Object	<p>I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate???</p> <p>Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. - This already over saturated with people for the small community resources there are. - There is not enough road space, and only a little amount of moorland available. We try to encourage our young in the community to go outside and be 'heathy'. There won't be anywhere left. I find the lack of advertising this proposal unacceptable. There are many more areas of fields elsewhere. Why add to an over exhausted community already? I dont understand why Whitworth has to be the target for this.</p>		<p>Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve. It isn't alot but it is valued and appreciated beyond your knowledge or understanding - all of these below would be affected adversely. - - Wildlife - Loss of trees - The local school - Landscaping - - Local amenities - Infrastructure - - - We deserve our voices to be heard.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1440	Helen	Banham	-	HS2.104 - Old Lane	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1452	vikki	Megram			Object	<p>unbearable strain on this network.</p> <p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. - 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. - 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. - 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. - 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? - 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. - 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1469	George	Salt	-		Object	Whitworth is located in a valley, this in itself presents issues with the amount of space available. 7,500 people lived in Whitworth according to the data from the 2011 Census and this is a large amount of people if you look at the services and infrastructure in Whitworth. To start off with there is one GP surgery that has 7,248 people registered with them. Whitworth Medical Centre has 4 GPs which means that for one GP there are 1,812 people. There is not any more capacity available for more people to register with the practice. - - Schools are also busy especially with just one school for secondary education. With more people living in Whitworth that would mean a greater demand on schools and could result in some children living in Whitworth not going to school there. - - Going back to Whitworth being a valley this physical feature means that infrastructure being put in can be difficult. Whitworth has one road in and out and during peak hours this is a very busy road. Most new people would probably be using a car as their main mode of transport adding more pressure to Market Street and its tributary roads. Public transport is also very poor in Whitworth meaning that it is not really a viable alternative for any new people who would come to Whitworth. - - As shown with a few of these arguments Whitworth does not have the capacity to accommodate an extra 359 houses over the next 15 years. For example an average of 3 people per house would result in 1,077 more people living in Whitworth. It is not going to work.		
1497	Wendy	Rose	-	South Quarry	Object	The infrastructure of Whitworth cannot support or sustain further development. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth. Congestion is a serious problem now due to the volume of traffic. When there are roadworks the situation is bordering on dangerous as emergency vehicles are hindered. Further residential development would only compound this issue with higher levels of vehicles. - - Power cuts are a regular occurrence in this area, one can only assume this would get worse with the extent of the proposed developments - - Doctors surgeries are fully to capacity and cannot adequately serve the community at the moment. Waiting times for appointments is ludicrous. Schools are over subscribed. Parking around schools is dangerous and any increase in school children would seriously impact on this. - - All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - - Proposed land in some cases is not viable as parts are prone to flooding. Culverts running through a proposed sight would impact on flood defences in the area. - - -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1502	Danielle	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	
1504	Timothy	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1505	Pat	Stewart	na		Object	<p>I object to all the listed sites in whitworth. - - HS2.102 - King Street, HS2.104 - Old Lane, HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens, - HS2.105 - Albert Street, HS2.107 Fern Isle Close, HS2.106 - Moorland Cres, - HS2.109 - Horsefield Av - - 1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in</p>		Please can you inform me of how many people object to the whitworth sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
						<p>the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - - Plus please note - - Human Rights Act - Responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, - In particular - Protocol 1, Article 1. - This states that "a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land." - Additionally, Article 8 - The Human Rights Act states that "a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life." - - In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1538	Mike	Burgess			Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
					unbearable strain on this network.			<p>accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
								<p>footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - DON'T FORGET EACH ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CAN PUT IN THEIR OWN OBJECTION FORM TO THE BUILDING WORK. Extract from the Governments Planning Policy Statement - Protection and Enhancement of the Environment 17. The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. Those with national and international designations should receive the highest level of protection. 18. The condition of our surroundings has a direct impact on the quality of life and the conservation and improvement of the natural and built environment brings social and economic benefit for local communities. Planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design, conservation and the provision of public space. 19. Plan policies and planning decisions should be based on: –up-to-date information on the environmental characteristics of the area; – the</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
								<p>potential impacts, positive as well as negative, on the environment of development proposals (whether direct, indirect, cumulative, long-term or short-term); and, – recognition of the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage. Planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, planning authorities and developers should consider possible mitigation measures. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. In line with the UK sustainable development strategy, environmental costs should fall on those who impose them – the “polluter pays” principle.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1545	Robert	Hesten		SHLAA16026	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whltworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam. Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
						<p>flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
1546	Sandra	Hesten		SHLAA16026	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam.</p> <p>Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
						<p>flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.104	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		
1744	Keren	Szelesi		Old Lane	Object	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Infrastructure is already at breaking point in this area. 2) Road system, water supply, medical centre, schools are at full capacity. 3) Encroach on green spaces. 4) Whitworth will no longer be a village but an urban sprawl. 		Not enough publicity has been given regarding these proposals.
Number of comments		HS2.104				66		
Reference		HS2.105		Albert Mill, Whitworth				
15	Mike	Royds	-		Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 2. The current road network cannot cope with the level of traffic now and will be extremely dangerous if substantial re-design, sight lines etc are noe carried out. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
24	Erica	Preston	-	HS2.105, HS. 107, HS2. 108, HS2.109	Object	The single road through the valley is not up to the volume of traffic using it currently. Hall St.will be a blocked junction, as will Tonacliffe Road. There are not the amenities in the area eg.doctors, dentists, schools etc. Unless major investment in the valley is made to update amenities and utilities these developments will cause immense problems and destroy the reasons people want to live here and turn the valley into yet another sprawling suburb. - I have every sympathy for the need for housing but feel the proposals are ill thought out and will lead to a detrimental effect on the township.		The need for housing must be weighed against the needs of the valley as a whole and destroying green belt and valued wildlife habitat will not make it a place people want to live.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
27	Michael	Chianca	-		Object	<p>HS2.102 - King Street - HS2.104 - Old Lane - HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens - HS2.105 - Albert Street - HS2.107 Fern Isle Close - HS2.106 Moorland Cres - HS2.109 Horsefield Av - - All these proposed sited are unsuitable for the following reasons. 1. Wildlife - This greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest area at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest itself would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action when we have other areas within Whitworth to build on that would not require the destruction of trees. 3. The local school at both dropping of and collection time around this area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists, Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative affect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. 9. Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" can you explain what those exceptional circumstances are when we have other areas more suitable for building houses on. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental affect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others would be overlooked. 14. As the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including school children. 16. This area and the surrounding area has already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
32	Paula	McNinch	-		Object	There is not the infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with extra housing. The road in and out is already too busy, the schools are full and there are no facilities for young people.		-
56	Valerie	McDonald	-		Object	Whilst I recognise the need for further housing within the area, I am concerned about the siting of so many proposed dwellings in this particular valley. The roads are already clogged at rush hour and as there is only one road through, movement of traffic, should there be an accident or roadworks, becomes frustratingly unpredictable. What provision is there to maintain and develop the road system in the valley? - - Whitworth High School has become more popular over the past couple of years with waiting lists existing. What provision will be made to expand the school, and will this be done with a long term objective in mind and not just a sticking plaster effort to put up some portable classrooms? - - Local services such as the Children's Centre have just been lost. What plans may be afoot to reinstate such necessary provision? I feel it is morally wrong to simply build new houses and forget about the infrastructure to support this development. - - There is a wealth of wildlife on the moors where you are proposing to site many homes. Presumably there will be checks in place to ensure some of these species are not endangered? - - Finally, there are already plenty of properties on the market at very affordable prices (in comparison with some surrounding areas). Some of these have been on the market a while? Why, if there is already affordable housing, is there a need to build more? -		-
98	Jacqueline	Butterworth	-		Object	I am objecting to proposed development of all the above houses around the Whitworth area. The area is overrun with traffic as it us. One way in and one way out. The schools are overloaded as are the GP surgery. It is inconceivable to build more houses and allowing more traffic to use our roads which are in a terrible state. We are already experiencing burst water pipes and our water pressure has already been reduced. We are experiencing more power cuts since all the new houses have been built on Cowm Park Way . Surely there must be someone in the planning department with some common sense and will prevent any further building of houses in Whitworth		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
131	Christine	Greenwood	-		Object	I am objecting to plans to allow the building of over £350 properties on various sites around Whitiworth and Shawforth over the next 15 years. - Not only am I concerned about the building on our greenbelt sites which is part of the attraction of the area. I can understand the wind farm and can support renewable energy sources but not the creation of a collection of housing estates - whether social/affordable or not . The awful collection in Britannia speaks for itself! We have already had several builds across Rossendale but the extra Council Tax revenue does not seem to have brought many benefits to the borough. - As it stands at present the infrastructure can just about support the current residents - schools are already over subscribed and getting an appointment at our one GP surgery is already a mammoth undertaking. Planning to build or reopen a school by any chance? - Traffic is already an issue with one road in and out and a bus service that has to be one of the most unreliable in the surrounding areas ! There are next to no facilities for young people/children and a library fighting to survive so I think that this needs to be given serious consideration before you go ahead.		-
155	Jo	Furtado			Support	HS2.105 - most people in Whitworth are relieved that Albert Mill has been demolished, and are not unhappy about the fact that housing will be built on the land released, for all that they have broad reservations about the issues raised above [see LT1 and General comments]; and a hope that access from the site to the main road has been carefully thought through - it's quite some rise. Support.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
195	Janet	King	-	HS.102, HS2.104-9 inclusive	Object	Whitworth' infrastructure cannot support almost 400 new properties - it is already nigh impossible to obtain a doctors appointment and my father has had to wait iver 6 months to obtain a podiatry appointment as there is only one who has been on long term sick and no replacement cover available. The fact that there is only one main arterial road into and out of Whitworth, which already has weekly road works delaying the already totally congested road does not bear thinking about. With an extra 400 properties and the increase in traffic that these will bring and as there is no large employer in the area most of these occupants will be commuting one way or another. We lost access to an A&E in Rochdale and now the nearest is either Fairfield or Oldham with the additional traffic these proposals would create the congested roads Could be catastrophic in an emergency. - - On a personal note, my family moved to Whitworth 12 years ago, from Oldham, due to its naturally beautiful countryside and I see the addition of these properties into areas of greenery (extending Wallbank estate etc.,) is the very short end of the stick. I can see that if these are accepted, encroaching on to green belt areas, slowly but surely the green belt areas will get smaller and smaller until eventually Whitworth just becomes another concrete plot with ever creaking infrastructure. - - Finally, I understand the need for affordable housing but there are plenty of mills/brown field that could be developed. However, I feel strongly that before any proposals are accepted it is of the utmost importance that the infrastructure is in place to support them, that includes roads, schools and NHS access.	-	-
206	Michael	Day	-		Object	Recent persimmon development has brought 100 homes to the area. - Schools can't cope, medical services can't cope and the road infrastructure is abysmal, more home will compound all these matters. - - We moved to Whitworth, Rossendale for the scenery, quiet life etc this will bee ruined -	-	-
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	This is an unbelievable plan that will stretch amenities in the area even further. - - The new estate near Cowm has already increased traffic congestion on the one road in and out of the village and schools are already struggling to cope. - - There is also the issue of wildlife and the impact it will have on their environment. - - I for one will be leaving if this idiotic plan goes through. -		This smells of greed over common sense

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
268	Michaela	Radford	-		Object	Whitworth has had numerous instances recently regarding the roadworks for the infrastructure repair and maintenance. As an employee of all 4 major utility asset owners in the area, I am very concerned regarding the houses proposed. We only have one road throughout the valley and this is impacted severly when roadworks are planned. My concerns are that these are not managed correctly by LCC at present, therefore; more houses and more infrastructure would have a massive impact on the people living in the village. People face unemployment now due to the frequent issues we face getting into work. - Not to mention over crowded schools and doctors as we stand at present. - - I request, here in writing, to be informed of any planned meetings regarding the houses in whitworth and notification be sent in writing to my address above.		-
297	Lindsay	Fairhurst			Object	Poor access along the length of Main Rd (Market Street) one narrow road lined with parked cars , as only access into & out of whitworth. No alternative route. No trains or trams. Buses won't must travel on same one access road both in and out as cars. No motorway access under 20 min journey both ways insufficient work in area means people must travel to Manchester, leeds, bury, Rochdale etc. Current public transport unrealistic. Traffic at peak times currently gridlocked & congested. Increased housing will add to this burden. Utilities infrastructure unable to cope currently leading to repeated remedial roadworks. Schools full Doctors full Rossendale Council Lancashire Council needs to address transport & roadways access + education access beofer building homkes where people will be unable to travel to employment and school		Highway safety compromised by insufficient access to site
298	Andrew	Fairhurst			Object	the number of houses proposed in this local plan for infrastructure can support. Whitworth has only one road in abd out and already this is constantly being dug up by utility companies often resulting in temporary traffic lights that cause massives queues of traffic in rush hours. Not only is the road narrow and conjested but there is no alternative train service - only the bus (on the same road) This is totall useless for the number of people wo commute to Manchester, Oldham and Bury every working day. Our schools, doctors and dentists are already close to capacity. There are very few options to travel to other facilities apart from along the one road through the valley.		Without robust and achievable plans to increase the support infrastructure for travel (a train for example) and health and education and culture this building should not go ahead. For people to afford these houses they need jobs first. Currently you need to move out of the valley to commute to work. Regeneration of the area and existing housing stock should come first.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
515	alec	taylor	-		Not Applicable	need to see the plan before commenting		no
590		Ashworth			Object	Absolutely ridiculous One way in and out of whitworth no extra schools or doctors when you have two or three cars per household. This is ruining our villages. We strongly object to this. Listen to the people who vote you in, as we have long memories		
631	Sue	Eveleigh	-		Support	The junction of Hall Street with Market Street is already very busy during rush hour and when children are being dropped and picked up from school. What vehicular access is being provided for the new houses to be built on the site of the Albert Mill, (and		-
691	Louisa	Corlett	-		Object	The road access around hall street is already dangerous. The traffic is already causing congestion. I regularly observe children exposed to moving traffic near the 2 school on hall street. The pavement is very narrow. The flooding regularly causes issues along this stretch. - Horses and access to healey dell is already compromised and dangerous for people trying to cross. - Free roaming sheep and other wildlife such as herons are seen along the river on hall street. More traffic would cause more damage to the environment. - The schools and dr surgery in this location are already at capacity.		-
743			Whitworth Town Council		Support	HS2.105 Albert Mill, Whitworth Council agreed that this site requires development and housing would seem the only viable option. There is an outline application already approved for 49 houses. Council raised concerns about access and potential flooding risk for houses on this site.		
763	Alan	Billingsley	-		Object	The Albert Mill scheme, albeit welcome in so much that it has achieved finally the demolition of the complete site, is just another housing addition to a village with an infrastructure that is already struggling to meet the demands of its current population. The building of 49 properties, on a site that is on a Flood Zone 3 (high risk), has access issues, not only to Albert St and Massey Croft, but also to Hall St and Market St, impinges on Green Belt areas to the south of the site and land adjacent to Massey Croft and will result in increased traffic flow past an area of elderly residents, is not acceptable		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
773	Susan	Worrall	-		Object	Whitworth is a village, a small community. Building these housing developments will change Whitworth into a town. - There is not the infrastructure to support this additional housing. There is one road in and out of Whitworth which is already struggling to cope with the increasing volume of traffic. Especially at peak times. If there are any traffic disruptions it can take 1-2 hours to get to Rochdale . We do not need more cars and the pollution they bring! - - There are limited school places both secondary and primary and local children born in the village will struggle to get places. - The one and only GP practice can not manage to provide the necessary health care for patients with no appointments pre bookable for weeks in advance. This healthcare will be diluted further. Living in Whitworth if A&E treatment is required which is often a life or death situation your chances of survival are reduced add more traffic on market street and your chance of survival diminishes further - - The people who live in Whitworth , live here because it is a village , it is quiet and the countryside is on the door step. Yet the plans want to destroy the village life, increase demands on existing services and increase pollution - - To consider building on greenbelt land in Whitworth is unbelievable and irresponsible, Planning has already - spoil the view of the countryside at the side of Daneswood ave and the wind farms are also affecting the views and countryside. - - Whitworth has lots of wildlife from deer, owls, herons, wild ponies as well as lots of insect life butterflies, bees etc which will all be at risk if the countryside is used for housing. - - There is empty housing all over the borough - fill these , not build more especially in our little village -		Stop putting profits first and put existing residents first

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
803	Marietta	Galbraith	-		Object	My objections for the proposed building of housing on the above sites is based on a number of reasons: - 1. Infrastructure. The current housing situation is already at (possibly beyond) capacity with regards to schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists, employment and traffic. There are no more schools planned and no way to expand the ones already here. Some children have to travel miles to schools out of the area due to oversubscribed local schools. This is the same for doctor's surgeries and many other amenities. - 2. Traffic. There is one main road in and out of Whitworth that already has issues with raised levels of traffic. In the four years we have lived here, there have been many occasions where traffic has been an issue due to constant roadworks (for various reasons relating to increased housing and traffic) which has caused major problems. Also, most people are employed outside of Whitworth so traffic is high anyway. More housing would increase this issue with no solution being given as to how it could be rectified. - 3. Utilities. More and more power cuts have been happening recently in Whitworth due to new housing as well as burst water pipes and problems with drainage. This has contributed to the traffic issues with roads having to be dug up every few weeks to 'fix' the problem. - 4. More housing would mean taking up land that is natural drainage for flooding. Recently, my area was put into the 'flood risk' category (although we haven't flooded), significantly increasing my home insurance. If more homes are built, this would increase risk of flooding to many homes around Whitworth, which would cause loss of market value and would reduce the chances of being able to sell the property. - 5. Much of the 'green land' would be lost which is detrimental to the wildlife around Whitworth. The Government have a duty to protect greenbelt land and our environment! The carbon footprint would be horrific! - In conclusion, building over 300 houses in Whitworth would cause issues beyond repair! Environment, traffic, pollution, infrastructure, drainage etc. would all be dramatically affected in the most negative and damaging way. Whitworth was not meant for so much housing and so many people.		-
886	Michael	Banham	-	HS2.102 to HS2.109	Object	The infrastructure of whitworth is over stretched as it is,the school's cannot cater for such an undertaking. Theres only one road in or out of whitworth any problems on this road causes absolute mayhem. The winter months are an absolute nightmare just to get onto market street.		I cannot understand why anyone would want to over populate an area that is already struggling.
889	Derek	Lord	-	HS 102, HS105, HS104, HS106, HS107, HS108, HS109.	Object	We in Whitworth are sure that there are enough houses here at the present time.There are large estates at Cowm Park, Tonacliffe, Wain Gap, Wallbank, Knot Hill, Orama Mill Site, Edgemoor Close, and a small estate at Facit. The exits onto the one main road are at present full of traffic. The Doctors, Schools etc are now at bursting point. We in Whitworth have done our share in housing. Please think again before building any more. Thank You. -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
892	Mandy	Sanderson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105,HS2.10 4, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2108, HS2.109	Object	The transport system around Whitworth cannot cope with the volume of traffic . Also local amenities are already at braking point..		No
903	Louise	Hewitt	-		Object	It is absolutely ridiculous to try and put 49 houses on the Albert Mill sight, not only is it going to be dangerous to try and access this sight but the schools are already oversubscribed and are turning people in the village away as they are full, the doctors are struggling with patients and you can't get a appointment and it is horrendous when there are roadworks or snow as there is only one road in and one road out.		No
911	Julie	Latham	-		Object	In principle I don't object to more houses or people. However I will until I am convinced that the planners are committed to the infrastructure improvements required to support the extra influx of people and cars . - The main bottlenecks caused by Whitworth traffic happen in the Rochdale Borough at the bottom of Whitworth Road and on Shawclough Road. These areas are controlled by Rochdale Council who are under no obligation to improve traffic flow to improve the lives of the people of Whitworth. There are changes could be made in these areas which would help greatly. Unless Rossendale Planners can work with Rochdale Planners to create new roads and implement better traffic flow measures the extra cars generated by this and other proposed housing projects in Whitworth will mean journey times to get to Rochdale, Manchester and the M62 Motorway network at f peak times will be so long that people who commute this way to work will have to give up their jobs or move away from the village. I really don't think that this issue is being taken on board by either Borough. - The medical centre is also over-subscribed and I believe that the schools are too. I appeal to the planners to find funds and solutions to these concerns before adding more pressure.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
913	Michelle	Ashcroft	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108 & HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a geographical challenge at the best of times, positioned in a valley, consisting of ONE main road with multiple roads stemming from this leading to many properties that are built on the hillside. There are many green areas which are used by local farmers for their livestock. During times of heavy rain many of the roads are flooded, and during winter many roads are very dangerous in the snow. It is not uncommon for Whitworth to be gridlocked as there are far too many cars on the roads, all it needs is one set of road works and the town becomes inaccessible. The local schools are now over subscribed, the High school has had to turn away many children who only live a couple of miles away. The primary schools are also subscribed making it very difficult for teachers to provide a good education to the children. The local doctors are unable to cope with the number of patients, trying to get a same day appointment is nigh on impossible these days. We have issues with anti social behaviour due to lack of amenities available for teenagers, the local youth club has been closed down. There is a lack of police presence (the PSCO tries her best), people don't feel as safe as they should. The library is still under threat of closure, the pool is only open because of the people of Whitworth who run it. Building more houses brings more people, more cars, more strain on the infrastructure. I appreciate housing is needed but the number of houses that has been suggested will bring this town to it's knees.		I would suggest you come to Whitworth during the morning school run and see how difficult it is around Horsefield Avenue. Come sit in the traffic jams during rush hour. - - The government has spoken about creating new towns, this is a great idea, there are places that can accommodate thousands and thousands of houses. Build there not here!!!
916	Jane	Trudgeon	-	HS2.102 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	We are already an overstretched village infrastructure, the roads would not cope with an extra amount of traffic and would make the already difficult commute to exit/enter the village impossible. There are not enough schools nor would the doctor's surgery be able to cope as even now it is almost impossible to get a reasonable appointment time, - - The housing developments would impact on wildlife		-
918	Marion	Ashworth	-	HS2.107 , ALL.	Object	I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.		I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
955	Janet	Whitehead	-	HS2.102, HS2.104,HS2.10 5, HS2.106,HS2.10 7, HS2.108,HS2.10 9	Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village, oversubscribed schools and Doctors - We have one road in and one road out which is almost impossible during peak times in the morning - The houses already exceed the heights up the sides of the valley - Our green belt is very important to wildlife and the the people the live here - If we let one builder onto greenbelt it opens the doors to far too many others - Our population is big enough and we cannot accommodate many more		- Our Councillors are voted in by us and now need to stand up and fight for us - - 400 houses is a ridiculous amount of new houses for a tiny village - - We have had 2 different sites where new houses have been built in recent years we've done our bit for Government figures - - Please find somewhere else
962	Kathryn	Gill	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2104, HS2106, HS2107, HS2108, HS2109	Object	I object to any changes in use of local greenbelt land to build houses. Also, there is only one road through Whitworth and it is already congested. We have only 1 doctors surgery, and not enough school places to accommodate hundreds of additional families. Greenbelt land cannot be restored once built on, and these proposals would change the landscape of Whitworth. I am also concerned about the building of 20 properties around Cowm. This is a resource continually used for recreation by the people of Whitworth and should be preserved.		
979	Marie	Pye	-		Object	All of these developments will contribute to already existing traffic problems as there is one road in and one road out of the area. The high school is already oversubscribed with local children not being offered places.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
992	Susan	Farrell		HS2: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109	Object	<p>I strongly object to the building of houses on all the above mentioned sites for the following reasons: - Greenbelt land is of importance to all the wildlife of Whitworth and Shawforth . Deer and bats live in the forests in the area. Many badgers and foxes inhabit the countryside and rare species of wildlife live in the ponds. - The forest area at Tonacliffe would be cut down having a negative impact on the environment. - Tonacliffe road is already dangerous for children with cars parked along the length of the road at school dropping off and picking up time. The increased number of cars if more houses were built in the area would be worse for the children and residents. - Local amenities such as dentists and GPs could not cope with the increased population. It is almost impossible at the moment to get a GP appointment in less than two weeks. More housing would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Whitworth and Shawforth. - Facilities such as water, gas and electricity are already stretched and a major upgrade of the infrastructure would be required to support increased housing. - Local drainage cannot cope with the current usage. More housing could have an impact on flooding. - Public footpaths could be lost reducing the number of rights of way for walkers. - The road network both ways from Rochdale to Bacup is already gridlocked. More housing would put an increased strain on traffic and the already poor public transport in the area. - The only high school in the area is already oversubscribed. With increased housing parents may have even less chance of a first choice school for their children. They may have to travel miles to school. - I understood it is government policy to protect Greenbelt land except for 'Exceptional Circumstances'. What are the exceptional circumstances that enable housing to be built on the greenbelt land in Whitworth and Shawforth?</p>		<p>Summary - - Whitworth and Shawforth are already busy villages with oversubscribed schools and GP services with one road in and out between Rochdale and Bacup. - - Can we accommodate more housing that will put pressure on already overstretched amenities, increase traffic and change the beautiful landscape forever?</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1029	Angela	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? -7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1107	Keith	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2 108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. GP services and other related support services are already overstretched and inadequate. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 5. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 6. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 7. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 7.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 7.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 7.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 8. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		-
1109	Jane	Gadsby	-		Object	<p>I wholly object to more housing being built in Whitworth!! We are a small(ish) village that can not cope already with the amount of new houses and people moving into it!! Our schools are already over subscribed; they are turning people away that don't live overly far away that a few years ago would have had no problem getting a place. The Doctors surgery can't cope with the number of patients wanting appointments. You are also increasing the risks of flooding. My house is already at risk and has already flooded twice. The main road (one road in and out) is gridlocked most mornings with commuters trying to get out of the village but most of all you are taking our beautiful green areas that Whitworth is so lucky and honoured to have. We have lots of empty properties that can't be filled already!! Please leave us and our village alone!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1134	Abigail	Leyland	-		Object	WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE HOUSING IN WHITWORTH! The schools are already oversubscribed, our local doctors can not possibly take on any more patients as it is already a struggle to get an appointment currently. We only have one road in and out of the village which gets badly effected by rush hour traffic, making it difficult for the locals to get to work/school etc. We have such a lovely view of greenery surrounding our little village and we do not want our sight ruined by building ugly, unnecessary housing.		
1166	Brendan	Doherty	-	HS2, 102,104,108,105 ,107,106,109.	Object	WHITWORTH IS FULL. This statement encapsulates all the issues surrounding any expansion of dwelling houses in the township of Whitworth. - - The negative impact of any developments in the town cannot be overstated. - - The whole nature of this small township will be irreversibly destroyed if development are allowed. - - Flora and fauna will be the first to suffer. This valley is home to an exceptional and expanding variety of animals and trees and flowers. This growth has taken decades to achieve and would by totally reversed by the stroke of a pen. - - To say that all the ingredients which go to make up Whitworth as a place for people to live are overloaded is indeed an understatement. - - Congestion of traffic and people is at its limit, any increase can only be detrimental to the health and quality of life of residents. - - Local services, schools, doctors, civic amenities are already at their serviceable optimum. - - The existing utilities of electricity,gas and water only just maintain service. There are often cuts in these making it seem that we are a third world town. - - Whitworth is a linear town with no bypass or possibility of such. Most of the day traffic is heavy and at peak times chaotic. This combined with the nature of HGV traffic leaves the roads in constant need of repair. Add a very poor public transport system and the certain increases proposed then the result is guaranteed to be disastrous.		Listen to the people of Whitworth.
1190	Nathan	Worrall	-	HS2.107 , HS2.108, HS2.109, HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104,HS2.10 6	Object	Whitworth doesn't have the infrastructure to sustain the construction of these new houses. The local doctors and schools would struggle to meet the needs of the increased population. There is bad traffic in Whitworth already, this will only make it worse and these traffic problems are highlighted when there are roadworks and there are large queues. The proposed sites are located on greenbelt land, and this will have a negative effect on the local wildlife as well as destroying the natural beauty of this land.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1272	Michala	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS102.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	I am objecting in general to the proposed house building in various sites around Whitworth and specifically in relation to the proposed sites t Tonacliffe. My objections are based on a number of reasons: 1. Wildlife in the local area. Deer, badgers, foxes and hares live within the forest areas. Rare protected newts live in the pond. Bats nest in the forest. The importance in f this green belt land for the wildlife cannot be over emphasised. - 2. Tonacliffe forest would need to be cut down adversely affecting the local environment. - 3. The impact of more cars around local schools, especially Tonacliffe School, is of great concern due to the already high volume of traffic. Increasing this would be unacceptable. - 4. Local amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already to capacity. I have concerns that more houses will have a negative impact on the lives of current residents in relation to these amenities. - 5. Has the infrastructure of our small village been considered in relation to electricity, gas and water supply if more houses are built? Whitworth already experiences power cuts and seems to be worse since other recent building developments have been completed. - 6. The road network into Rochdale is already gridlocked. More houses will increase this problem. Public transport from Whitworth is limited to buses and I consider that if this proposed building goes ahead there will also be a negative impact on the poor public transport in and out of our village. - 7. Local drainage already struggles to cope with usage now, if the volume of residents increases would the drainage system be able to deal with the added strain? - 8. We bought our property because it is located on the last cul de sac of a small estate with no through traffic. This proposed building work will completely alter this into drive through roads. Plus the volume of traffic will - Increase which I consider to be unacceptable. - 9. I am very concerned that we may have loss of privacy as we are not currently overlooked and this was a major consideration when we bought our house.	-	
1283	Jonathan	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	Whitworths infrastructure is already at near full capacity. The single main road through Whitworth is, at times, grid-locked. Streets around the primary schools is chaotic. There is a definite flood issue through the valley. Chime is rising unchallenged. The rich and diverse wildlife is flourishing around Whitworth. - Any of the development projects would have a negative and detrimental implication on Whitworth and it's residents.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1310	Richard	Dolan	-	HS2.101-109	Object	<p>We are vehemently opposed to all housing allocation in Whitworth. Our group has decided to vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. We will withhold our votes and encourage family, friends, and community to do likewise. - We are outraged by this proposal, especially HS2.107 that will encroach on Healy Dell. On this point we will be contacting the National Trust and other such organisations to make them away of the proposed desecration to the Green Belt. Furthermore, we are now investigating possible financial links between all Councillors, MPs, and RBC employees involved in this issue with the proposed contractors. This senseless proposal for a village far too small to accommodate a possible 300 new homes suggest an ulterior motive. No one in our community that we have spoken to is in favour of this plan and we will use our sizeable influence. - There has been more than enough housing development in Whitworth. This new proposal will destroy our green spaces and necessitate a new schools, doctors' surgery, dentist, shops, and possible a new road. All future housing development must stop. Our community can not accommodate any more. - In light of the fact that this proposal has not been advertised to a great extent (we have spoken to people who know nothing of it), we will be conducting a petition again this proposal and encouraging everyone to sign the following statement: - We will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community.</p>		<p>To reiterate, we will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community. - - The people's power will be felt if this plan is authorised.</p>
1336	Maureen	O'Mara	-	HS2.102,105,104,106,107,108,109	Object	<p>Whitworth is already struggling with oversubscribed schools. There is only 1 small GP surgery and 1 dentist. The village cannot cope with stretching the existing amenities. - One of the main objections I have is the traffic and parking, which is already dire. Streets are almost impossible to drive down safely due to double parking. There is only one main road, which when closed for any reason means driving via Todmorden to get around - this has happened on a number of occasions. Most roads have very steep inclines which are regularly not gritted in winter. To increase parking and traffic would destroy Whitworth. Where would access roads be and how would this affect current residents.</p>		
1363	Gareth	Dolan	-	HS2.101 to 109	Object	<p>I do not live in Whitworth but spend a lot of time there with my family. I am deeply concerned by this proposed loss of green belt and will do my utmost to object against it. - - I strongly urge RBC to re-consider its proposal. Whitworth cannot handle any more development. - - Thanks</p>		<p>If this destruction of the green belt in Whitworth is passed then I shall simply take my family and my money elsewhere as there will no longer be the same attraction Whitworth now offers.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1365	Michael	Whitehead	-		Object	The doctors is overcrowded, the schools are overcrowded and there is one road in and out. All three of the mentioned cannot cope in the current state. Whitworth has too many houses for the current infrastructure. If the proposal goes through, which I sincerely hope it does not, there will be 300+ more homes within Whitworth. This means 650+ more people needing a doctor, 300+ more children who need schools and 300+ more cars on the roads. If the current infrastructure is struggling I dread to think how the village would end up with that amount of extra people. - There are also many deer which have recently returned to the greenbelt land on either side of the valley. Moving any sort of greenbelt/urban borders is highly likely to destroy their habitat and force them away.		-
1397	John	Cavanagh		Albert Mill	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve
1398	Joshua	Hopwood Mairs		Albert Mill	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1402	JOANNE	WHITWORTH	-	Albert Mill	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. -		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling with make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth who have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for now and for our future generations.
1405	GARETH	WHITWORTH	-	Albert Mill	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for our children and our childrens children.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1417	Gillian	Middlemas	Whitworth Community High School	HS1.102 HS2.103 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	As Headteacher of the only secondary school in the Whitworth area, I am concerned that the proposals to build considerable numbers of new dwellings take no account of educational provision in the local area. - The school is already oversubscribed: for 2017 entry into Y7 over 40 families were unsuccessful in gaining a place, despite Whitworth Community High School being their first preference; over 40 families went onto on the Local Authority's waiting list for a place; over 25 families went to Appeal for a place, and very few of them were successful. The school now has 640 students and, without extra classroom space, has no capacity to increase the admissions number, nor to take additional students into existing year groups. - Likewise, many local primary schools are also full / oversubscribed, suggesting there is insufficient educational provision in the local area already. - This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed number of new dwellings goes ahead, unless the developers or Lancashire County Council are prepared to increase the school's capacity by funding additional classroom / learning / social space. The school is over 50 years old, largely of Langspan pre-tensioned concrete construction (intended life expectancy already exceeded) with HAC (high alumina cement) - In addition, the school experiences ongoing issues with the provision of utilities: the water main up the school drive is at risk of collapse; the water supply to the area has recently been affected on a number of occasions, and presumably further demand from new building would increase these issues. - The proposals for new housing does not appear to be linked to any plans to improve the traffic situation in the Whitworth area: lengthy queues heading towards Rochdale each morning already create issues for students travelling to school.		Whilst it is excellent news that there is demand for additional housing in the Whitworth area, I am particularly concerned about the infrastructure which is essential to support this kind of development. Education, and raising aspirations, is essential to improving the future for our young people and I have concerns regarding school capacity; increased traffic; increased demand on local services generally; impact on provision of utilities; and whether or not this has all been factored into the planning process. The infrastructure needs to be in place before the planning is agreed. I also have concerns about the impact of further building on wildlife, the village ethos, and greenbelt areas.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1420	Julie	bower	-	Albert Mill	Object	<p>I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate???</p> <p>Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. - This already over saturated with people for the small community resources there are. - There is not enough road space, and only a little amount of moorland available. We try to encourage our young in the community to go outside and be 'heathy'. There won't be anywhere left. I find the lack of advertising this proposal unacceptable. There are many more areas of fields elsewhere. Why add to an over exhausted community already? I dont understand why Whitworth has to be the target for this.</p>		<p>Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve. It isn't alot but it is valued and appreciated beyond your knowledge or understanding - all of these below would be affected adversely. - - Wildlife - Loss of trees - The local school - Landscaping - - Local amenities - Infrastructure - - - We deserve our voices to be heard.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1440	Helen	Banham	-	HS2.105 - Albert Stree	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

unbearable strain on this network.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1442	Tracy	Thompson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105 & HS2.109	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen within this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
						residents put an unbearable strain on this network. -		
1452	vikki	Megram			Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. - 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. - 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. - 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. - 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? - 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. - 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1453	Jordan	Collier			Object	<p>Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
						residents put an unbearable strain on this network. -		
1469	George	Salt	-		Object	Whitworth is located in a valley, this in itself presents issues with the amount of space available. 7,500 people lived in Whitworth according to the data from the 2011 Census and this is a large amount of people if you look at the services and infrastructure in Whitworth. To start off with there is one GP surgery that has 7,248 people registered with them. Whitworth Medical Centre has 4 GPs which means that for one GP there are 1,812 people. There is not any more capacity available for more people to register with the practice. - - Schools are also busy especially with just one school for secondary education. With more people living in Whitworth that would mean a greater demand on schools and could result in some children living in Whitworth not going to school there. - - Going back to Whitworth being a valley this physical feature means that infrastructure being put in can be difficult. Whitworth has one road in and out and during peak hours this is a very busy road. Most new people would probably be using a car as their main mode of transport adding more pressure to Market Street and its tributary roads. Public transport is also very poor in Whitworth meaning that it is not really a viable alternative for any new people who would come to Whitworth. - - As shown with a few of these arguments Whitworth does not have the capacity to accommodate an extra 359 houses over the next 15 years. For example an average of 3 people per house would result in 1,077 more people living in Whitworth. It is not going to work.		
1497	Wendy	Rose	-	Albert Mill	Object	The infrastructure of Whitworth cannot support or sustain further development. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth. Congestion is a serious problem now due to the volume of traffic. When there are roadworks the situation is bordering on dangerous as emergency vehicles are hindered. Further residential development would only compound this issue with higher levels of vehicles. - - Power cuts are a regular occurrence in this area, one can only assume this would get worse with the extent of the proposed developments - - Doctors surgeries are fully to capacity and cannot adequately serve the community at the moment. Waiting times for appointments is ludicrous. Schools are over subscribed. Parking around schools is dangerous and any increase in school children would seriously impact on this. - - All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - - Proposed land in some cases is not viable as parts are prone to flooding. Culverts running through a proposed sight would impact on flood defences in the area. - - -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1502	Danielle	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	
1504	Timothy	Makin	-		Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1505	Pat	Stewart	na		Object	<p>I object to all the listed sites in whitworth. - - HS2.102 - King Street, HS2.104 - Old Lane, HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens, - HS2.105 - Albert Street, HS2.107 Fern Isle Close, HS2.106 - Moorland Cres, - HS2.109 - Horsefield Av - - 1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in</p>		Please can you inform me of how many people object to the whitworth sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - - Plus please note - - Human Rights Act - Responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, - In particular - Protocol 1, Article 1. - This states that "a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land." - Additionally, Article 8 - The Human Rights Act states that "a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life." - - In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1538	Mike	Burgess			Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
					unbearable strain on this network.	HS2.105	<p>accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
								<p>footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - DON'T FORGET EACH ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CAN PUT IN THEIR OWN OBJECTION FORM TO THE BUILDING WORK. Extract from the Governments Planning Policy Statement - Protection and Enhancement of the Environment 17. The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. Those with national and international designations should receive the highest level of protection. 18. The condition of our surroundings has a direct impact on the quality of life and the conservation and improvement of the natural and built environment brings social and economic benefit for local communities. Planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design, conservation and the provision of public space. 19. Plan policies and planning decisions should be based on: –up-to-date information on the environmental characteristics of the area; – the</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
								<p>potential impacts, positive as well as negative, on the environment of development proposals (whether direct, indirect, cumulative, long-term or short-term); and, – recognition of the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage. Planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, planning authorities and developers should consider possible mitigation measures. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. In line with the UK sustainable development strategy, environmental costs should fall on those who impose them – the “polluter pays” principle.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1545	Robert	Hesten		SHLAA16006	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam. Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
						<p>flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
1546	Sandra	Hesten		SHLAA16006	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam.</p> <p>Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
						<p>flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions?</p> <p>Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS.</p> <p>There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village.</p> <p>Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed?</p> <p>In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area.</p> <p>Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF.</p> <p>Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.105	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		
1744	Keren	Szelesi		Albert Street	Object	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Infrastructure is already at breaking point in this area. 2) Road system, water supply, medical centre, schools are at full capacity. 3) Encroach on green spaces. 4) Whitworth will no longer be a village but an urban sprawl. 		Not enough publicity has been given regarding these proposals.
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities		Not Applicable	<p>HS2.105 - Land adjacent to Albert Mill, Whitworth</p> <p>United Utilities has a large existing sewer running through the site therefore this should be considered as a constraint which needs further consideration.</p> <p>We would ask any future developer(s) to contact us to explore options for addressing this as early as possible.</p>		
Number of comments					66			
Reference		HS2.106		Land to the east of Tonacliffe School				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
5	Kimberley	Ashworth	-		Object	<p>I am writing to object against the proposed local plan for Whitworth. - - I am unable to attend the meeting tomorrow night due to illness but I have looked at the proposal as stated below: - - http://www.rossendale.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/3700/whitworth_map_with_street_names - - I'm disappointed to see that a number of green spaces are being considered to build houses on. The green spaces behind Tonacliffe School are used by many for walking. To build on this space would be detrimental to the green space due to wildlife and other conversation in that area. - Building houses would also see an increase in traffic which is at demand during peak times at the moment. - - Other green spaces on the plans are also being considered. In a village that is at full capacity I am unsure why Rossendale Council see the need to build in places that already has adequate housing. - - There are no plans to look at new recreational and family facilities which the town needs. The closure of the children's centre means that new parents and young families have nowhere to go. The plans don't take any such new facility into consideration and I urge Rossendale Council to look at this. - - I know I speak on behalf of many in the Town when I say the option for Whitworth is option 1 'Do nothing' - - Kind regards -</p> <p>Email received 31/07/17: Dear Sir or Madam I am writing to express my disappointment about the draft Local Plan consultation meetings. Many residents in Whitworth have found out today about the consultation meeting taking place tomorrow evening. This is simply too short notice when many residents haven't had time to find out more about the plans. It is clearly a very important issue. Unfortunately, I wouldn't be able to get to one of the other consultations for before 7.30pm as I work the other side of Manchester.</p>		I am extremely disappointed that a meeting has been arranged in Whitworth for tomorrow evening when all the other consultation meetings are taking place in September
12	Chloe	Halliday	-		Object	<p>Already too much traffic in this area during school hours with cars often dangerously parked. Would also result in the habitats of many wildlife being disrupted.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
18	Michael	Stewart	-		Object	<p>This proposed site is unsuitable for the following reasons. - - 1. Wildlife - This greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep with the Forest area at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. - - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest itself would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action when we have other areas within Whitworth to build on that would not require the destruction of trees. - - 3. The local school at both dropping of and collection time around this area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. - - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. - - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists, Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative affect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. - - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. - - 9. Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - - 10. Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" can you explain what those exceptional circumstances are when we have other areas more suitable for building houses on. - - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on the living standers of both. - - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - - 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others would be overlooked. - - 14. As the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including school children. - - 16. This area and the surrounding area has already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) would be lost. - - PLEASE CAN I HAVE A WRITTEN RESPONSE TO MY OBJECTIONS.</p>		<p>I will be writing to my MP and local councillors on this matter as it is my belief you are going against your own policy on greenbelt areas. - - I will be involving all relevant parties including Campaign to protect rural England as I believe we have better sites to build houses on with in Whitworth that would have much less impact on the community and Wildlife. - - I would expect a written report sending to me via email answering the objections I have put forward.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
20	Jamie	Ward	-		Object	The objection is simple on the grounds of traffic management, a majority of the streets do not have proper paving and the hills up to Tonacliffe have a lot of problems with traffic and parking already, especially when there is a primary school on two of the roads.unless new access roads are added or the existing roads are considerably improves including traffic calming measures and possibly a one way system then you would sing be making the roads too congested and also very dangerous.		-
21	Jordan	Buckley	-		Object	Development on this land would cause a disruption in the community. - - increased traffic due to builders etc. - - increased traffic due to the number of houses proposed - - ruin perfect moorland, visible from a number of houses. - -		No
22	susan	mairs	-		Object	Object to any new building in whitworth especially on the moorlands, my concern is that the amount of more traffic, not enough schooling, wildlife conservation, and invasion of more eople in our village, lack of policing etc, more people will cause more problems.		Having lived in this village for over 40 years and love it, I am really concerned that it's going to be spoilt by excessive building of new homes. I think there are plenty of old properties to be purchased in the area.
23	Carole	Linley	-	Moorland Crescent,	Object	Whitworth village is already far far too busy and we live on Moorland Crescent, OL12 8SU and are surrounded by moorland which is full of nature and should not be disturbed		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
27	Michael	Chianca	-		Object	<p>HS2.102 - King Street - HS2.104 - Old Lane - HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens - HS2.105 - Albert Street - HS2.107 Fern Isle Close - HS2.106 Moorland Cres - HS2.109 Horsefield Av - - All these proposed sited are unsuitable for the following reasons. 1. Wildlife - This greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest area at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest itself would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action when we have other areas within Whitworth to build on that would not require the destruction of trees. 3. The local school at both dropping of and collection time around this area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists, Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative affect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. 9. Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" can you explain what those exceptional circumstances are when we have other areas more suitable for building houses on. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental affect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others would be overlooked. 14. As the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including school children. 16. This area and the surrounding area has already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
28	Karen	Ward	N/a		Object	<p>I object to the proposed planning for houses in my local area (Whitworth). The local infer-structure of Whitworth Village cannot possible take the volume of traffic these proposed houses will generate. The increased in cars commuting out/in especially at peaks times would cause a residential and commuting nightmare as there is one road in and one road out of Whitworth. Most houses proposed to be built are two to three bedroom family homes, and therefore in reality this could mean that each home will be a two car family. This will add to commuting time as more traffic is on the road (one road in and out of Whitworth). This means that more time travelling is cutting into precious work-life balance time with family and children. Also, the local surgeries/dentists are already full to capacity with appointments not being able to be given the same day or appointments not able to be given the same week, meaning residents have to wait in some cases one to two weeks to see a local GP. How many extra people wanting to sign on at Whitworth/Healey medical centre for medical attention which is over stretched as it is. Building in the area would only add to these already stretched services within the area. In view of this there is also the emergency services to consider and are these able to cope with demand? Has this been looked into in regards to emergency response times and that the nearest A&E is Oldham hospital? Some of the planned access roads are classed as un-adopted/private. These are not suitable for heavy or extra traffic and who will maintain these roads? Building more houses in the area would mean the current schools in the area would not be able to cope with demand. With the local schools already at near capacity and with no current plans in the proposal to build another local school this will only get worse. Since schools are no longer ring-fenced in regards to places/applications, there are many of the local children not getting into their local Whitworth school/nurse. By adding more houses within the Whitworth Valley this would add to the demand for school/nursery places. Local children (who currently live within the Valley) are having to travel outside of the Valley as places are being taken up from children outside the immediate area, therefore adding more houses in Whitworth would cause additional placement/schooling and nursery demands to mean the out local children's needs are not being met. Currently the need, sheer capacity and demand as it is falling short of residents needs without adding more houses to the area. More research and investment needs to be been done, looking at how many children locally are wanting nursery, school places in Whitworth as there are many parents struggling to place their children in a school near to the home/first choice for intake 2017. Traffic in the area is already at dangerous levels around Tonacliffe primary school in the mornings and afternoon and therefore adding houses and extra traffic to the streets that are not suitable for the extra capacity will increase the risk of accidents. The roads are narrow with resident's double parking on the side in which they live.</p>		Whitworth infer-structure can't take the amount of proposed housing that these plans show. I find it disgraceful that local residence and Whitworth council have not been consulted from the start.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
						Building houses on Green-belt will lead to the destruction of the local wildlife, flora and fauna. This needs to be considered in regards to building on land and this is the natural habitat for many birds, animals, insects and flowers. - - -		
32	Paula	McNinch	-		Object	There is not the infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with extra housing. The road in and out is already too busy, the schools are full and there are no facilities for young people.	-	
39	Claire	Butterworth	-		Object	There is no infrastructure to place extra houses in this location. Wildlife in the area bats, deer, foxes and badgers all reside in this area with there homes in these locations these will be destroyed. The roads are not wide enough to accommodate extra houses and are not maintained by the council (it has taken 3 years of complaints to resurface a road a few hundred yards in length) the grit bins do not get filled in the winter and the road turns to sheet ice with the water off the moor, this would worsen. the doctors have no space for extra patients nor does the school. Children out playing will become more vulnerable with extra traffic, as the countryside is there playground and you are removing this. Winter fetches flood water off the hills and with extra property this will put our houses st risk of flooding when water finds it's natural pathway flooding has increased in the area over the last couple of years as the council is already aware. One road in and one out this will cause traffic problems at peak times. You will be reducing the price of my property as I bought the property for its views and location, my views will be gone (am I going to compensated for this).		There are certain areas which would benefit from extra property but these locations are not the best option.
40	Jason	Butterworth	-		Object	1 traffic congestion problems already causing danger to children at school before said planning. 2 roads are very narrow already causing people to park on the paths. 3 land is very wet at all times with numerous streams throughout the land and would need large scale infrastructure to cure . 4 there is no infrastructure in place to accommodate e.g. Doctors schools already full. 5 traffic is already bad getting in or out of Whitworth due to one road in and would make a problem worse than already is. 6 there is a lot of wildlife in both areas badger sets bats deer which would be upsetting to all involved. 7 people use the land for walking,children play on the land taking it away would leave them with only streets to play on making them more vulnerable. 8 with flooding problems already in Whitworth would only make matter worse. 9 people bought houses at a price which reflected the area and would de value all properties being over looked by lots of houses. 10 the area would need large scale earth moving to accommodate these plans leaving the area having the feel of a valley taken away.		This would cause a lot of stress to the community and cause divisions throughout Whitworth.
46	Ian	Hills	-		Object	Increase in traffic pollution and the lack of new access to these sites		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
56	Valerie	McDonald	-		Object	<p>Whilst I recognise the need for further housing within the area, I am concerned about the siting of so many proposed dwellings in this particular valley. The roads are already clogged at rush hour and as there is only one road through, movement of traffic, should there be an accident or roadworks, becomes frustratingly unpredictable. What provision is there to maintain and develop the road system in the valley? - - Whitworth High School has become more popular over the past couple of years with waiting lists existing. What provision will be made to expand the school, and will this be done with a long term objective in mind and not just a sticking plaster effort to put up some portable classrooms? - - Local services such as the Children's Centre have just been lost. What plans may be afoot to reinstate such necessary provision? I feel it is morally wrong to simply build new houses and forget about the infrastructure to support this development. - - There is a wealth of wildlife on the moors where you are proposing to site many homes. Presumably there will be checks in place to ensure some of these species are not endangered? - - Finally, there are already plenty of properties on the market at very affordable prices (in comparison with some surrounding areas). Some of these have been on the market a while? Why, if there is already affordable housing, is there a need to build more? -</p>		-
98	Jacqueline	Butterworth	-		Object	<p>I am objecting to proposed development of all the above houses around the Whitworth area. The area is overrun with traffic as it us. One way in and one way out. The schools are overloaded as are the GP surgery. It is inconceivable to build more houses and allowing more traffic to use our roads which are in a terrible state. We are already experiencing burst water pipes and our water pressure has already been reduced. We are experiencing more power cuts since all the new houses have been built on Cowm Park Way . Surely there must be someone in the planning department with some common sense and will prevent any further building of houses in Whitworth</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
131	Christine	Greenwood	-		Object	I am objecting to plans to allow the building of over £350 properties on various sites around Whitiworth and Shawforth over the next 15 years. - Not only am I concerned about the building on our greenbelt sites which is part of the attraction of the area. I can understand the wind farm and can support renewable energy sources but not the creation of a collection of housing estates - whether social/affordable or not . The awful collection in Britannia speaks for itself! We have already had several builds across Rossendale but the extra Council Tax revenue does not seem to have brought many benefits to the borough. - As it stands at present the infrastructure can just about support the current residents - schools are already over subscribed and getting an appointment at our one GP surgery is already a mammoth undertaking. Planning to build or reopen a school by any chance? - Traffic is already an issue with one road in and out and a bus service that has to be one of the most unreliable in the surrounding areas ! There are next to no facilities for young people/children and a library fighting to survive so I think that this needs to be given serious consideration before you go ahead.		-
153	G.N	Royds			Not Applicable	As I have indicated before, a prerequisite for a community is sustainable employment. A complete hash has been made by not providing this. Former mill sites have been used for housing, such as Orama Mill, Facit Mill, Albert Mill and the mill near Spodden Fold (which I think may have been called Old Kays). Most of these are easily accessible. Now Spring Mill is proposed for similar treatment! On the other hand, peripheral businesses have been allowed, e.g. tattoo parlours and tanning centres, which debase the human body; the type of potentially smelly fast food outlets that encourage unhealthy eating. Housing without local employment means commuting, causing traffic congestion and pollution. The kind of industry needed is that involved in green energy, recycling, sensible clothing and the production of healthy food. The former site of Spring Mill is a place where a sensitively designed industrial estate might be possible. It is already surrounded by trees and has foundations remaining but it is not on a regular public transport route and is less accessible than previously mentioned sites that have been precluded. It is absurd to think of building on HS2.102/103/106/109 and on that part of HS2.107 not formerly occupied by Spring Mill. These are large areas of countryside enjoyed at present as part of the natural environment. HS2.104 also appears to be countryside, with a few established houses, and also should be protected from further building. Cowm Water Treatment Works (HS2.108) is ideal for industrial development. Let us have local jobs and ensure adequate facilities are available before any more houses are built in Whitworth.		P.S. I did not make this response online because it was mandatory to provide an e-mail address. Please change this, so that more people are encouraged to respond. P.P.S. Please keep me informed of developments.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
155	Jo	Furtado			Object	<p>HS2.106 and 109 -those areas of land are d'etightful to walk on; they might be delightful to live on, if the houses are well built and well insulated BUT access to/from those houses, via Tonacliffe Way, would put real pressure on narrow"estate roads, particularly at school start and finish times. The two big issues are broader, however. 1. The numbers of houses proposed pose a real challenge/threat in terms of schools, health services and road infrastructure, as outlined above. The proximity of these sites to the southern end of the valley means they would almost certainly be occupied disproportionately by those who work in or beyond Rochdale, with obvious consequences for the A671 and its users. 2. These are two sizeable chunks of Green Belt, carefully shown as such on your own Green Belt Assessment document (which was available along with the DLP maps/document/Infrastructure Delivery document at the Library), though mysteriously appearing as Urban Area on the DLP map.</p> <p>Whitworth's Green Belt is mostly moorland, and there will be those who see moorland as worthless. But the moorland is a large part of what gives Whitworth the character its residents value: we should not be giving it up so easily. (The moorland surrounding is already disproportionately given up to wind turbines.) Let the government meet its housebuilding targets by throwing up estates in the Cotswolds, or the South Downs, or the Chilterns, or the South Hams. Perhaps we should redesignate our moorland a "Heritage Asset": in ENV2 you yourselves say that historic landscapes could be so designated. Oppose vigorously, in both cases.</p> <p>In SD2 the DLP states, "All new developments in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundary defined in the Policies map ... " which begs the question, when, and by whose authority, did the parcels of land numbered HS2.106 and 109 transfer from Green Belt to Urban Land? The DLP goes on, " ... except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area." (My italics) Put bluntly, they don't, and they wouldn't. The spirit ofthe DLP is quite clear: it would be wrong to build houses on either of these two sites.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
195	Janet	King	-	HS.102, HS2.104-9 inclusive	Object	Whitworth' infrastructure cannot support almost 400 new properties - it is already nigh impossible to obtain a doctors appointment and my father has had to wait iver 6 months to obtain a podiatry appointment as there is only one who has been on long term sick and no replacement cover available. The fact that there is only one main arterial road into and out of Whitworth, which already has weekly road works delaying the already totally congested road does not bear thinking about. With an extra 400 properties and the increase in traffic that these will bring and as there is no large employer in the area most of these occupants will be commuting one way or another. We lost access to an A&E in Rochdale and now the nearest is either Fairfield or Oldham with the additional traffic these proposals would create the congested roads Could be catastrophic in an emergency. - - On a personal note, my family moved to Whitworth 12 years ago, from Oldham, due to its naturally beautiful countryside and I see the addition of these properties into areas of greenery (extending Wallbank estate etc.,) is the very short end of the stick. I can see that if these are accepted, encroaching on to green belt areas, slowly but surely the green belt areas will get smaller and smaller until eventually Whitworth just becomes another concrete plot with ever creaking infrastructure. - - Finally, I understand the need for affordable housing but there are plenty of mills/brown field that could be developed. However, I feel strongly that before any proposals are accepted it is of the utmost importance that the infrastructure is in place to support them, that includes roads, schools and NHS access.	-	
258	Fiona	Harrisson			Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village oversubscribed schools and GP Services with one road in and one road out. The pressure on the infrastructure would be immense, plus travelling to or from anywhere especially at peak times is already horrendous, nevermind with another approx 400 houses being built. Our skyline and beautiful views and countryside are also going to be lost.	-	
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	This is an unbelievable plan that will stretch amenities in the area even further. - - The new estate near Cowm has already increased traffic congestion on the one road in and out of the village and schools are already struggling to cope. - - There is also the issue of wildlife and the impact it will have on their environment. - - I for one will be leaving if this idiotic plan goes through. -		This smells of greed over common sense

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
268	Michaela	Radford	-		Object	Whitworth has had numerous instances recently regarding the roadworks for the infrastructure repair and maintenance. As an employee of all 4 major utility asset owners in the area, I am very concerned regarding the houses proposed. We only have one road throughout the valley and this is impacted severly when roadworks are planned. My concerns are that these are not managed correctly by LCC at present, therefore; more houses and more infrastructure would have a massive impact on the people living in the village. People face unemployment now due to the frequent issues we face getting into work. - Not to mention over crowded schools and doctors as we stand at present. - - I request, here in writing, to be informed of any planned meetings regarding the houses in whitworth and notification be sent in writing to my address above.		-
297	Lindsay	Fairhurst			Object	Poor access along the length of Main Rd (Market Street) one narrow road lined with parked cars , as only access into & out of whitworth. No alternative route. No trains or trams. Buses won't must travel on same one access road both in and out as cars. No motorway access under 20 min journey both ways insufficient work in area means people must travel to Manchester, leeds, bury, Rochdale etc. Current public transport unrealistic. Traffic at peak times currently gridlocked & congested. Increased housing will add to this burden. Utilities infrastructure unable to cope currently leading to repeated remedial roadworks. Schools full Doctors full Rossendale Council Lancashire Council needs to address transport & roadways access + education access beofer building homkes where people will be unable to travel to employment and school		highway safety compromised by insufficient access up tonacliffe road past primary school - children at risk also
298	Andrew	Fairhurst			Object	the number of houses proposed in this local plan for infrastructure can support. Whitworth has only one road in abd out and already this is constantly being dug up by utility companies often resulting in temporary traffic lights that cause massives queues of traffic in rush hours. Not only is the road narrow and conjested but there is no alternative train service - only the bus (on the same road) This is totall useless for the number of people wo commute to Manchester, Oldham and Bury every working day. Our schools, doctors and dentists are already close to capacity. There are very few options to travel to other facilities apart from along the one road through the valley.		Without robust and achievable plans to increase the support infrastructure for travel (a train for example) and health and education and culture this building should not go ahead. For people to afford these houses they need jobs first. Currently you need to move out of the valley to commute to work. Regeneration of the area and existing housing stock should come first.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
335	Venkatesh	Thoppae	-		Object	Currently, due to traffic I am already starting 30 minutes early to work, with the school run, I believe the roads towards Haslingden and Rochdale will be much congested for office goers if proposed plans are executed without proper plans to widen the roads and making new ways to connect to the various part of the main roads(motor way). - - Also the schools, GP services will be under much more strain if those are not equipped to address the increasing population.		-
405	Sheila	Sutcliffe	-		Object	Whitworth and in particular the area around Tonacliffe Primary School is already a very busy area with extreme access and parking problems. - - This area is already saturated with housing and there is no advantage to be gained by the proposal of increasing housing in the area. This would only increase the associated problems brought by a new housing development i.e. extra traffic, parking problems, school places, GP and dentist places. - - The traffic problems alone would be horrific, the proposal of building a further 120 new houses would bring 240 more vehicles to the area, bearing in mind that most houses have at least 2 vehicles. The proposed site in Tonacliffe has only one access road, Tonacliffe Way, which is already heavily congested as it includes the main entrance to a primary school. Police are continually requested to show a presence to deter traffic issues on Tonacliffe Way and residents already suffer terribly with obstruction problems outside their properties. - - Tonacliffe School is already up to capacity on the pupil roll number and is oversubscribed in some year groups. It would not be able to sustain the increase in school places that 120 new houses in the area would undoubtedly bring. Tonacliffe School also has no further space within the building to increase the number of classrooms.		I implore all counsellors to reconsider these proposals which would destroy a greenbelt area providing countryside on the doorstep of current residents and an Outstanding Ofsted primary school. - - The area provides a natural habitat for wildlife, I have personally enjoyed watching deer, falcons, and owls in the area. It provides a safe haven for children to play, families enjoy walks together and many, many dog owners exercise their pets on the hillside. - - - -
441	Sharon	Brown	-		Object	Tonacliffe is already congested. Water pipes have burst, the road is in a state of disrepair. - - In addition concerns on how the school would cope with 120 new families moving directly to that street. Plus the additional - - I have lived at Ainsdale for 12 months now and have had 3 power cuts already.		Whitworth Road couldn't cope with the extra through traffic.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
446	Paula	Todd	-		Object	Whitworth is a small community with only one main road to access it. I feel that if all these purposed houses are built the traffic congestion for commuting will be very difficult for the local residents. Other than the bus service residents have no alternative to drive to and from work. - - My children go to local Tonnacliffe school and the traffic and parking is extremely heavy and if more houses are built in that area the roads would not be able to cope. - - Flooding is a massive problem at present in Whitworth, united utilities are constantly out trying to fix problems, having more houses I believe would make the flooding worse. - - Whitworth is also known for its beauty, walks and wildlife and to purpose building on the greenbelt areas of Whitworth would cause a detrimental effect on this. - - Whitworth does not have access to a local A&E dept, Rochdale hospital only has a urgent care centre as does Burnley. Residents of Whitworth closes A&E is either Oldham or Blackburn. Having more residents in Whitworth with limited healthcare facility's could increase morbidity rate. Along side no local A&E we only have one GP practice in the area, having more residence would cause strain on their service, this also includes only one dental practice. - - Will there be enough places in the schools for all the new children to the area? The local high school is only small and as I believe was over subscribed this school year. - -		
464		Hough			Object	<p>We wish to express our opposition to the above proposal on the following grounds.</p> <p>(1) The infrastructure of Whitworth has already been stretched to its limits with the “new” builds over the last few years.</p> <p>(a) Schools are currently fully subscribed.</p> <p>(b) Community support (medical facilities and emergency services) struggle even at present to cope with increasing demands.</p> <p>(c) The geographical nature of Whitworth, one road both in and out of the borough currently presents severe rush hour congestion. The proposed “new builds” will undoubtedly result in more commuters which in turn would make the journey to and from people’s place of work take on “nightmare proportions”.</p> <p>(2) The open moorland and its footpaths and rights of way behind Tonacliffe are of benefit to the community and also home to wildlife deer, foxes, birds and badgers (is it illegal to destroy a badger set?)</p> <p>The open aspect and its benefits will be lost forever if this proposal is permitted to go ahead!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
464		Hough			Object	<p>I wish to oppose to the above proposal on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schools are oversubscribed at present 2. Roads are crowded at peak times. Any new housebuilding programme would make the situation intolerable. 3. It is difficult to get an appointment at the doctors at present more patients could only make the situation worse. 4. The moorland is boggy and whilst suitable for wildlife (deer, badgers) not suitable for housing. A culvert runs through the proposed Tonacliffe site which drains water. If the new build goes ahead there will be an increased risk of flooding. <p>If this proposed new building programme goes ahead I feel it goes against government policies on planning and greenbelt conservation.</p>		
509	Joanne	Robinson	-	HS2.106 & HS2.109	Object	<p>The changing of usage of these 2 areas from greenbelt so you can use them to build 120 houses is totally unacceptable. To begin with more houses in Whitworth itself is going to create more problems on our main road which is already so busy as it is one main road in & out of the village. Any roadworks that occurs (which are frequently) because of water mains constantly bursting due to overuse & other utilities constantly having to upgrade because of new houses already being built. The back up of traffic is appalling. We also need to think about ruining the natural beauty of the area, the wildlife that will be disturbed, we have 2 ponds in these areas also. Already when we get a lot of rain we have flooding in our gardens. Your plan is proposing to use our street as one of the access roads again this would be a nightmare as the amount of cars on all the streets over Tonnacliffe would make the congestion unbearable. We have a primary school at the bottom which at school time again congestion of cars ridiculous. What about local amenities schools, doctors, dentists will they be able to take the influx of more people?</p>		
510	Philip andrew	Robinson	-	HS2.106 & HS2.109	Object	<p>I am not happy with your proposal to change these 2 areas from greenbelt so you can build 120 houses on them. The area has an abundance of wildlife, 2 ponds and would be a great loss to our community. Taking this piece of greenbelt would ruin our beautiful landscape. The problems with congestion on our main road through the village is getting worse as of new houses already being built and the constant digging up of our roads by the utility department to try and fix problems that are constantly occurring. The state of our main roads and roads around Tonnacliffe are appallingly and will only get worse with more cars. The access to these sites coming off our street and others on Tonnacliffe would be a nightmare because again with the number of cars at the houses already there. When the school is open again the congestion is ridiculous. We also have trouble with flooding after a lot of rain in our gardens coming off the moors so again more houses would not be helping that.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
544	Lois	Lees	-		Object	HS2.106 - The access to the proposed site on Tonacliffe is one road in and out. There are already traffic issues and congestion getting up and down Tonacliffe, and in and out of the village. - The current road surfaces are poor and damaged. - The schools		Whitworth is a lovely village which is just managing to deal with the number of cars, houses and people that exist here. - There is already damage to the roads and water supply. Adding extra housing and more people will only cause more issues with the roa
590		Ashworth			Object	Absolutely ridiculous One way in and out of whitworth no extra schools or doctors when you have two or three cars per household. This is ruining our villages. We strongly object to this. Listen to the people who vote you in, as we have long memories		
627	alan	lord		HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	Whitworth as a whole is an over developed village, the schools do not have enough places the doctors and dentist are full but more importantly the village is chock a block with traffic. There is one road in and one road out and traffic is a night mare for local people. On Tonacliffe we have badgers, deer, rabbits, foxes and newts just to name a few animals, what happens to these animals where do they go I am not sure they understand the prospect of new houses being built and having to find a new habitat. TRaffic at Tonacliffe school in the mornings and evenings is awful, I came home at 3.30pm on Friday to look for myself I do not know how there are not more accidents or children hurt or injured we just cannot cope with any more people or vehicles in this village		I suggest the planning officer actually visits the area he is planning to decimate and see for himself the beauty of the place and how much he would be ruining. At evenings and weekends the moors off Tonacliffe are full of mountain bikers, walkers and people just enjoying the fresh air which he wants to take away. No doubt the planners will return to their ivory towers and enjoy peace and quiet in their villages why does Whitworth have to have more houses we have more than enough for local people. I havent even touched on emergency vehicles who struggle to get through due to parking on narrow roads that are already full For once councillors think about your actions and decisions and see which people and animals this will affect Greenbelt should stay that protected

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
717	Joanne	Banks	-		Object	Tonacliffe Way and Tonacliffe Road cannot cope with the additional traffic. The drains on Tonacliffe Road are regularly bursting, they will not be able to cope with an additional 110 houses. - - Whenever there are traffic lights the main road, Whitworth grounds to a halt, as highlighted with the recent traffic lights at Healey Corner. People take short cuts along Tonacliffe Road, which will only get worse if more houses are built in the area. - - Has consideration been made to determine if our amenities can cope with extra housing in Whitworth? Will there be enough school places for our children?		I believe Rossendale Council should think really hard about further developments in Whitworth. The local amenities are already overstretched with only 4 primary schools, 1 high school and 1 GP surgery.
743			Whitworth Town Council		Object	HS2.106 Land to the east of Tonacliffe School HS2.109 Site off Horsefield Avenue, Tonacliffe Council have strong concerns about removing this land from greenbelt and feel that brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenbelt. Developing this area would have an adverse impact on the diversity of nature and wildlife in this area. Additionally, there is a pylon and electricity cables located in the site off Horsefield Avenue which has not been identified on the plan. These areas have formed part of previous greenbelt reviews and the studies have recommended that these areas remain in greenbelt.		
773	Susan	Worrall	-		Object	Whitworth is a village, a small community. Building these housing developments will change Whitworth into a town. - There is not the infrastructure to support this additional housing. There is one road in and out of Whitworth which is already struggling to cope with the increasing volume of traffic. Especially at peak times. If there are any traffic disruptions it can take 1-2 hours to get to Rochdale . We do not need more cars and the pollution they bring! - - There are limited school places both secondary and primary and local children born in the village will struggle to get places. - The one and only GP practice can not manage to provide the necessary health care for patients with no appointments pre bookable for weeks in advance. This healthcare will be diluted further. Living in Whitworth if A&E treatment is required which is often a life or death situation your chances of survival are reduced add more traffic on market street and your chance of survival diminishes further - - The people who live in Whitworth , live here because it is a village , it is quiet and the countryside is on the door step. Yet the plans want to destroy the village life, increase demands on existing services and increase pollution - - To consider building on greenbelt land in Whitworth is unbelievable and irresponsible, Planning has already - spoil the view of the countryside at the side of Daneswood ave and the wind farms are also affecting the views and countryside. - - Whitworth has lots of wildlife from deer, owls, herons, wild ponies as well as lots of insect life butterflies, bees etc which will all be at risk if the countryside is used for housing. - - There is empty housing all over the borough - fill these , not build more especially in our little village -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
793	Victoria	Roberts	-		Object	<p>1 My children attend this school that is current over subscribed as its not just whitworth children loads are from Rochdale taking spaces. the school is unable to be extended ie additional buildings. so to add more house with families would cause issues with people getting to school of choice/local on door step. - 2 Parking is currently as issues plus the narrow streets makes it hard now to park to add more houses would make it horrendous and I feel would to add the amount would put strain on the current roads but also make it unsafe for children esp the ones that walk to school so it would make it dangerous to increased volume - 3when the roads have congestion over tonaccliffe is used as a short causing issues of safety esp when schools is open. The situation has been ongoing for years and trying to find a solution but has been unsuccessful so far - 4 wildlife in that area will be affected there homes will lose there habit, trees cut down are they going to be replaced? some trees are fully grown and been there hundreds of years. are the endangered specie going to be taken in to consideration - 5 children use that access to walk over the moors on trips to the local church. will this mean that children can no longer do this as it will be unsafe taking a large amount of children on an educational trip. this could become a cost to the parents school etc so the trips could be lost so a child loses the incite to local church - 6 one of the roads that will be used is okenshaw and this road has that many holes inis in great need of resurfacing but there is no money in the pot. so more volume of traffic is only going to make it worse. and lcc Idea is to fill in holes wasting money this has been done many times. - 7 the facilities to get to the houses gas eclectic etc. is going to cause great disruption on the people in the area also parents picking dropping up. the extent of the issue around parking etc needs to be taken in to consideration. as the safety of my children is paramount and would be deeply upset if any harm cam to them through to a judgement that causes more harm than good. - 8 is the school going to lose out door space? they should be safe in there environment and the freedom to roam but if house are to be built then they will be confined in a smaller space in a small outdoor playground. -</p>		<p>whitworth facit Is a small village that current cant take any more traffic and homes . it one in and out and god forbid if traffic lights or bad weather journies increase by 1hrs just to get in and out of whitworth. animals will be loosing homes to make way for more homes. roads unsuitable and more holes then anything -</p>
796	Steven	Smith	Wagg		Object	<p>Already an overcrowded infastucture..object to greenbelt land being used and local wildlife being destroyed.the proposed site on horsefield av site would be built under or very near electricity pylons.the roads or already overused to and from whitworth so more traffic will mean longer delays on worse roads.the schools and doctors are already full..more traffic passing tonaccliffe primary school would endanger the pupils at school opening and closing.previous mining at tonacclffe makes the proposed site unsuitable for building on.the transportation of heavy plant will damage the roads.</p>		<p>Don't use greenbelt land and build somewhere else.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
797	Louise	Madden	-		Object	<p>1. The roads around Moorland Crescent are already extremely busy at school times, parking is a increasingly growing concern and the impact of more traffic around this are is quite worrying. My son attends this school and I see first hand how dangerous the current situation is without adding more traffic to the mix. - 2. I live on Market St which is the main thoroughfare from Rochdale to Bacup. We are often gridlocked (especially when there are road closures / traffic lights in the area). As an example, myself and my son often 'play a game' about how many cars pass us before we can pull out into traffic. Our record is 122 cars without a break in traffic. This road was never intended to take this level of traffic, what impact would this have on the already poor level of public transport. - 3. The proposed site is on greenbelt land, which the government is supposedly protecting. What would happen to the wildlife currently in this area, not only during the building process but also the higher level of pollution around this area. - 4. Amenities are already stretched, almost every month there are some works being done to water, electric, gas etc. would further impact these services. Tonacliffe Road has been dug up every winter for the last few years due to burst pipes, this situation won't improve with increased usage and traffic. - 5. The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down, a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative impact on the environment. How greatly would this impact for carbon footprint of the valley,.</p>		<p>There are several proposed housing sites in Whitworth, and in general I object to them all. This is due to the infrastructure of the valley already at breaking point. - Due to only one road in / one road out, Market St is often gridlocked at peak times. 4 years ago, there was a bad accident outside our house. Due to this, the road was closed for 3 hours, this meant a diversion, either back through Bacup through Littleborough or through Rawtenstall / Bury. Increased traffic through the whole valley is just putting further pressure on the valley. - We often have temporary traffic lights on this main road, as our current facilities (water / gas / electric etc) struggle to cope with demand. Have this services been contacted, are any plans to improve their facilities - again this will lead to further problems already highlighted. - Our doctors / dentists are already fully loaded (I know this through hearsay as I am a patient at surgeries in Rochdale). I often hear complaints about the amount of time it takes to see a doctor. - - I feel that major improvements need to be made to the current infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with the current population, adding to this is just putting so much pressure on an already failing situation.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
803	Marietta	Galbraith	-		Object	<p>My objections for the proposed building of housing on the above sites is based on a number of reasons: - 1. Infrastructure. The current housing situation is already at (possibly beyond) capacity with regards to schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists, employment and traffic. There are no more schools planned and no way to expand the ones already here. Some children have to travel miles to schools out of the area due to oversubscribed local schools. This is the same for doctor's surgeries and many other amenities. - 2. Traffic. There is one main road in and out of Whitworth that already has issues with raised levels of traffic. In the four years we have lived here, there have been many occasions where traffic has been an issue due to constant roadworks (for various reasons relating to increased housing and traffic) which has caused major problems. Also, most people are employed outside of Whitworth so traffic is high anyway. More housing would increase this issue with no solution being given as to how it could be rectified. - 3. Utilities. More and more power cuts have been happening recently in Whitworth due to new housing as well as burst water pipes and problems with drainage. This has contributed to the traffic issues with roads having to be dug up every few weeks to 'fix' the problem. - 4. More housing would mean taking up land that is natural drainage for flooding. Recently, my area was put into the 'flood risk' category (although we haven't flooded), significantly increasing my home insurance. If more homes are built, this would increase risk of flooding to many homes around Whitworth, which would cause loss of market value and would reduce the chances of being able to sell the property. - 5. Much of the 'green land' would be lost which is detrimental to the wildlife around Whitworth. The Government have a duty to protect greenbelt land and our environment! The carbon footprint would be horrific! - In conclusion, building over 300 houses in Whitworth would cause issues beyond repair! Environment, traffic, pollution, infrastructure, drainage etc. would all be dramatically affected in the most negative and damaging way. Whitworth was not meant for so much housing and so many people.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
852	Christine	O'Malley	-		Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed housing sites 'to the land east of Tonacliffe School' 68 houses and 'site off Horsefield Avenue, Tonacliffe' 52 houses. I live at number one Tonacliffe Way and I have a birds eye view of how congested the traffic is on Tonacliffe Way and Tonacliffe Road. This is especially serious when in the mornings, afternoons and evenings when the school is open. Cars park on the pavement forcing pedestrians including those with prams and young children into the road and oncoming traffic. When the cars park on either side of the road only one car can pass up the road at once causing congestion, chaos and a very dangerous situation. Rossendale Council recognised this a couple of years ago by adding double yellow lines on both sides of the road. This hasn't reduced the traffic risk as drivers ignore the restrictions and park on the lines every day. Occasionally the local enforcement officer drives round and gives parking tickets but it's not often enough to put off drivers parking wherever they want on the restricted areas. If the proposed 120 new houses are approved in the Tonacliffe area then this situation will be magnified and put the children and parents lives in more risk of an accident. - Outside of school times there are many drivers who do not abide to the 20 mile an hour speed restriction and as far as I'm aware no-one has been fined for going over this speed limit. - There is also the problem of accommodating the new children that these houses would bring into local schools. All the schools in this area are over subscribed and could mean children having to travel a long way from home to attend a primary school. This would then increase the traffic in and out of Whitworth. The infrastructure can only just accommodate the current traffic flow if all the local housing plans are approved then the main road in and out of Whitworth would grind to a halt including the emergency services that would not be able to pass through. - The local GP practices can't expand any further and new developments would increase the demand for accessing gp services. Many residents would then be put off trying to access the local health services and would potentially increase the risk of early intervention of health conditions in local residents and increase pressure and spend on hospital services and specialist care in local Health Authorities. - Other potential health problems would increase by building on green belt land by not allowing residents to enjoy the beautiful land that surrounds Tonacliffe. Walking has been proven by many health professionals as having a positive impact on our health and reducing the access to this land would discourage many residents of doing this cost free exercise. - On the many walks I have done on this green belt land around Tonacliffe I have seen lots of different wildlife including badgers, deer, rabbits and squirrels. Building the 120 new homes on this green belt will inevitably destroy the habitat for these animals. - During the last few years heavy rain fallen and has seen many houses flooded in this area. We are especially vulnerable at Tonacliffe as we are at the mid point on a hill side. The</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
						moorland that is proposed for housing developments is currently soaking up a lot of the rain. If this land is developed on then this flood barrier will be removed and houses all over Tonacliffe will be susceptible to flooding.		
866	Robert	Atkinson	-		Object	I strongly oppose the proposed plan to build additional houses on the Greenfield site Horsefield Avenue. •The proposed build will overlook my property and as such will result in a loss of privacy. •Access to the the proposed development is restricted and increased traffic levels would cause unacceptable noise and congestion. •Unacceptable over development of the site. •Open aspect views of the countryside would be lost adversely affecting the residential amenity of neighbouring owners. •Generally the schools, medical centres, roads (namely Tonacliffe Road and Tonacliffe Way) and other amenities and infrastructure in Whitworth are unable to support further development. •Previous applications have been refused		No
873	Terence	Burke	N/A	HS2.106 HS2.109	Object	This location is heavily congested with traffic and can be extremely dangerous with speeding traffic. The Council have been helpful in a limited way with educational signs but the police have not shown much interest with speeding or illegal parking in the whitworth area. - There have been a number of accidents (some serious) and tonacliffe Rd is particularly hazardous because vehicles meet head on round a blind bend. - - The Idea that Whitworth will benefit commercially from development is illogical because of poor network links; at certain times it can take half an hour to reach Rochdale and longer to access the motorway, on days with roadworks it is considerably longer. - - Subsidence is also an issue. There are many mine shafts all around this area; there is one mine shaft at the top of High Peak Rd that has been capped with concrete. All the cottages on High Peak were miners cabins many years ago; my bungalow still has the cabin in the walls and roof space. - - The schools in Whitworth are already stretched with some local children having to travel out off the area. - - The local wildlife will suffer like the newts in the pond and the badgers and foxes in the area, although I don't think developers care much about wildlife, or about the local residents either. - If the proposed housing is to be built like the small houses leading up to Whitworth cemetery which looks like a prison block then the village is going down hill fast. Any development should be sympathetic to its local surroundings with both design and the existing social environment blending together.		-
886	Michael	Banham	-	HS2.102 to HS2.109	Object	The infrastructure of whitworth is over stretched as it is, the school's cannot cater for such an undertaking. There's only one road in or out of whitworth any problems on this road causes absolute mayhem. The winter months are an absolute nightmare just to get onto market street.		I cannot understand why anyone would want to over populate an area that is already struggling.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
889	Derek	Lord	-	HS 102, HS105, HS104, HS106, HS107, HS108, HS109.	Object	We in Whitworth are sure that there are enough houses here at the present time. There are large estates at Cowm Park, Tonacliffe, Wain Gap, Wallbank, Knot Hill, Orama Mill Site, Edgemoor Close, and a small estate at Facit. The exits onto the one main road are at present full of traffic. The Doctors, Schools etc are now at bursting point. We in Whitworth have done our share in housing. Please think again before building any more. Thank You. -	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
890	Debbie	Stewart	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
892	Mandy	Sanderson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105,HS2.10 4, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2108, HS2.109	Object	residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - The transport system around Whitworth cannot cope with the volume of traffic . Also local amenities are already at braking point..		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
899	Julie	Bywater	N/a	HS2.106 & HS2.109	Object	<p>The Tonacliffe area cannot take any more traffic. Tonacliffe way and Tonacliffe rd are dangerously congested especially at School times and the roads are full of pot holes due to the excess traffic. Additional traffic could be fatal to a child including my own. - Both of these proposed areas have local wildlife including deer, badgers, foxes, hares, bats and newts. A family of deer is seen on a daily basis grazing on the moorland crescent site which is a wonderful site for residents and children to see these in their natural habitat. Building here will mean the loss of all this wildlife and their natural habitat. - In addition as a resident that backs onto this land I can confirm that the land including my own back garden is flooded all year round. We have had drainage laid in our garden but this has not stopped the flooding and our garden is unusable all year round. Additional houses will mean less natural drainage and will cause a severe and dangerous flooding risk to all residents. There is a culvert that runs through the land which is always running water away from the houses however this is at bursting point every time there is even a bit of rain. - We are regularly experiencing power cuts and burst water pipes impacting on this area. This causes roads to be dug up meaning horrendous tailbacks of traffic through Whitworth as far as shawforth. More houses will mean more frequent utility issues and therefore longer tailbacks due to the increase in population. The traffic is gridlocked down market st and Whitworth rd everyday! This small village simply cannot take any additional traffic, existing residents lives are already miserable enough sitting in this rush hour traffic everyday!! - The schools and GP surgeries are oversubscribed, will there be new schools and GP surgeries built? The existing ones cannot take the amount of residents as it is. - Finally, my husband and I purchased our house in 2010 due to the corner plot location. We wanted our children to grow up surrounded by nature and knew this was greenbelt land when we bought it. Greenbelt land used to mean something and was protected for a reason, we feel incredibly sad that it is even being considered to change the usage of this beautiful and natural landscape. From a financial point of view, if these houses go ahead the value of our house will decrease effectively putting us into negative equity. This will leave us unable to move to another area impacting on our children's upbringing significantly. If we had wanted to raise our children in the middle of a large housing estate we would have bought a house in one. The Human Rights Act, protocol 2, Article 1 states that 'a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land'. -</p>		Please please rethink these plans, there are better and more appropriate areas to build than this saturated village.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
901	Adam	Bywater	N/a	HS2.106 & HS2.109	Object	<p>The Tonacliffe area cannot take any more traffic. Tonacliffe way and Tonacliffe rd are dangerously congested especially at School times and the roads are full of pot holes due to the excess traffic. Additional traffic could be fatal to a child including my own. - Both of these proposed areas have local wildlife including deer, badgers, foxes, hares, bats and newts. A family of deer is seen on a daily basis grazing on the moorland crescent site which is a wonderful site for residents and children to see these in their natural habitat. Building here will mean the loss of all this wildlife and their natural habitat. - - In addition as a resident that backs onto this land I can confirm that the land including my own back garden is flooded all year round. We have had drainage laid in our garden but this has not stopped the flooding and our garden is unusable all year round. Additional houses will mean less natural drainage and will cause a severe and dangerous flooding risk to all residents. There is a culvert that runs through the land which is always running water away from the houses however this is at bursting point every time there is even a bit of rain. - We are regularly experiencing power cuts and burst water pipes impacting on this area. This causes roads to be dug up meaning horrendous tailbacks of traffic through Whitworth as far as shawforth. More houses will mean more frequent utility issues and therefore longer tailbacks due to the increase in population. The traffic is gridlocked down market st and Whitworth rd everyday! This small village simply cannot take any additional traffic, existing residents lives are already miserable enough sitting in this rush hour traffic everyday!! - The schools and GP surgeries are oversubscribed, will there be new schools and GP surgeries built? The existing ones cannot take the amount of residents as it is. - Finally, my wife and I purchased our house in 2010 due to the corner plot location. We wanted our children to grow up surrounded by nature and knew this was greenbelt land when we bought it. Greenbelt land used to mean something and was protected for a reason, we feel incredibly sad that it is even being considered to change the usage of this beautiful and natural landscape. From a financial point of view, if these houses go ahead the value of our house will decrease effectively putting us into negative equity. This will leave us unable to move to another area impacting on our children's upbringing significantly. If we had wanted to raise our children in the middle of a large housing estate we would have bought a house in one. The Human Rights Act, protocol 2, Article 1 states that 'a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land'. -</p>		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
911	Julie	Latham	-		Object	In principle I don't object to more houses or people. However I will until I am convinced that the planners are committed to the infrastructure improvements required to support the extra influx of people and cars . - The main bottlenecks caused by Whitworth traffic happen in the Rochdale Borough at the bottom of Whitworth Road and on Shawclough Road. These areas are controlled by Rochdale Council who are under no obligation to improve traffic flow to improve the lives of the people of Whitworth. There are changes could be made in these areas which would help greatly. Unless Rossendale Planners can work with Rochdale Planners to create new roads and implement better traffic flow measures the extra cars generated by this and other proposed housing projects in Whitworth will mean journey times to get to Rochdale, Manchester and the M62 Motorway network at f peak times will be so long that people who commute this way to work will have to give up their jobs or move away from the village. I really don't think that this issue is being taken on board by either Borough. - The medical centre is also over-subscribed and I believe that the schools are too. I appeal to the planners to find funds and solutions to these concerns before adding more pressure.		-
912	Amanda	Greenwood	-	HS2.106 and HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a beautiful and unspoilt village. It has a fantastic community and is supported by one local secondary school and three Primary schools. There is one road in and out; and traffic is usually busy. I live in the Tonacliffe part of Whitworth and with school runs and work commutes etc, we already see enough traffic. The various proposals for housing developments in the area are ludicrous. They are proposing building a further 359 houses that will cause more problems with already oversubscribed schools, more local traffic, more pressure on already stretched services such as doctors and not forgetting what this will do to a stunning area of natural beauty.		No.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
913	Michelle	Ashcroft	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108 & HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a geographical challenge at the best of times, positioned in a valley, consisting of ONE main road with multiple roads stemming from this leading to many properties that are built on the hillside. There are many green areas which are used by local farmers for their livestock. During times of heavy rain many of the roads are flooded, and during winter many roads are very dangerous in the snow. It is not uncommon for Whitworth to be gridlocked as there are far too many cars on the roads, all it needs is one set of road works and the town becomes inaccessible. The local schools are now over subscribed, the High school has had to turn away many children who only live a couple of miles away. The primary schools are also subscribed making it very difficult for teachers to provide a good education to the children. The local doctors are unable to cope with the number of patients, trying to get a same day appointment is nigh on impossible these days. We have issues with anti social behaviour due to lack of amenities available for teenagers, the local youth club has been closed down. There is a lack of police presence (the PSCO tries her best), people don't feel as safe as they should. The library is still under threat of closure, the pool is only open because of the people of Whitworth who run it. Building more houses brings more people, more cars, more strain on the infrastructure. I appreciate housing is needed but the number of houses that has been suggested will bring this town to it's knees.		I would suggest you come to Whitworth during the morning school run and see how difficult it is around Horsefield Avenue. Come sit in the traffic jams during rush hour. - - The government has spoken about creating new towns, this is a great idea, there are places that can accommodate thousands and thousands of houses. Build there not here!!!
916	Jane	Trudgeon	-	HS2.102 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	We are already an overstretched village infrastructure, the roads would not cope with an extra amount of traffic and would make the already difficult commute to exit/enter the village impossible. There are not enough schools nor would the doctor's surgery be able to cope as even now it is almost impossible to get a reasonable appointment time, - - The housing developments would impact on wildlife		-
918	Marion	Ashworth	-	HS2.107 , ALL.	Object	I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.		I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
922	Susan	Percy	-	HS.2107 HS2.106 HS2.109	Object	I wish to object to the proposed building developments on the grounds that there is one route into and out of this village which is Market Street. This route is already very congested during morning and evening rush hour and also due to school runs at other times of the day. This is compounded by the many times that the roads are being dug up for roadworks and temporary traffic lights in situ. - - Increased traffic would be an issue for children that play in these areas. - - Schools are also over subscribed in this area and additional parking outside schools would make a bad situation even worse and dangerous. - - Doctors surgeries and Dentists are also full and additional patients would mean longer waiting times to get appointments and would be detrimental for the health and well being of local people. - - Building on green belt would result in loss of wildlife e.g newts, badgers, foxes and hares. Deer use shelter within these areas and it would be detrimental to them if they lost this facility. - - Drainage is a major issue - loss of more greenbelt would make this worse as we already have problems. There is a culvert runs through the middle of Tonacliffe which takes land drain water off the moors this is already near bursting point and we could be in danger of severe flooding. - - Has a land survey been undertaken? Some of these sites would be unsuitable for building on.	-	
935	Christine	Fallon		HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	1 Whitworth has one main road which is often gridlocked the smaller access roads are grossly unsuitable e.g Tonacliffe. - 2 Schools are already oversubscribed parking at drop off times would be more chaotic and dangerous. - 3 Doctors and dentists are already at capacity. - 4 Services of gas electricity and water would require major upgrade. - 5 We are seeing flooding due to inadequate drainage this would be increased. - 6 Is this acceptable use of greenbelt land where previous planning permission has been refused the effect on wildlife and trees would be immense.	-	
939	Geoffrey	Fallon	-	HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a small village with one already inadequate road. Doctors dentists and schools are already oversubscribed parking in school areas is dangerous already and would be far worse. - Gas electricity and water services would need major upgrade. - This is inappropriate use of greenbelt land causing damage to wildlife and the environment drainage is a major problem now with frequent flooding.	-	
944	N/A	N/A	Britannia Hotels Limited		Support	Allocation of land to the east of Tonacliffe School, Whitworth for housing development is welcomed and supported by the landowner. This support relates to Local Plan site reference HS2.106.	No	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
955	Janet	Whitehead	-		Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village, oversubscribed schools and Doctors - We have one road in and one road out which is almost impossible during peak times in the morning - The houses already exceed the heights up the sides of the valley - Our green belt is very important to wildlife and the the people the live here - If we let one builder onto greenbelt it opens the doors to far too many others - Our population is big enough and we cannot accommodate many more		- Our Councillors are voted in by us and now need to stand up and fight for us - - 400 houses is a ridiculous amount of new houses for a tiny village - - We have had 2 different sites where new houses have been built in recent years we've done our bit for Government figures - - Please find somewhere else
962	Kathryn	Gill	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2104, HS2106, HS2107, HS2108, HS2109	Object	I object to any changes in use of local greenbelt land to build houses. Also, there is only one road through Whitworth and it is already congested. We have only 1 doctors surgery, and not enough school places to accommodate hundreds of additional families. Greenbelt land cannot be restored once built on, and these proposals would change the landscape of Whitworth. I am also concerned about the building of 20 properties around Cowm. This is a resource continually used for recreation by the people of Whitworth and should be preserved.		
979	Marie	Pye	-		Object	All of these developments will contribute to already existing traffic problems as there is one road in and one road out of the area. The high school is already oversubscribed with local children not being offered places.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
992	Susan	Farrell		HS2: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109	Object	I strongly object to the building of houses on all the above mentioned sites for the following reasons: - Greenbelt land is of importance to all the wildlife of Whitworth and Shawforth . Deer and bats live in the forests in the area. Many badgers and foxes inhabit the countryside and rare species of wildlife live in the ponds. - The forest area at Tonacliffe would be cut down having a negative impact on the environment. - Tonacliffe road is already dangerous for children with cars parked along the length of the road at school dropping off and picking up time. The increased number of cars if more houses were built in the area would be worse for the children and residents. - Local amenities such as dentists and GPs could not cope with the increased population. It is almost impossible at the moment to get a GP appointment in less than two weeks. More housing would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Whitworth and Shawforth. - Facilities such as water, gas and electricity are already stretched and a major upgrade of the infrastructure would be required to support increased housing. - Local drainage cannot cope with the current usage. More housing could have an impact on flooding. - Public footpaths could be lost reducing the number of rights of way for walkers. - The road network both ways from Rochdale to Bacup is already gridlocked. More housing would put an increased strain on traffic and the already poor public transport in the area. - The only high school in the area is already oversubscribed. With increased housing parents may have even less chance of a first choice school for their children. They may have to travel miles to school. - I understood it is government policy to protect Greenbelt land except for 'Exceptional Circumstances'. What are the exceptional circumstances that enable housing to be built on the greenbelt land in Whitworth and Shawforth?		Summary - - Whitworth and Shawforth are already busy villages with oversubscribed schools and GP services with one road in and out between Rochdale and Bacup. - - Can we accommodate more housing that will put pressure on already overstretched amenities, increase traffic and change the beautiful landscape forever?
1000	carol	Thomson	-		Object	I object to the amount of houses that will be built affecting the countryside. Are there any more schools being built to accommodate?		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1025	Warren	Madden	-		Object	<p>1. The roads around Horsefield Ave are already extremely busy at school times, parking is a increasingly growing concern and the impact of more traffic around this are is quite worrying. My son attends this school and I see first hand how dangerous the current situation is without adding more traffic to the mix. - 2. I live on Market St which is the main thoroughfare from Rochdale to Bacup. We are often gridlocked (especially when there are road closures / traffic lights in the area). This road was never intended to take this level of traffic, what impact would this have on the already poor level of public transport. - 3. The proposed site is on greenbelt land, which the government is supposedly protecting. What would happen to the wildlife currently in this area, not only during the building process but also the higher level of pollution around this area. - 4. Amenities are already stretched, almost every month there are some works being done to water, electric, gas etc. would further impact these services. Tonacliffe Road has been dug up every winter for the last few years due to burst pipes, this situation won't improve with increased usage and traffic. -</p>		<p>There are several proposed housing sites in Whitworth, and in general I object to them all. This is due to the infrastructure of the valley already at breaking point. - Due to only one road in / one road out, Market St is often gridlocked at peak times. 4 years ago, there was a bad accident outside our house. Due to this, the road was closed for 3 hours, this meant a diversion, either back through Bacup through Littleborough or through Rawtenstall / Bury. Increased traffic through the whole valley is just putting further pressure on the valley. - We often have temporary traffic lights on this main road, as our current facilities (water / gas / electric etc) struggle to cope with demand. Have this services been contacted, are any plans to improve their facilities - again this will lead to further problems already highlighted. - Our doctors / dentists are already fully loaded (I know this through hearsay as I am a patient at surgeries in Rochdale). I often hear complaints about the amount of time it takes to see a doctor. - - I feel that major improvements need to be made to the current infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with the current population, adding to this is just putting so much pressure on an already failing situation. -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1029	Angela	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2108; HS2 109	Object	1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? -7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.		-
1035	Nadeen	Whitworth	-	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	The schools and gp surgeries are already at capacity in this area. - - Floods already around Tonacliffe areas and beyond. - - Traffic to and from Rochdale is horrendous, the road cannot cope with anymore traffic. Especially when there are roadworks. - - Badgers, foxes, owls and hares have been seen on the fields also we believe there are old coaling mines around the area. - - There have already been new houses built Hall fold, new line and bacup we do not need anymore affecting our countryside and wildlife. -		Why are you destroying the lovely countryside and wildlife we have left. You need to look at renovating abandoned building before new builds.
1037	Derick	Whitworth	-	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	The schools and gp surgeries are already at capacity in the area. - - Floods around Tonacliffe areas and beyond. - - Traffic to and from Rochdale in horrendous the road cannot cope with anymore traffic especially when there are roadworks. - - Badgers, Foxes, owls and hares live in this area and their homes are protected. There is historic coal mining in the area of HS2.109. - - There have already been new houses built at hall fold, new line, bacup and shawclough. We do not need any more new built houses affecting our countryside and wildlife. - - The area is also used for recreation by local children especially when it has snowed.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1038	Brenda	Whitworth	-	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	The schools and gp surgeries are already at capacity in the area. - - Floods around Tonacliffe areas and beyond. - - Traffic to and from Rochdale in horrendous the road cannot cope with anymore traffic especially when there are roadworks. - - Badgers, Foxes, owls and hares live in this area and their homes are protected. There is historic coal mining in the area of HS2.109. - - There have already been new houses built at hall fold, new line, bacup and shawclough. We do not need any more new built houses affecting our countryside and wildlife. - - The area is also used for recreation by local children especially when it has snowed.	-	
1039	Derick	Whitworth	-	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	The schools and gp surgeries are already at capacity in the area. - - Floods around Tonacliffe areas and beyond. - - Traffic to and from Rochdale in horrendous the road cannot cope with anymore traffic especially when there are roadworks. - - Badgers, Foxes, owls and hares live in this area and their homes are protected. There is historic coal mining in the area of HS2.109. - - There have already been new houses built at hall fold, new line, bacup and shawclough. We do not need any more new built houses affecting our countryside and wildlife. - - The area is also used for recreation by local children especially when it has snowed.	-	
1047	Andrew	Hargreaves	-	SHLAA16002	Object	The current access to the whole area is via Tonacliffe Road, a narrow, congested road often with cars parked on both sides of the road with access on school days at drop off and collection times virtually impossible. Building additional houses (120 in number) on both sides of Tonacliffe way: - HS2.106 SHLAA16002 Land to the east of Tonacliffe School 2.27 68 Year 6-15 Housing Greenfield - HS2.109 SHLAA16001 Site of Horsefield Avenue, Tonacliffe 1.75 52 Year 6-15 Housing Greenfield - will exacerbate an already difficult situation. - The addition pressure on the services water sewage etc in this area will also stretch the current provision where leaks and fire fighting already reduce the flow rate noticably on a fairly regular basis. -	-	
1072	David	Thomson	-	HS2.106 HS2.109	Object	No infrastructure. For more houses .The destruction of trees and to our wildlife which is ever growing of all kinds of animals .Traffic problems which there already is without more vehicles adding to it and also spoiling a beautifull countryside !!!!!!!!!!!		Not right now !!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1107	Keith	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2 108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. GP services and other related support services are already overstretched and inadequate. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 5. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 6. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 7. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 7.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 7.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 7.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 8. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		
1109	Jane	Gadsby	-		Object	<p>I wholly object to more housing being built in Whitworth!! We are a small(ish) village that can not cope already with the amount of new houses and people moving into it!! Our schools are already over subscribed; they are turning people away that don't live overly far away that a few years ago would have had no problem getting a place. The Doctors surgery can't cope with the number of patients wanting appointments. You are also increasing the risks of flooding. My house is already at risk and has already flooded twice. The main road (one road in and out) is gridlocked most mornings with commuters trying to get out of the village but most of all you are taking our beautiful green areas that Whitworth is so lucky and honoured to have. We have lots of empty properties that can't be filled already!! Please leave us and our village alone!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1118	Gary	Calderbank	-		Object	<p>There are a great number of reasons why Whitworth township should not be blighted with further development, particularly on land which has been designated as green belt for a large number of years. I wish to summarise these as below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Traffic - Whitworth is served by one road from both the north and south and is a major arterial route to people accessing the m62 and surrounding towns from the valley, Burnley and beyond. It is therefore very busy all of the time without even considering the effect of increasing local traffic even further. This route is regularly disrupted as a result of failing infrastructure resulting in severe delays and tailbacks. - - Schools - The existing schools in the town are already over subscribed and there is no capacity for further children without again significant development of schools. The road where I live is already gridlocked by vehicles dropping off children twice a day, illegally parked and causing obstructions. In relation to developments at Tonacliffe and Horsefield the thought of construction traffic too would be completely unmanageable and dangerous. Further development would exacerbate the problem. - - Policing - Whitworth already suffers from insufficient community policing resulting in many issues which do not get resolved, from burglary to bad behaviour and fly tipping. The town can not afford a further increase of population on this scale bringing with it its percentage of problems. - - Planning Policy - Brown Field Sites - Whitworth and the valley in general is a town built on industrial heritage and just like other cities should be primarily developing brownfield developments not green belt. There are many derelict spaces which can be developed to improve the area whilst providing suitable additional housing. There is no real justification for building on moorland in lieu of this. - - Construction Difficulties - Much of Whitworth moorland is unsuitable to build on, primarily due to poor access to the developments earmarked, mine shafts, poorly drained ground, sloping sites, poor infrastructure, marshland and biodiversity issues. - - Biodiversity - The land surrounding Whitworth is a haven for many wild animals which can be seen on a daily basis. From our house we can regularly observe, a family of foxes, badgers, deer, birds of prey, pipistrelle bats, cows, horses and sheep. This is a gift without price. - - Infrastructure - We regularly have power cuts, water bursts and the A671 is constantly being dug up as existing services are updated resulting in major delays. The drains in our road are currently running 24/7 as a result of water run off off the moors even when it has not rained for a number of days. When it does rain the water backs up out of the covers as the drains are undersize and cannot cope. This would be totally unsuitable for further development, especially considering a greater amount of hard surfacing. 	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1127	William	Calderbank	Tonacliffe Resident	HS2.109 & HS2.106	Object	I understand that for some people in this day and age, the natural beauty of the countryside may not seem important or significant in perspective to more immediate problems. I have lived in Whitworth my whole life and have spent almost 22 years surrounded by the wonders of the open fields, hills, and moors. I may be a "Millennial" but that does not mean that I can not appreciate more than just technology, growing up the moors behind Tonacliffe was my playground, where my siblings, friends, neighbour children and I would all play using nothing but our imaginations and the local natural environment for entertainment. However, I am no longer a child but an adult who has learned to appreciate the peaceful and pleasing aesthetic of the natural land for what it is. For 3 years I lived away from home and attended Nottingham Trent University and had to endure living in the cramped hustle and bustle of the inner city, fast-paced, noisy and dismally grey in comparison to my life back home and the tranquil green of the countryside. - - Whilst studying at university my family got a dog named Todd, He is a young "Staffy" (which if you know dogs, are one of the most athletic and playful breeds). For nearly 3 years he also has had the privilege of being raised with the moorland behind Tonacliffe as his playground. The moors offer him long leisurely local walks from Brown Wardle Hill, Healey Stones and Healey Fisheries, a safe place to play and explore (to satisfy his inquisitive nature). He may be a dog, yet the destruction of this land not only affects people but the pets of locals. - - It seems to be quite incomprehensible to understand that with all the fuss the last few years over recycling and saving the planet that you blatantly wish to outright destroy the natural environment, destroying the habitats of hundreds of multiple species of plants, insects and animals in order to create more houses in an already overpopulated village.		-
1134	Abigail	Leyland	-		Object	WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE HOUSING IN WHITWORTH! The schools are already oversubscribed, our local doctors can not possibly take on any more patients as it is already a struggle to get an appointment currently. We only have one road in and out of the village which gets badly effected by rush hour traffic, making it difficult for the locals to get to work/school etc. We have such a lovely view of greenery surrounding our little village and we do not want our sight ruined by building ugly, unnecessary housing.		
1152	angela	Jordan	-		Object	I do not think whitworth has enough resources to sustain further housing estates .The one and only road is already impossible at peak times,our doctors surgery is bursting with no appointments,and our school children cant get a place at our local school. - The wildlife is also important to whitwoth people but is being pushed further and further out of its natural habitat.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1166	Brendan	Doherty	-	HS2, 102,104,108,105 ,107,106,109.	Object	WHITWORTH IS FULL. This statement encapsulates all the issues surrounding any expansion of dwelling houses in the township of Whitworth. - - The negative impact of any developments in the town cannot be overstated. - - The whole nature of this small township will be irreversibly destroyed if development are allowed. - - Flora and fauna will be the first to suffer. This valley is home to an exceptional and expanding variety of animals and trees and flowers. This growth has taken decades to achieve and would be totally reversed by the stroke of a pen. - - To say that all the ingredients which go to make up Whitworth as a place for people to live are overloaded is indeed an understatement. - - Congestion of traffic and people is at its limit, any increase can only be detrimental to the health and quality of life of residents. - - Local services, schools, doctors, civic amenities are already at their serviceable optimum. - - The existing utilities of electricity,gas and water only just maintain service. There are often cuts in these making it seem that we are a third world town. - - Whitworth is a linear town with no bypass or possibility of such. Most of the day traffic is heavy and at peak times chaotic. This combined with the nature of HGV traffic leaves the roads in constant need of repair. Add a very poor public transport system and the certain increases proposed then the result is guaranteed to be disastrous.		Listen to the people of Whitworth.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1172	Racheal	Biggs	-	HS2.109 HS2.106	Object	<p>I would like to object to the building of more housing on this site for the following reasons: - 1. Due to existing school and it's growing numbers of families this has caused a significant increase in the amount of cars in the area and causes substantial problems with access and volume of traffic. If more houses were to be built in this area then i believe the impact on existing residents would be very concerning. We already have issues of safety for the children coming out of school and our resident children due to the large numbers of cars and road layout: Small streets, cul de sacs, one small road into the area, more cars would make an existing bottle-neck even worse. Increase in volume of traffic in such a small area is compromising the safety of these children and would have a negative affect on existing residents. - 2. Living in a semi rural environment means that we are able to enjoy the landscape and the wildlife within it. More houses in this area could potentially see the loss of not only tress but wildlife including.. Deer, badgers, foxes, protected species of pondlife, bats, owls and other birds. Increased noise pollution and construction in this area would see this wildlife disrupted and potentially at risk of harm. Over the last 15 years we have seen an increase in the wildlife and this adds to our rural environment that as residents we would like to continue to enjoy. Government policy is to protect Greenbelt areas except for 'exceptional circumstances'. Building in this area I believe would not be regarded as 'exceptional' and is not needed. - 3.In the past few years we have suffered from local flooding and have had many drains in the road flooding out due to poor drainage and excessive water. More building in this area is going to take away the moorland which I believe soaks up this excess water and helps prevent residential properties from being flooded. There is a culvert which runs through the middle of the proposed site and this helps with drainage, building would impact on this and create problems with local flooding. - 4. Infrastructure of the village is already stretched and schools, GP's, care homes etc are full to capacity making it increasingly difficult to access in its current state. Adding more houses to this area is going to create overcrowding and would have a negative effect on living standards of the residents of Whitworth. We have had over the past 3 years over 150 new houses built in the area which has impacted on school intake, making what i would consider local people, unable to access their chosen school and this will worsen with another 400 new homes in this area. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and increases in traffic will put a significant strain on transport. Any roadworks in our small village creates huge problems and the prospect of 400 more families which potentially equates to 800 more cars would be catastrophic. We have seen an increase in power cuts and water bursts over the last few years and I feel this may be due to the current addition of new housing with no improvement to existing infrastructure. Roads in and around Whitworth are in dire need of repair and this is getting</p>		<p>We understand the need for more housing in the borough but it was highlighted in a survey which was conducted in 2015 by Turley on behalf of Peel investments that the need was not in the East (Whitworth & Bacup) but more in the west (Helmshore & Haslingden). The current housing minister Sajid Javid has now pointed out in his September 2017 speech that we need to assess where that demand is and 'Nor does it impress local people who see their area taking on a huge number of new homes while a town on the other side of a local authority boundary barely expands at all'. I understand this means other local authorities but it is also true of our own authority. If you were to include the increase of new houses built in Whitworth and the overwhelming number of new houses built in Shawforth and Bacup, then take into account that those new residents may work in Rochdale then their only choice of route is through Whitworth... creating substantial pressure on the volume of traffic in the area. This factor must be a consideration when evaluating where Rossendale needs new housing.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----------------

worse with each year. - In conclusion I believe that the council would be going against government policies on planning and Greenbelt conservation and would be affecting the human rights and 'the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land' - (Human Rights Act- Protocol 1, Article 1) of every single resident in this area and that you have a duty to respect the community and their welfare standards.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1174	Timothy	Southwick	-	HS2.106- HS2.109	Object	<p>Received 08/09/17: I bought this house due to its location and green belt land to the rear of the property, there are fishing ponds, deer, badgers, newts, bats and many other habitats that feed and rely on this beautiful countryside. Badgers have many pathways through this country side and sets quite close to the houses. At the moment the traffic is becoming dangerous at school times and the amount of growing parked cars in all directions, not to mention the escalating traffic to the bottle neck at the Rochdale junctions in the morning, is there a highways strategy for the growing population in Whitworth, Bacup and surrounding areas. Since I have lived here, I have had to set off an hour earlier in the mornings to try to get to work, sometimes still not making it on time. I could loose my job or sanity if it gets any worse. I really think it would be a terrible shame to develop on this piece of land, not just for my own personal reasons, but the uniqueness of the old walls, fields and its history. This area is to valuable to be developed on surely, it would be a colossal mistake.</p> <p>Received 08/10/17: Well for a start the fields and fishing lodges are habitat to many different types of wildlife and walking areas for many residents. There are deer regularly visiting the area, herons and swallows feeding from the insects from the ponds, as well as newts, frogs ect. There are badgers and birds of prey, Buzzards, sparrow hawks and kestrels. This is a nature reserve for many animals and an area of natural beauty. It would be preposterous to use this area for further development. - The traffic also seems to be at it worst its ever been, living at Tonacliffe I have experienced increasing problems with school traffic and serous wear to the surrounding roads. This Urban sprawl in whitworth gets worse year on year and the grid lock at the bottom of Whitworth Road and Shawclough Road is soul destroying in the mornings. Even on my street parking and disputes are becoming a issue and tempers on the roads are increasing, so instead of thinking about revenue and development, maybe try thinking about the consequences and Highway compatibility first. People are not happy with the traffic getting out of Whitworth in the mornings and the grid lock at Rochdale Junctions. So with regards to future Local plan, do not regard Whitworth as an appropriate village for increasing housing, Whitworth will gain a reputation as a place not to come and live, reducing housing prices due to the dense population and unable to get to work in the mornings. -</p>		Develop nearer the motorways and not small inadequate villages.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1178	Stacey	Ryan	-		Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. -2. The schools in Whitworth are full to capacity, in particular, Whitworth High School, and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential students. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular, this road is congested with stand still traffic, contributing to air pollution. - People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale, all travel through Whitworth and all add to the problem. In rush hour traffic a 10 minute journey to travel from Whitworth to Rochdale can regularly take up to 40 minutes. The three access roads to Market Street from Add to dictionary are regularly backed up with traffic, only adding to the peak time travel chaos. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. additional development will only increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these proposed sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. Traffic on Tonacliffe, particularly around school drop off and pick up times is chaotic. The proposed sites will only add to this chaos and potentially endanger the lives of more school children. -6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1 Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth. Why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for these proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city as there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build elsewhere which is within easy commute of employment easing traffic congestion and pollution. 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these environments. For example, wild deer are regularly seen on the Tonacliffe moors and protected Newts live in the brook on the Tonacliffe moors. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing has already become an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth. Additional housing will inevitable add tot the problem.</p>		Any planning in Whitworth seems ill thought out due to the lack of amenities, schools, GP surgery, adequate roads and employment opportunities.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1179	Wayne	Ryan	-		Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth are full to capacity, in particular, Whitworth High School, and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential students. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular, this road is congested with stand still traffic, contributing to air pollution. - People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale, all travel through Whitworth and all add to the problem. In rush hour traffic a 10 minute journey to travel from Whitworth to Rochdale can regularly take up to 40 minutes. The three access roads to Market Street from Add to dictionary are regularly backed up with traffic, only adding to the peak time travel chaos. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. additional development will only increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these proposed sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. Traffic on Tonacliffe, particularly around school drop off and pick up times is chaotic. The proposed sites will only add to this chaos and potentially endanger the lives of more school children. 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1 Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth. Why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for these proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city as there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build elsewhere which is within easy commute of employment easing traffic congestion and pollution. 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these environments. For example, wild deer are regularly seen on the Tonacliffe moors and protected Newts live in the brook on the Tonacliffe moors. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing has already become an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth. Additional housing will inevitable add tot the problem. -</p>		Whitworth cannot accommodate more new houses that will put pressure on our already stretched amenities, increasing traffic and changing our landscape.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1181	Thomas	Ryan	-		Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. - - 2. The schools in Whitworth are full to capacity, in particular, Whitworth High School, and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential students. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular, this road is congested with stand still traffic, contributing to air pollution. - People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale, all travel through Whitworth and all add to the problem. In rush hour traffic a 10 minute journey to travel from Whitworth to Rochdale can regularly take up to 40 minutes. The three access roads to Market Street from Add to dictionary are regularly backed up with traffic, only adding to the peak time travel chaos. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. additional development will only increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these proposed sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. Traffic on Tonacliffe, particularly around school drop off and pick up times is chaotic. The proposed sites will only add to this chaos and potentially endanger the lives of more school children. 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1 Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth. Why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for these proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city as there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build elsewhere which is within easy commute of employment easing traffic congestion and pollution. 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these environments. For example, wild deer are regularly seen on the Tonacliffe moors and protected Newts live in the brook on the Tonacliffe moors. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing has already become an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth. Additional housing will inevitable add tot the problem. -</p>		Whitworth cannot accommodate more new houses that will put pressure on our already stretched amenities, increasing traffic and changing our landscape.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1182	Charlie	Ryan	-		Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth are full to capacity, in particular, Whitworth High School, and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential students. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular, this road is congested with stand still traffic, contributing to air pollution. - People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale, all travel through Whitworth and all add to the problem. In rush hour traffic a 10 minute journey to travel from Whitworth to Rochdale can regularly take up to 40 minutes. The three access roads to Market Street from Add to dictionary are regularly backed up with traffic, only adding to the peak time travel chaos. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. additional development will only increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these proposed sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. Traffic on Tonacliffe, particularly around school drop off and pick up times is chaotic. The proposed sites will only add to this chaos and potentially endanger the lives of more school children. 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1 Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth. Why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for these proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city as there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build elsewhere which is within easy commute of employment easing traffic congestion and pollution. 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these environments. For example, wild deer are regularly seen on the Tonacliffe moors and protected Newts live in the brook on the Tonacliffe moors. - - 8. Crime and lack of effective policing has already become an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth. Additional housing will inevitable add tot the problem. -</p>		Whitworth cannot accommodate more new houses that will put pressure on our already stretches amenities, increasing traffic and changing our landscape.
1190	Nathan	Worrall	-		Object	<p>Whitworth doesn't have the infrastructure to sustain the construction of these new houses. The local doctors and schools would struggle to meet the needs of the increased population. There is bad traffic in Whitworth already, this will only make it worse and these traffic problems are highlighted when there are roadworks and there are large queues. The proposed sites are located on greenbelt land, and this will have a negative effect on the local wildlife as well as destroying the natural beauty of this land.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1260	Rita	Banham	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife - There are Deer and Badgers (which are protected) - According to The government planning policy statement Protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - 2. Newts living in ponds, bats nests in the forrest, foxes and hares. - - 3. Loss of Trees - - 4. Increased traffic could cause further danger to children. The impact of more cars passing through could be fatal. Parking around this area is already a concern - increased traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - 5. A culvert runs through the middle of the tonacliffe proposed site which takes drain water off the moors - this is already at near bursting point when there is heavy rain. If this site goes a head I worry we are at danger of flooding, - - 6. landscaping - the site is geographically unsuitable for housing. The features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. Has a land survey been done?? - - 7. Local Amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already full. Building would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. - - 9. If access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs - this would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - - 10. it is government policy to protect greenbelt areas except for "exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances? - - 11. Local drainage cannot cope with the useage now - more residents would put an unbearable strain on this network. - - 12. A public footpath (right of way) could be lost. - - 13. Loss of privacy. - - 14. Increased noise pollution - the area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents. Building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - -</p>		We highly protest against this building development. Our community is already under enough pressure and the safety of our children does not need to be compromised any further by incremental traffic, especially the roads leading up to Moorland Crescent via Tonacliffe road the traffic is already too dangerous.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1262	Roland	banham	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife - There are Deer and Badgers (which are protected) - According to The government planning policy statement Protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - 2. Newts living in ponds, bats nest in the forrest, foxes and hares. - - 3. Loss of Trees - - 4. Increased traffic could cause further danger to children. The impact of more cars passing through could be fatal. Parking around this area is already a concern - increased traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - 5. A culvert runs through the middle of the tonacliffe proposed site which takes drain water off the moors - this is already at near bursting point when there is heavy rain. If this site goes a head I worry we are at danger of flooding, - - 6. landscaping - the site is geographically unsuitable for housing. The features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. Has a land survey been done?? - - 7. Local Amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already full. Building would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. - - 9. If access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs - this would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - - 10. it is government policy to protect greenbelt areas except for "exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances? - - 11. Local drainage cannot cope with the useage now - more residents would put an unbearable strain on this network. - - 12. A public footpath (right of way) could be lost. - - 13. Loss of privacy. - - 14. Increased noise pollution - the area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents. Building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - -</p>		<p>I highly object to the proposed building work at Moorland Crescent and Horsefield avenue. - - Our children do not need to be put in any further danger from increased traffic. - - The Wildlife needs to be protected along with the elderly. - - Any building work on these areas will cause too much damage to our wildlife and land. - -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1265	Jade	Toolan	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife - There are Deer and Badgers (which are protected) - According to The government planning policy statement Protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - 2. Newts living in ponds, bats nest in the forrest, foxes and hares. - - 3. Loss of Trees - - 4. Increased traffic could cause further danger to children. The impact of more cars passing through could be fatal. Parking around this area is already a concern - increased traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - 5. A culvert runs through the middle of the tonacliffe proposed site which takes drain water off the moors - this is already at near bursting point when there is heavy rain. If this site goes a head I worry we are at danger of flooding, - - 6. landscaping - the site is geographically unsuitable for housing. The features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. Has a land survey been done?? - - 7. Local Amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already full. Building would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. - - 9. If access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs - this would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - - 10. it is government policy to protect greenbelt areas except for "exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances? - - 11. Local drainage cannot cope with the useage now - more residents would put an unbearable strain on this network. - - 12. A public footpath (right of way) could be lost. - - 13. Loss of privacy. - - 14. Increased noise pollution - the area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents. Building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - -</p>		<p>I highly object to the proposed building site on Moorland Crescent and Horsefield Avenue. - - There are a number of Deer and Badgers living where the proposed site is due to be built. Government policy states our wildlife is to be protected. Please advise what justifies destroying their homes? - - Increased traffic is extremely concerning with roads already grid locked now. Children's safety is also a major concern. - - The privacy of home on Moorland Crescent will be imposed. - -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1266	Will	Biggs	-	HS2.106, HS2.109	Object	1) Impact of more traffic around Tonacliffe area- we have limited routes in and out of Tonacliffe and particularly around school times it suffers with congestion already- this will be compounded by a further increase. There will be more risk to safety of children walking to/from school due to increase in traffic and local parking - There is only two routes into the village from Rochdale and one out towards Bacup that will suffer with the additional traffic.. - 2) Local schools, doctors and dentists are already at capacity and increased housing will create issues with services being compromised without further provision. - 3) Would expect facilities such as Water, electric and gas to need further uplift to support this - I have witnessed a number of water leaks on Tonacliffe recently as well as power cuts over the years- will our services cope with the additional demand for these proposals - 4) Loss of trees and wildlife on the green belt- This will impact our environment and need for our wildlife habitats. - 5) Many children play on the local area around Moorland Cresnet & Tonacliffe way (Cottesmore Close, Horsefield Ave, Bell Isle etc) and more through traffic from the new estates will create further risk of injury or even fatality		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1272	Michala	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS102.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	I am objecting in general to the proposed house building in various sites around Whitworth and specifically in relation to the proposed sites t Tonacliffe. My objections are based on a number of reasons: 1. Wildlife in the local area. Deer, badgers, foxes and hares live within the forest areas. Rare protected newts live in the pond. Bats nest in the forest. The importance in f this green belt land for the wildlife cannot be over emphasised. - 2. Tonacliffe forest would need to be cut down adversely affecting the local environment. - 3. The impact of more cars around local schools, especially Tonacliffe School, is of great concern due to the already high volume of traffic. Increasing this would be unacceptable. - 4. Local amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already to capacity. I have concerns that more houses will have a negative impact on the lives of current residents in relation to these amenities. - 5. Has the infrastructure of our small village been considered in relation to electricity, gas and water supply if more houses are built? Whitworth already experiences power cuts and seems to be worse since other recent building developments have been completed. - 6. The road network into Rochdale is already gridlocked. More houses will increase this problem. Public transport from Whitworth is limited to buses and I consider that if this proposed building goes ahead there will also be a negative impact on the poor public transport in and out of our village. - 7. Local drainage already struggles to cope with usage now, if the volume of residents increases would the drainage system be able to deal with the added strain? - 8. We bought our property because it is located on the last cul de sac of a small estate with no through traffic. This proposed building work will completely alter this into drive through roads. Plus the volume of traffic will - Increase which I consider to be unacceptable. - 9. I am very concerned that we may have loss of privacy as we are not currently overlooked and this was a major consideration when we bought our house.	-	-
1283	Jonathan	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	Whitworths infrastructure is already at near full capacity. The single main road through Whitworth is, at times, grid-locked. Streets around the primary schools is chaotic. There is a definite flood issue through the valley. Crime is rising unchallenged. The rich and diverse wildlife is flourishing around Whitworth. - Any of the development projects would have a negative and detrimental implication on Whitworth and it's residents.	-	-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1298	Carol	Williams	-		Object	Same as HS2.109 Horsefield Avenue - Infrastructure, roads, electricity, water and gas, drainage - Wildlife - Amenities - schools, Dentists,Doctors - Danger to local residents due to addition cars/traffic - landscape, trees, forest, ponds - Green belt area, noise and pollution - Plans previously refused in certain parts and nothing's changed - Access, would endanger lives - Loss of privacy		I believe the council is going against the Government policies on planning and green belt conservation - - A high level of protection should be given to most valued landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - I object to the policy itself and the proposed housing developments on individual sites mentioned namely HS2.109 Horsefield Avenue, HS2.106 Moorland Crescent, HS2.102 king Street and HS2.104 Quarry Street

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1302	Tegan	Calderbank	Student	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	<p>How would you describe England's land? Green? My favourite part of growing up was running and playing on the vast fields that my house backs onto. The fields around Tonacliffe are scattered with wildflowers of all kinds the variations of grasses, shrubs and flowers helps expand the biodiversity of the land. - - When I heard of the plan to build houses on the green belt land surrounding Tonacliffe I was shocked, appalled and disgusted at the notion of it. How could anyone possibly want to destroy the habitats of countless animals? It made me think of the precious memories I have of the land, from of watching fox cubs play fight with each other, to seeing deer graze in the fields, watching a fawn prance through the grass, or bucks play fight. Rabbits have burrows in the hillside and there is no better sight than watching them feast on the lush grass in spring. Badgers make tracks in the grass, tracks that tell you a story. - - If you build houses on this land these animals will have nowhere to live, Doe will have nowhere to feed their fawns or watch them grow, Rabbits have nowhere to burrow, Foxes have nowhere to raise their cubs and Badgers cannot make their journey along the tracks they made to get food. For what? Houses? Will people buy your houses when they know how much suffering they were made from? Do the lives of these animals mean nothing to you? Programs like Countryfile encourage you to enjoy the great outdoors, to support wildlife nearby and to preserve natural beauty. If you take this land away from its local residents to cover it in tarmac and stick masses of brick and metal on it you are taking the countryside away from us. We would not be able to enjoy the great outdoors, we would not be able to support wildlife or preserve its natural beauty because it won't be there. You are the ones damaging the biodiversity of the world, you are the ones killing these animals. If you build houses on the green belt land around Tonacliffe you are just proving me right. - - There are many protected animals in the area surrounding Tonacliffe, including pipistrel bats the population of pipistrelle bats has declined in the UK over the past 30 years, between 1978 and 1993 there was a national decrease of 70 percent. All the UK species of bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and it is illegal to harm them or disturb their roost sites. Over the years the habitats e.g. hedges, ponds and old grassland, where bats like to hunt have declined in number and they have also lost many of their traditional roosting places, such as hollow trees. - - Traffic around tonacliffe is bad enough as it is, if you build an estate on the land around Tonacliffe then imagine how bad the road traffic will be. 52 houses of the site of Horsefield Ave and 68 houses on the land east of Tonacliffe means 120 houses. Suppose if these housed nuclear families and each parent had a car that would mean 240 more cars on Whitworth's roads causing more road erosion and more traffic. With Whitworth having only one road in and one road out, it's extremely obvious that there is a lot of traffic going in and out already. Can we really deal with anymore? - - When</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
						<p>Tonacliffe Primary School closes at 3:30 pm parents park their cars ANYWHERE in order to pick their child up from school. They park on double yellow lines, block your drive, park on corners and park where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles these all come under rule 243 from the department of transport as illegal. Imagine how hard it is to drive up the hill you live on, squeezing through gaps, fighting for road space only to arrive at your drive and find it blocked by a parent picking their child up from school. Obviously building houses on the lands around Tonacliffe will escalate the problem, with more residents trying to get up or down the road. - - Another issue is local schools in Whitworth are already OVERSUBSCRIBED. Primary schools e.g. Tonacliffe Primary School, St Anselm's RC Primary School and other local primary schools in the area. High schools are sparsely distributed in Rossendale and high schools like All Saints Catholic High School and Whitwoth High School are ALSO oversubscribed. How is Whitworth supposed to manage with more residents? It's a simple answer, it cant.</p>		
1307	Jenny	Lowe	-		Object	<p>Done my objection :- 1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. - 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. - 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. - 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. - 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? - 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. - 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1310	Richard	Dolan	-	HS2.101-109	Object	<p>We are vehemently opposed to all housing allocation in Whitworth. Our group has decided to vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. We will withhold our votes and encourage family, friends, and community to do likewise. - We are outraged by this proposal, especially HS2.107 that will encroach on Healy Dell. On this point we will be contacting the National Trust and other such organisations to make them away of the proposed desecration to the Green Belt. Furthermore, we are now investigating possible financial links between all Councillors, MPs, and RBC employees involved in this issue with the proposed contractors. This senseless proposal for a village far too small to accommodate a possible 300 new homes suggest an ulterior motive. No one in our community that we have spoken to is in favour of this plan and we will use our sizeable influence. - There has been more than enough housing development in Whitworth. This new proposal will destroy our green spaces and necessitate a new schools, doctors' surgery, dentist, shops, and possible a new road. All future housing development must stop. Our community can not accommodate any more. - In light of the fact that this proposal has not been advertised to a great extent (we have spoken to people who know nothing of it), we will be conducting a petition again this proposal and encouraging everyone to sign the following statement: - We will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community.</p>		<p>To reiterate, we will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community. - - The people's power will be felt if this plan is authorised.</p>
1321	Andrew	Lowe	-		Object	<p>I am extremely worked about the impact of new housing in the area. - 1, The traffic in this area is already very busy especially before and after Tonacliffe school. The roads are always in a bad state of repair. Adding new houses will only make things worse. - 2, This area is full of natural beauty and full of wildlife. You see the Deer, foxes and each evening without fail hundreds of bats. This would be so wrong to damage their habitat. - 3, The Schools are already at breaking point. Many kids what have gone through primary school in Whitworth have missed out on going to Whitworth High School this time. They have had to go to Todmorden High which is outrageous. New houses in Whitworth would only make the situation worse. - 4, Whitworth is a small Village with few amenities. It is very difficult to get in at the doctors or dentist as it is. New houses will ruin our village. - 5, Crime is as bad as it's ever been in the Village now. The nearest police station being in Waterfoot. A bigger population in Whitworth will only make for more crime. - Whitworth is a village not a town and these houses will take away everything that is good about our village.</p>		<p>New housing will ruin our village and our wildlife. I am completely against new housing in the village of Whitworth.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1336	Maureen	O'Mara	-		Object	Whitworth is already struggling with oversubscribed schools. There is only 1 small GP surgery and 1 dentist. The village cannot cope with stretching the existing amenities. - One of the main objections I have is the traffic and parking, which is already dire. Streets are almost impossible to drive down safely due to double parking. There is only one main road, which when closed for any reason means driving via Todmorden to get around - this has happened on a number of occasions. Most roads have very steep inclines which are regularly not gritted in winter. To increase parking and traffic would destroy Whitworth. Where would access roads be and how would this affect current residents.		
1363	Gareth	Dolan	-	HS2.101 to 109	Object	I do not live in Whitworth but spend a lot of time there with my family. I am deeply concerned by this proposed loss of green belt and will do my utmost to object against it. - - I strongly urge RBC to re-consider its proposal. Whitworth cannot handle any more development. - - Thanks		If this destruction of the green belt in Whitworth is passed then I shall simply take my family and my money elsewhere as there will no longer be the same attraction Whitworth now offers.
1365	Michael	Whitehead	-		Object	The doctors is overcrowded, the schools are overcrowded and there is one road in and out. All three of the mentioned cannot cope in the current state. Whitworth has too many houses for the current infrastructure. If the proposal goes through, which I sincerely hope it does not, there will be 300+ more homes within Whitworth. This means 650+ more people needing a doctor, 300+ more children who need schools and 300+ more cars on the roads. If the current infrastructure is struggling I dread to think how the village would end up with that amount of extra people. - There are also many deer which have recently returned to the greenbelt land on either side of the valley. Moving any sort of greenbelt/urban borders is highly likely to destroy their habitat and force them away.		-
1387	Victoria	Mairs			Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1391	rachel	maddock	-		Object	I am objecting to the above proposal of housing. - - I am a Bacup resident who travels regularly to Whitworth for work and schooling. The proposal of changing the beautiful greenbelt land on Tonacliffe for more housing is outrageous. I have lived in Whitworth and Bacup all my life and grew up on the moors surrounding Tonacliffe. ...the beautiful moors that we are very lucky to have. Has anyone thought of the wildlife?.....where will they go?..... - To build housing in an area which is already fit to burst is madness. The schools and public services in Whitworth or already oversubscribed. ...getting a doctors apt or dentist apt takes weeks to get. ...adding more people to these services will bring it to breaking point,. - The traffic is also a major problem already. There is one road in and one road out. A simple traffic light brings the village to a halt already, let alone having another cohort of cars and people added to the equation.		-
1392	Anthony	Maddock	-	HS106 HS109	Object	I am objecting to the above proposal of housing. - - I am a Bacup resident who travels regularly to Whitworth for work and schooling. The proposal of changing the beautiful greenbelt land on Tonacliffe for more housing is outrageous. I have lived in Whitworth and Bacup all my life and grew up on the moors surrounding Tonacliffe. ...the beautiful moors that we are very lucky to have. Has anyone thought of the wildlife?.....where will they go?..... - To build housing in an area which is already fit to burst is madness. The schools and public services in Whitworth or already oversubscribed. ...getting a doctors apt or dentist apt takes weeks to get. ...adding more people to these services will bring it to breaking point,. - The traffic is also a major problem already. There is one road in and one road out. A simple traffic light brings the village to a halt already, let alone having another cohort of cars and people added to the equation.		-
1394	Rhys	Maddock	-	HS106 HS109	Object	I am objecting to the above proposal of housing. - - I am a Bacup resident who travels regularly to Whitworth for work and schooling. The proposal of changing the beautiful greenbelt land on Tonacliffe for more housing is outrageous. I have lived in Whitworth and Bacup all my life and grew up on the moors surrounding Tonacliffe. ...the beautiful moors that we are very lucky to have. Has anyone thought of the wildlife?.....where will they go?..... - To build housing in an area which is already fit to burst is madness. The schools and public services in Whitworth or already oversubscribed. ...getting a doctors apt or dentist apt takes weeks to get. ...adding more people to these services will bring it to breaking point,. - The traffic is also a major problem already. There is one road in and one road out. A simple traffic light brings the village to a halt already, let alone having another cohort of cars and people added to the equation.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1397	John	Cavanagh			Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve
1398	Joshua	Hopwood Mairs		tonacliffe	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1402	JOANNE	WHITWORTH	-	tonacliffe	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. -		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling with make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth who have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for now and for our future generations.
1405	GARETH	WHITWORTH	-	tonacliffe	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for our children and our childrens children.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1417	Gillian	Middlemas	Whitworth Community High School	HS1.102 HS2.103 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2 107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	As Headteacher of the only secondary school in the Whitworth area, I am concerned that the proposals to build considerable numbers of new dwellings take no account of educational provision in the local area. - The school is already oversubscribed: for 2017 entry into Y7 over 40 families were unsuccessful in gaining a place, despite Whitworth Community High School being their first preference; over 40 families went onto on the Local Authority's waiting list for a place; over 25 families went to Appeal for a place, and very few of them were successful. The school now has 640 students and, without extra classroom space, has no capacity to increase the admissions number, nor to take additional students into existing year groups. - Likewise, many local primary schools are also full / oversubscribed, suggesting there is insufficient educational provision in the local area already. - This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed number of new dwellings goes ahead, unless the developers or Lancashire County Council are prepared to increase the school's capacity by funding additional classroom / learning / social space. The school is over 50 years old, largely of Langspan pre-tensioned concrete construction (intended life expectancy already exceeded) with HAC (high alumina cement) - In addition, the school experiences ongoing issues with the provision of utilities: the water main up the school drive is at risk of collapse; the water supply to the area has recently been affected on a number of occasions, and presumably further demand from new building would increase these issues. - The proposals for new housing does not appear to be linked to any plans to improve the traffic situation in the Whitworth area: lengthy queues heading towards Rochdale each morning already create issues for students travelling to school.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1420	Julie	bower	-	tonacliffe	Object	<p>I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate???</p> <p>Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. - This already over saturated with people for the small community resources there are. - There is not enough road space, and only a little amount of moorland available. We try to encourage our young in the community to go outside and be 'heathy'. There won't be anywhere left. I find the lack of advertising this proposal unacceptable. There are many more areas of fields elsewhere. Why add to an over exhausted community already? I dont understand why Whitworth has to be the target for this.</p>		<p>Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve. It isn't alot but it is valued and appreciated beyond your knowledge or understanding - all of these below would be affected adversely. - - Wildlife - Loss of trees - The local school - Landscaping - - Local amenities - Infrastructure - - - We deserve our voices to be heard.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1436	Louise	Currie	-		Object	<p>1. The plans to build in this area, will reduce the natural environment within the area, which the government's planning policy is committed to protect. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 2. Utilities are already stretched with the current housing stock - drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There are currently parking issues and high traffic volumes around Tonacliffe Primary, without creating additional through traffic to new houses in the vicinity along a narrow road, which requires resurfacing and who's current 20 mile an hour speed limit is not enforced. 5. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. Continuing roadworks to address ongoing issues with failing water mains often leaves Whitworth gridlocked with long queues of traffic trying to leave the Village in the morning and return in the evening. Additional housing will compound this problem 6. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 7. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 8. Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		As well as these particular developments, the others sited in the plan will also increase volumes of traffic along Market Street (A671), adding to congestion and putting pressure on water mains and utilities and the road's surface leading to increased road works and further problems entering and leaving the Village at peak times. - - Whitworth and the other villages along the A671 cannot simply continue to expand without addressing the wider infrastructure of utilities and access in and out of the village through neighbouring authority areas

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1440	Helen	Banham	-	HS2.106 - Moorland Cres	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

unbearable strain on this network.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1453	Jordan	Collier			Object	<p>Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1464	R	Platts	-		Object	<p>residents put an unbearable strain on this network. -</p> <p>Overall I object to upwards of 300 houses being built in a small village of only 7,500 residents. There is only one road in and one road out and traffic is already slow moving, if indeed moving at all, at peak times. The village is already susceptible to flooding, a problem that more building will only exacerbate. Local amenities such as our schools, our local doctors and dentists are already oversubscribed. In short, the village can't support such a surge in population. - The two sites I mainly object to are Horsefield Avenue and land to the East of Tonacliffe School. These sites are both Greenfield. Greenfield should not be built on unless absolutely necessary. In this case, it isn't absolutely necessary. If Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances", then Rossendale Council should take heed of this and concentrate it's focus on other areas instead. - The roads around this area surround Tonacliffe Primary School, and twice during the day these roads are virtually impassible and extremely dangerous to children. Bringing more traffic into the area is an accident waiting to happen. Pedestrians on Tonacliffe Road walking in the Rochdale direction aren't well catered for with footpaths. There's only very narrow pavements on the left-hand side, and no pavement at all in some parts. The resulting excess in vehicles will make it even more dangerous. As a parent I worry constantly about my children and the roads around here and that will only get worse. - I would also like to add that after heavy rainfall, Highgate Lane is like a river with all the excess water running down from the hills. We'll all be at risk of flooding if parts of the greenbelt is concreted over.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1469	George	Salt	-		Object	Whitworth is located in a valley, this in itself presents issues with the amount of space available. 7,500 people lived in Whitworth according to the data from the 2011 Census and this is a large amount of people if you look at the services and infrastructure in Whitworth. To start off with there is one GP surgery that has 7,248 people registered with them. Whitworth Medical Centre has 4 GPs which means that for one GP there are 1,812 people. There is not any more capacity available for more people to register with the practice. - - Schools are also busy especially with just one school for secondary education. With more people living in Whitworth that would mean a greater demand on schools and could result in some children living in Whitworth not going to school there. - - Going back to Whitworth being a valley this physical feature means that infrastructure being put in can be difficult. Whitworth has one road in and out and during peak hours this is a very busy road. Most new people would probably be using a car as their main mode of transport adding more pressure to Market Street and its tributary roads. Public transport is also very poor in Whitworth meaning that it is not really a viable alternative for any new people who would come to Whitworth. - - As shown with a few of these arguments Whitworth does not have the capacity to accommodate an extra 359 houses over the next 15 years. For example an average of 3 people per house would result in 1,077 more people living in Whitworth. It is not going to work.		
1487	Claire	Taylor	-		Object	I object to all of the plans to increase the population in Whitworth. Our schools are bursting at the seams, with local children not getting places. The water drains burst constantly, we cannot add any further pressure - my water was off 5 times this year due to burst pipes. - We cannot accommodate additional people in the doctors. - More cars around Tonnacliffe will be fatal, parking is already jam packed and winter due to heavy snow in the area makes it an access nightmare to school and houses. The village infrastructure is over flowing, we struggle for broadband already, and burst water pipes is very common. - We cannot accommodate any further growth, we do not want to see depreciation of our lovely village, its landscapes or the wildlife.		Yes, we do not want any additional housing in whitworth period.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1497	Wendy	Rose	-	Tonacliffe	Object	The infrastructure of Whitworth cannot support or sustain further development. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth. Congestion is a serious problem now due to the volume of traffic. When there are roadworks the situation is bordering on dangerous as emergency vehicles are hindered. Further residential development would only compound this issue with higher levels of vehicles. - - Power cuts are a regular occurrence in this area, one can only assume this would get worse with the extent of the proposed developments - - Doctors surgeries are fully to capacity and cannot adequately serve the community at the moment. Waiting times for appointments is ludicrous. Schools are over subscribed. Parking around schools is dangerous and any increase in school children would seriously impact on this. - - All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - - Proposed land in some cases is not viable as parts are prone to flooding. Culverts running through a proposed sight would impact on flood defences in the area. - - -		-
1500	katherine	maclean	-	HS2.109 HS2.106	Object	I object to the proposed plans - wildlife all the greenbelt land is of great importance to our local wildlife of whitworth. at the back of us we regular see deer's and foxes. - - local amenities such as schools, dentist, doctors are already full and building more houses would have a negative impact on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - the road network is already shocking as its, we have one road in and out of whitworth, building more houses will only add to the strain. the roads around whitworth are also in poor condition which would only see this get worse.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1502	Danielle	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	-
1503	edward	maclean	-		Object	I object to the proposed plans - wildlife all the greenbelt land is of great importance to our local wildlife of whitworth. at the back of us we regular see deer's and foxes. - - local amenities such as schools, dentist, doctors are already full and building more houses would have a negative impact on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - the road network is already shocking as its, we have one road in and out of whitworth, building more houses will only add to the strain. the roads around whitworth are also in poor condition which would only see this get worse.	-	-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1504	Timothy	Makin	-		Object	<p>The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1505	Pat	Stewart	na		Object	<p>I object to all the listed sites in whitworth. - - HS2.102 - King Street, HS2.104 - Old Lane, HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens, - HS2.105 - Albert Street, HS2.107 Fern Isle Close, HS2.106 - Moorland Cres, - HS2.109 - Horsefield Av - - 1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in</p>		Please can you inform me of how many people object to the whitworth sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----------------

the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - - Plus please note - - Human Rights Act - Responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, - In particular - Protocol 1, Article 1. - This states that "a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land." - Additionally, Article 8 - The Human Rights Act states that "a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life." - - In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1535	Susan	Neilson	N/A	HS2.106 Moorland Crescent and HS2.109 Horsefield Avenue	Object	<p>These two sites at Tonacliffe are unsuitable for housing. The geographical features of the landscape would make it very difficult to build on (as previous land surveys conducted here in the 70's and 90's have proved). Access to the proposed sites is also not suitable, as there is a dangerous bottleneck situation from the Moorland Crescent side and the second proposed access at High Peak Lane is partially owned by local residents, so would not be a viable option. - - The moorland is percolated by a system of springs and the culvert, which runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe site is already near besting point at times of heavy rain. There would be a serious risk of widespread flooding if this building goes ahead. - - The current infrastructure is totally inadequate for this proposed number of houses, as Tonacliffe Road, leading to the two designated access roads for the Tonacliffe site, is very narrow, currently often congested and in need of frequent repairs with the current level of traffic. At dropping off and collection time, the roads in the Tonacliffe area around Tonacliffe County Primary School are already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal . Parking around the area is already a concern for the school and an increase in traffic will only make it worse . Local residents regularly voice their concerns about this . Local amenities such as the schools, dentists, and doctors are already full and building more houses would have a negative effect on the living and health standards of the people of Whitworth . The water, electricity and gas services would also need major work and upgrades to accommodate this level of housing. There have been several incidents are linked to other new building developments, which have already being completed in Whitworth , at which have resulted in power cuts and problems with sewerage and water supply . The road network to and from Rochdale and Bacup was never intended to take the already large volume of traffic. It is frequently gridlocked. More houses would make it worse. - - The proposed site is in an area of Greenbelt Land, which is of great importance to preserve local wildlife in Whitworth . We have protected newts living in the pond and Pipistrelle bats nesting in the area. There are badgers, foxes, deer and hares living wild, alongside the sheep and horses that graze on the moors. In a recent government planning policy statement, it was stated that there needs to be 'a higher level of protection given to the most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitat and natural resources.' This needs to be factored In In order to maintain the environmental quality of the area . The proposed building would cause irreversible damage to the environment . - - -</p>		There would also be a detrimental effect both for the local wildlife and residents in terms of increased noise, pollution and related impact on the carbon footprint of the valley. Public footpaths and rights of way would be lost .The whole proposal across both sites at Tonacliffe could only negatively impact on both the character of the village and its environment and pollute what is currently an area of importance both to the conservation of protected species and wild, moorland beauty .

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1545	Robert	Hesten		SHLAA16002	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam. Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
						<p>flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1546	Sandra	Hesten		SHLAA16002	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam.</p> <p>Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
						<p>flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
1547	Karen	Ruane		SHLAA16002	Object	<p>I wish to object to the Emerging Local Plan Draft Local Plan (2019 to 2034) for Rossendale and the proposals for Whitworth. I would like to state my objections to the local plan specifically for the Whitworth Area, and in particular Site Ref HS2.106 and Site Ref HS2.1 09</p> <p>I am a resident of Meadow Head ave and have lived here since February 1978. I remember when these two areas were defined as Green Belt because of their unsuitability for development. (Inspector's Report September 1994 Gill. D and Sustainability Appraisal May 2017 {3.16.7})</p> <p>The objections raised then and their causes have not 'gone away and are just as valid now. In fact, there are more reasons for keeping the areas as Green Belt. As the problems expressed then, have multiplied rather than decreased. The increased congestion at Tonacliffe Road and Tonacliffe Way is now a nightmare for residents entering and leaving their homes and for parents dropping off their children at Tonacliffe School.</p> <p>Bus Services have decreased from Rochdale and Rossendale through Whitworth as part of a cost cutting exercise. Leaving the minor roads on to estates not serviced by public transport. Shift workers have to use their own cars or car sharing and the last resort, Taxis, because there are no Buses available.</p> <p>I am not a lone voice in expressing my concerns over the current infrastructure which is not adequate for our needs? This Emerging Local Plan (ELP) is going to increase our problems rather than relieve them. And while our MP Jake Berry and Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) may publicly argue about the figures for housing needs, their discussion does prove that it is a Government-led initiative RBC are chasing in this ELP rather than filling a Local need.</p> <p>The increase in pressure on our local resources, this ELP would produce is because of a Whitehall need not a Whitworth need.</p> <p>On the 14th September 2017 in parliament Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government publicly stated the government's commitment by saying. "Greenbelt is still protected."</p> <p>Our local MP then announced in the Rossendale Free Press on 22nd September 2017 "I'm delighted that after raising this issue at the highest levels that I've been able to get the Valley's housing figures reduced to protect more of our local green spaces. This is a victory for everyone here in Rossendale. "</p> <p>In presenting this Draft ELP Rossendale Borough Council are ignoring the wishes of our MP and the residents of Whitworth who seek to protect the Greenbelt not because we consider it our own back garden but because in the absence of any proper development of resources this ELP will increase the burden on an already overburdened infrastructure. As Jake Berry says. "These new homes should</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.106	Further comment
						<p>continue to be prioritised on brownfield and former industrial sites rather than our beautiful countryside."</p> <p>I agree with the Sustainable Development Commission which states: "Sustainable Development starts with making better decisions on the issues that affect all of our lives, easy access to health care and leisure facilities, education for all ... at the nearest school, good public transport, roads and schools. It is about ensuring a strong, healthy, and just society, meeting the diverse needs of all residents those existing and potential future generations. The Schools, Tonaciiffe School, St Anselms School, St Bartholomew's school, St Michael and St John School and the one High School are almost at capacity now. The planning area of Whitworth will show a limited number of places remaining across schools in that planning area If local schools are unable to meet the demand of a new development there is the potential to have an adverse impact on the local community, with children having to travel greater distances to access a school place.</p> <p>(Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017)</p> <p>One GP Surgery, one dentist, one road in and out of Whitworth, schools oversubscribed, I feel this ELP does not show how Sustainable Development (SD) will be achieved. It does, however, show how Rossendale rate revenue will be increased.</p> <p>I believe as community members we have a duty to preserve our open spaces and not allow them to be removed from the Greenbelt to justify a Whitehall need, rather than the needs of Whitworth people for better and improved Services.</p> <p>Without improvement to the existing infrastructure in Whitworth, this Emerging Local Plan will increase problems not reduce them.</p>		
1744	Keren	Szelesi		Moorland Crescent	Object	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Infrastructure is already at breaking point in this area. 2) Road system, water supply, medical centre, schools are at full capacity. 3) Encroach on green spaces. 4) Whitworth will no longer be a village but an urban sprawl. 		Not enough publicity has been given regarding these proposals.
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>TONACLIFFE, WHITWORTH - HS 2:106 and 109 – The sustainability of the sites is considered to be low and improvements to the pedestrian and cycle links would be required. There are ongoing concerns on Tonacliffe Road raised by the residents in relation to vehicle speeds and therefore mitigation measures to reduce vehicle speeds in accordance with the speed limit may be required. The sites could be deemed acceptable subject to a design which is in accordance with Manual for Streets which provides maximum permeability and loop roads for multiple vehicle access points off the adopted highway network, rather than extensions of cul-de-sacs.</p>		
Number of comments		HS2.106				129		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
Reference		HS2.107		Land off Eastgate, Whitworth				
23	Carole	Linley	-	Moorland Crescent,	Object	Whitworth village is already far far too busy and we live on Moorland Crescent, OL12 8SU and are surrounded by moorland which is full of nature and should not be disturbed		-
24	Erica	Preston	-	HS2.105, HS. 107, HS2. 108, HS2.109	Object	The single road through the valley is not up to the volume of traffic using it currently. Hall St.will be a blocked junction, as will Tonacliffe Road. There are not the amenities in the area eg.doctors, dentists, schools etc. Unless major investment in the valley is made to update amenities and utilities these developments will cause immense problems and destroy the reasons people want to live here and turn the valley into yet another sprawling suburb. - I have every sympathy for the need for housing but feel the proposals are ill thought out and will lead to a detrimental effect on the township.		The need for housing must be weighed against the needs of the valley as a whole and destroying green belt and valued wildlife habitat will not make it a place people want to live.
25	Rachael	Dowsing	-		Object	Fern Isle is already at its limit for parking,the road itself is covered in potholes and if this is the access road there is going to be a higher flow of traffic affecting the road itself. The parking is very limited and there are already too many cars for households located on Fern Isle Close meaning that some residents are having to park in the layby. The local children also play on the proposed site and regularly on the street, the increase in traffic means that they are unable to play in front of their own houses. The is also the fact that Wallbank Drive and Hall street and the one road in and out to are already in disrepair and a nightmare at peak hours.		Residents have not been kept informed of the upcoming plans but luckily due to social media this has been highlighted. Is it not good practice to keep local residents who will be affected by the works informed?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
27	Michael	Chianca	-		Object	<p>HS2.102 - King Street - HS2.104 - Old Lane - HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens - HS2.105 - Albert Street - HS2.107 Fern Isle Close - HS2.106 Moorland Cres - HS2.109 Horsefield Av - - All these proposed sited are unsuitable for the following reasons. 1. Wildlife - This greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest area at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest itself would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action when we have other areas within Whitworth to build on that would not require the destruction of trees. 3. The local school at both dropping of and collection time around this area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists, Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative affect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. 9. Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" can you explain what those exceptional circumstances are when we have other areas more suitable for building houses on. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental affect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others would be overlooked. 14. As the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including school children. 16. This area and the surrounding area has already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
32	Paula	McNinch	-		Object	There is not the infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with extra housing. The road in and out is already too busy, the schools are full and there are no facilities for young people.		-
49	Geoffrey	Lyon	-		Object	IT IS PROPOSED TO BUILD 111 UNITS ON THE LAND OFF EASTGATE WHITWORTH, HOWEVER THE ONLY ACCESS IS VIA HALL ST WHITWORTH. - HALL ST IS ALREADY SATURATED WITH TRAFFIC, THE ROAD IS CRUMBLING WITH THE AMOUNT OF VEHICLES ALREADY USING IT. - IT JUST CANNOT TAKE ANY MORE TRAFFIC, SITE TRAFFIC WOULD HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT NOT ONLY ON THE ROAD SURFACE BUT WILL HAVE TO GO STRAIGHT THROUGH WALLBANK HOUSING ESTATE - ONCE BUILT THE NEW HOUSED WOULD INCREASE TRAFFIC ON HALL ST BY OVER 20% - THERE ARE NO FACILITIES FOR ANY NEW HOUSES OTHER THAN A CORNER SHOP ON WALLBANK ESTATE - THERE IS NO DEMAND FOR SO MANY NEW HOUSES ,OVER 350 IN TOTAL TO BE BUILT WITHIN THE WHITWORTH AREA - LOCAL SCHOOLS ARE ALREADY CLOSE TO CAPACITY		-
56	Valerie	McDonald	-		Object	Whilst I recognise the need for further housing within the area, I am concerned about the siting of so many proposed dwellings in this particular valley. The roads are already clogged at rush hour and as there is only one road through, movement of traffic, should there be an accident or roadworks, becomes frustratingly unpredictable. What provision is there to maintain and develop the road system in the valley? - - Whitworth High School has become more popular over the past couple of years with waiting lists existing. What provision will be made to expand the school, and will this be done with a long term objective in mind and not just a sticking plaster effort to put up some portable classrooms? - - Local services such as the Children's Centre have just been lost. What plans may be afoot to reinstate such necessary provision? I feel it is morally wrong to simply build new houses and forget about the infrastructure to support this development. - - There is a wealth of wildlife on the moors where you are proposing to site many homes. Presumably there will be checks in place to ensure some of these species are not endangered? - - Finally, there are already plenty of properties on the market at very affordable prices (in comparison with some surrounding areas). Some of these have been on the market a while? Why, if there is already affordable housing, is there a need to build more? -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
73	Caroline	Lord			Object	<p>This is green space where wildlife thrives, there are badgers, foxes, deer, hare, newts in the river and many many more, to build here would destroy their habitat. The local schools are at saturation point I work in the local Secondary school and we are full to bursting with the council still allowing more and more students in on appeal it is causing disruption to student learning. Parking by Tonacliffe primary school is a nightmare at the moment to introduce more cars will cause total gridlock. A culvert runs through Tonacliffe and this is at bursting point when it rains heavily our garden is flooded. The landscape is totally unsuitable for building and will most certainly cause flooding should building commence. Local amenities will not cope with more people doctors dentist etc are already full. Whitworth as a village comes to a standstill at the drop of a hat and total carnage occurs should there be traffic lights etc. Recent demolition of the local mill was an example of this as there is only one road in and out of the village. Access roads to Tonacliffe are narrow and will cause problems for emergency vehicles with more traffic it will be dangerous for children playing, basically if councillors came and looked at this beautiful green moorland I am fairly certain they could not agree to build and surely a brief walk through Whitworth would show this village is totally at saturation point . Come on counsellors have some sense!</p>		<p>I really hope you take into consideration local peoples feelings for once instead of sitting in your ivory towers making decisions that affect local people</p>
98	Jacqueline	Butterworth	-		Object	<p>I am objecting to proposed development of all the above houses around the Whitworth area. The area is overrun with traffic as it is. One way in and one way out. The schools are overloaded as are the GP surgery. It is inconceivable to build more houses and allowing more traffic to use our roads which are in a terrible state. We are already experiencing burst water pipes and our water pressure has already been reduced. We are experiencing more power cuts since all the new houses have been built on Cowm Park Way . Surely there must be someone in the planning department with some common sense and will prevent any further building of houses in Whitworth</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
131	Christine	Greenwood	-		Object	I am objecting to plans to allow the building of over £350 properties on various sites around Whitiworth and Shawforth over the next 15 years. - Not only am I concerned about the building on our greenbelt sites which is part of the attraction of the area. I can understand the wind farm and can support renewable energy sources but not the creation of a collection of housing estates - whether social/affordable or not . The awful collection in Britannia speaks for itself! We have already had several builds across Rossendale but the extra Council Tax revenue does not seem to have brought many benefits to the borough. - As it stands at present the infrastructure can just about support the current residents - schools are already over subscribed and getting an appointment at our one GP surgery is already a mammoth undertaking. Planning to build or reopen a school by any chance? - Traffic is already an issue with one road in and out and a bus service that has to be one of the most unreliable in the surrounding areas ! There are next to no facilities for young people/children and a library fighting to survive so I think that this needs to be given serious consideration before you go ahead.		-
153	G.N	Royds			Not Applicable	As I have indicated before, a prerequisite for a community is sustainable employment. A complete hash has been made by not providing this. Former mill sites have been used for housing, such as Orama Mill, Facit Mill, Albert Mill and the mill near Spodden Fold (which I think may have been called Old Kays). Most of these are easily accessible. Now Spring Mill is proposed for similar treatment! On the other hand, peripheral businesses have been allowed, e.g. tattoo parlours and tanning centres, which debase the human body; the type of potentially smelly fast food outlets that encourage unhealthy eating. Housing without local employment means commuting, causing traffic congestion and pollution. The kind of industry needed is that involved in green energy, recycling, sensible clothing and the production of healthy food. The former site of Spring Mill is a place where a sensitively designed industrial estate might be possible. It is already surrounded by trees and has foundations remaining but it is not on a regular public transport route and is less accessible than previously mentioned sites that have been precluded. It is absurd to think of building on HS2.102/103/106/109 and on that part of HS2.107 not formerly occupied by Spring Mill. These are large areas of countryside enjoyed at present as part of the natural environment. HS2.104 also appears to be countryside, with a few established houses, and also should be protected from further building. Cowm Water Treatment Works (HS2.108) is ideal for industrial development. Let us have local jobs and ensure adequate facilities are available before any more houses are built in Whitworth.		P.S. I did not make this response online because it was mandatory to provide an e-mail address. Please change this, so that more people are encouraged to respond. P.P.S. Please keep me informed of developments.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
155	Jo	Furtado			Not Applicable	HS2.107 - surely permission for housing at the old Spring Mill site was granted long since? I suppose the local feelings are 1. Is some greedy company land-hoarding? 2. Is the fact that no-one has built on it yet an indication that there's something wrong with the land - pollution of some sort? 3. Long may there be no building there, given that access would be via Wallbank Drive (already an interesting drive, given the number of estate roads that feed into it, the number of kids, and the sections where the road narrows to one lane to accommodate parked cars); and then onto Hall Street (two schools, on-road parking, and the route onto the main road for the new 100+ house estate on the old Orama Mill site). Neither support nor oppose.		
195	Janet	King	-	HS.102, HS2.104-9 inclusive	Object	Whitworth' infrastructure cannot support almost 400 new properties - it is already nigh impossible to obtain a doctors appointment and my father has had to wait iver 6 months to obtain a podiatry appointment as there is only one who has been on long term sick and no replacement cover available. The fact that there is only one main arterial road into and out of Whitworth, which already has weekly road works delaying the already totally congested road does not bear thinking about. With an extra 400 properties and the increase in traffic that these will bring and as there is no large employer in the area most of these occupants will be commuting one way or another. We lost access to an A&E in Rochdale and now the nearest is either Fairfield or Oldham with the additional traffic these proposals would create the congested roads Could be catastrophic in an emergency. - - On a personal note, my family moved to Whitworth 12 years ago, from Oldham, due to its naturally beautiful countryside and I see the addition of these properties into areas of greenery (extending Wallbank estate etc.,) is the very short end of the stick. I can see that if these are accepted, encroaching on to green belt areas, slowly but surely the green belt areas will get smaller and smaller until eventually Whitworth just becomes another concrete plot with ever creaking infrastructure. - - Finally, I understand the need for affordable housing but there are plenty of mills/brown field that could be developed. However, I feel strongly that before any proposals are accepted it is of the utmost importance that the infrastructure is in place to support them, that includes roads, schools and NHS access.		-
249	Sandra	Cosby	-		Not Applicable	Wish to know were houses will be actualy built land off Eastgate		No
258	Fiona	Harrisson			Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village oversubscribed schools and GP Services with one road in and one road out. The pressure on the infrastructure would be immense, plus travelling to or from anywhere especially at peak times is already horrendous, nevermind with another approx 400 houses being built. Our skyline and beautiful views and countryside are also going to be lost.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	This is an unbelievable plan that will stretch amenities in the area even further. - - The new estate near Cowm has already increased traffic congestion on the one road in and out of the village and schools are already struggling to cope. - - There is also the issue of wildlife and the impact it will have on their environment. - - I for one will be leaving if this idiotic plan goes through. -		This smells of greed over common sense
268	Michaela	Radford	-		Object	Whitworth has had numerous instances recently regarding the roadworks for the infrastructure repair and maintenance. As an employee of all 4 major utility asset owners in the area, I am very concerned regarding the houses proposed. We only have one road throughout the valley and this is impacted severely when roadworks are planned. My concerns are that these are not managed correctly by LCC at present, therefore; more houses and more infrastructure would have a massive impact on the people living in the village. People face unemployment now due to the frequent issues we face getting into work. - Not to mention over crowded schools and doctors as we stand at present. - - I request, here in writing, to be informed of any planned meetings regarding the houses in whitworth and notification be sent in writing to my address above.		-
297	Lindsay	Fairhurst			Object	Poor access along the length of Main Rd (Market Street) one narrow road lined with parked cars , as only access into & out of whitworth. No alternative route. No trains or trams. Buses won't must travel on same one access road both in and out as cars. No motorway access under 20 min journey both ways insufficient work in area means people must travel to Manchester, leeds, bury, Rochdale etc. Current public transport unrealistic. Traffic at peak times currently gridlocked & congested. Increased housing will add to this burden. Utilities infrastructure unable to cope currently leading to repeated remedial roadworks. Schools full Doctors full Rossendale Council Lancashire Council needs to address transport & roadways access + education access beofer building homkes where people will be unable to travel to employment and school		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
298	Andrew	Fairhurst			Object	the number of houses proposed in this local plan for infrastructure can support. Whitworth has only one road in abd out and already this is constantly being dug up by utility companies often resulting in temporary traffic lights that cause massives queues of traffic in rush hours. Not only is the road narrow and conjested but there is no alternative train service - only the bus (on the same road) This is totall useless for the number of people wo commute to Manchester, Oldham and Bury every working day. Our schools, doctors and dentists are already close to capacity. There are very few options to travel to other facilities apart from along the one road through the valley.		Without robust and achievable plans to increase the support infrastructure for travel (a train for example) and health and education and culture this building should not go ahead. For people to afford these houses they need jobs first. Currently you need to move out of the valley to commute to work. Regeneration of the area and existing housing stock should come first.
391	Emma	Dudley	-		Object	We tried this 5 years ago and got no where. I'm objecting to the build of houses on land off eastgate on wallbank (actually land off westgate) the land is too wet to build and contaminated with all kinds of chemicals. There's so much wildlife too where are they suppose to go!! It's really unfair. My house will be to overlooked and I fear for my privacy. We can't cope with the amount of traffic going through Whitworth at the minute and things go really bad when there's traffic lights as you have probably heard with recent events so why add more it's ridiculous. There's no room in primary schools near by and the high school is full too, there's only one dentist and one doctors that can just about cope so we're are all these people from the proposed builds goingvto go. Do you even think about this. We should keep Whitworth green belts this is what makes Whitworth a great place to live we don't need anymore ugly looking houses added to it, there's enough new builds now. But really just think about the roads there's only one road on and off wallbank the traffic at hall street is bad enough		Please leave the green belt on the land off eastgate wallbank we really don't need anymore houses. This really annoys me because I have lived in my house on westgate since 1999 and have never heard of any build off eastgate until me and the neighbours seen diggers in the field at the back in 2012 that was because they had to do something on the land before the planning ran out so they put a bit of tarmac down!!!! Ridiculous!! And how are they aloud to build on the field at the back of westgate when it's not eastgate?? The plans say land off eastgate! Surely the field at the back of westgate should be land off westgate it's not on eastgate side

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
544	Lois	Lees	-		Object	Whitworth is a lovely but busy village. There is only one road into the village and one out. Traffic is already heavy at peak times. Adding more housing to the village will only increase the number of vehicles on the road, causing more congestion, and further damage to the already damaged roads. - Schools and GP's are already over subscribed. The village has sufficient housing and does not need more. - HS2.107 - The road onto Wallbank, leading to Eastgate/Spring mill land is a complete mess. Hall Street is full of pot holes and has been patched so many times that at the junction of Wallbank Drive and Hallfold, the road is terrible. There is limited access to the site at Spring Mill. - The land is full of wildlife. There is a pond at the side of the road, close to the waterworks access, there are Great Crested Newts in this pond, as well as frogs and other creatures. Herons feed at this pond. - There are deer living in the trees in the land at the top of the plot and badgers use the area to feed. Woodpeckers live in the trees, and many varieties of birds nest in the shrubs and bushes. - The land at Spring Mill has been contaminated for years, disturbing this land would release toxins and cause environmental damage.		Whitworth is a lovely village which is just managing to deal with the number of cars, houses and people that exist here. - There is already damage to the roads and water supply. Adding extra housing and more people will only cause more issues with the roa
561	Lynne	Meigh	Retired	SHLAA16005	Object	This proposal would bring a great amount of traffic onto an already congested area. The bridge at Hall Street over the River Spodden is already taking too much traffic. Near to the bridge there are three lots of housing complexes where there are a large a		-
590		Ashworth			Object	Absolutely ridiculous One way in and out of whitworth no extra schools or doctors when you have two or three cars per household. This is ruining our villages. We strongly object to this. Listen to the people who vote you in, as we have long memories		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
674	Tracey Jane	Dowd	-		Object	According to the council the local high school is under subscribed yet the school claims it's over subscribed and is turning away students. Which one is it as they want to build more homes where the schools are oversubscribed. The roads are in a terrible mess and there are no real parking spaces on the Wallbank estate. School times are an accident waiting to happen with the idiot parents who park anywhere they want. On Wallbank Drive people park over the steps and on Southgate one car parks fully on the path blocking 2 footpaths so you have to walk on the grass and the council wants to make it even worse by adding more houses and more cars.		Clearly this is a case of money rather than thinking about what it means for the local residents who have to live where they want to build more houses. - Why are these decisions made by someone who doesn't live in the area and has no idea what they are doing. If you are adding 50 more houses then you should st least double that by the amount of cars that will be in the area and with no where to park on the main streets in the area you are just making the situation worse. - Hall street is an absolute disgrace regarding the state of the road . The drains are not maintained properly so when we have a massive downpour it gets flooded. We have had so many bursts this year already and one burst was left for a few days that the road collapsed and blew my tyre resulting in me making a claim. The drains are not cleared when the leaves falls so the road gets flooded where Wallbank lodge is. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
692	Gregory William	Meigh	-		Object	<p>I object on the grounds that: - - 1. The roads leading off this site would be more congested and quite dangerous. Two of the main schools are on this road where at certain times of the day our children are walking to and from school. There are quite a number of our elderly residents living in this area who already struggle to cross these roads due to the amount of traffic. - - 2. There is a narrow bridge which has to take this traffic and is inadequate for this purpose and has a blind spot. - - 3. Due to vehicles parking at school times and when there is an event on at the church on this road, it becomes extremely narrow and queuing traffic on Hall Street, to get onto Market Street, can be as far back as the schools. It doesn't need much thought to see how dangerous this can be. - - 4. As previously stated, our village is already very busy. More traffic would be horrendous. Our schools are oversubscribed, our gp service are over burdened and the one main road cannot be expected to cope. - - Whitworth is becoming a place where people won't want to live.</p> <p>I object to this proposal on the grounds that: - - The roads in this area are very busy. They serve two busy schools, and a church plus Wallbank housing estate, plus three residential buildings for the elderly. - - At peak periods the traffic is intense with numerous parked vehicles and a great number of our children walking in this area. A lot of our elderly who live nearby are already struggle to cross Hall Street. At peak periods traffic will back up to the schools waiting to get onto Market Street, (our only main road.) There is a bridge with a bend and drivers cannot see until they negotiate this bend. This bridge I feel is already under a great strain. - If there is an event at the church this will add to the parking problem. There have been a number of accidents. - - If the 111 houses are built, how many more vehicles would be on these roads, maybe 100 to 150?? - - Ours schools are full our GP & services are overstretched. We are already experiencing electric cuts, burst water pipes, phone lines and internet being overloaded. Our greenery is slowly disappearing, as is our village. - - Enough is enough.</p>		
743			Whitworth Town Council		Support	<p>HS2.107 Land off Eastgate (should read land to rear of Westgate)</p> <p>This site has existing outline planning permission, Council agreed that this site is likely to be developed but raised concerns that we do not have the physical infrastructure nor social facilities for a development of that size.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
773	Susan	Worrall	-		Object	Whitworth is a village, a small community. Building these housing developments will change Whitworth into a town. - There is not the infrastructure to support this additional housing. There is one road in and out of Whitworth which is already struggling to cope with the increasing volume of traffic.Especially at peak times. If there are any traffic disruptions it can take 1-2 hours to get to Rochdale . We do not need more cars and the pollution they bring! - - There are limited school places both secondary and primary and local children born in the village will struggle to get places. - The one and only GP practice can not manage to provide the necessary health care for patients with no appointments pre bookable for weeks in advance. This healthcare will be diluted further. Living in Whitworth if A&E treatment is required which is often a life or death situation your chances of survival are reduced add more traffic on market street and your chance of survival diminishes further - - The people who live in Whitworth , live here because it is a village , it is quiet and the countryside is on the door step. Yet the plans want to destroy the village life, increase demands on exisiting services and increase pollution - - To consider building on greenbelt land in Whitworth is unbelievable and irresponsible, Planning has already - spoil the view of the countryside at the side of Daneswood ave and the wind farms are also affecting the views and countryside. - - Whitworth has lots of wildlife from deer, owls, herons, wild ponies as well as lots of insect life butterflies, bees etc which will all be at risk if the countryside is used for housing. - - There is empty housing all over the borough - fill these , not build more especially in our little village -		Stop putting profits first and put existing residents first
796	Steven	Smith	Wagg		Object	Already an overcrowded infastucture..object to greenbelt land being used and local wildlife being destroyed.the proposed site on horsefield av site would be built under or very near electricity pylons.the roads or already overused to and from whitworth so more traffic will mean longer delays on worse roads.the schools and doctors are already full..more traffic passing tonacliffe primary school would endanger the pupils at school opening and closing.previous mining at tonaclffe makes the proposed site unsuitable for building on.the transportation of heavy plant will damage the roads.		Don't use greenbelt land and build somewhere else.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
803	Marietta	Galbraith	-		Object	My objections for the proposed building of housing on the above sites is based on a number of reasons: - 1. Infrastructure. The current housing situation is already at (possibly beyond) capacity with regards to schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists, employment and traffic. There are no more schools planned and no way to expand the ones already here. Some children have to travel miles to schools out of the area due to oversubscribed local schools. This is the same for doctor's surgeries and many other amenities. - 2. Traffic. There is one main road in and out of Whitworth that already has issues with raised levels of traffic. In the four years we have lived here, there have been many occasions where traffic has been an issue due to constant roadworks (for various reasons relating to increased housing and traffic) which has caused major problems. Also, most people are employed outside of Whitworth so traffic is high anyway. More housing would increase this issue with no solution being given as to how it could be rectified. - 3. Utilities. More and more power cuts have been happening recently in Whitworth due to new housing as well as burst water pipes and problems with drainage. This has contributed to the traffic issues with roads having to be dug up every few weeks to 'fix' the problem. - 4. More housing would mean taking up land that is natural drainage for flooding. Recently, my area was put into the 'flood risk' category (although we haven't flooded), significantly increasing my home insurance. If more homes are built, this would increase risk of flooding to many homes around Whitworth, which would cause loss of market value and would reduce the chances of being able to sell the property. - 5. Much of the 'green land' would be lost which is detrimental to the wildlife around Whitworth. The Government have a duty to protect greenbelt land and our environment! The carbon footprint would be horrific! - In conclusion, building over 300 houses in Whitworth would cause issues beyond repair! Environment, traffic, pollution, infrastructure, drainage etc. would all be dramatically affected in the most negative and damaging way. Whitworth was not meant for so much housing and so many people.		
886	Michael	Banham	-	HS2.102 to HS2.109	Object	The infrastructure of whitworth is over stretched as it is,the school's cannot cater for such an undertaking. Theres only one road in or out of whitworth any problems on this road causes absolute mayhem. The winter months are an absolute nightmare just to get onto market street.		I cannot understand why anyone would want to over populate an area that is already struggling.
889	Derek	Lord	-	HS 102, HS105, HS104, HS106, HS107, HS108, HS109.	Object	We in Whitworth are sure that there are enough houses here at the present time.There are large estates at Cowm Park, Tonacliffe, Wain Gap, Wallbank, Knot Hill, Orama Mill Site, Edgemoor Close, and a small estate at Facit. The exits onto the one main road are at present full of traffic. The Doctors, Schools etc are now at bursting point. We in Whitworth have done our share in housing. Please think again before building any more. Thank You. -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
892	Mandy	Sanderson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105,HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The transport system around Whitworth cannot cope with the volume of traffic . Also local amenities are already at braking point..		No
911	Julie	Latham	-		Object	In principle I don't object to more houses or people. However I will until I am convinced that the planners are committed to the infrastructure improvements required to support the extra influx of people and cars . - The main bottlenecks caused by Whitwo		-
913	Michelle	Ashcroft	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108 & HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a geographical challenge at the best of times, positioned in a valley, consisting of ONE main road with multiple roads stemming from this leading to many properties that are built on the hillside. There are many green areas which are used by local farmers for their livestock. During times of heavy rain many of the roads are flooded, and during winter many roads are very dangerous in the snow. It is not uncommon for Whitworth to be gridlocked as there are far too many cars on the roads, all it needs is one set of road works and the town becomes inaccessible. The local schools are now over subscribed, the High school has had to turn away many children who only live a couple of miles away. The primary schools are also subscribed making it very difficult for teachers to provide a good education to the children. The local doctors are unable to cope with the number of patients, trying to get a same day appointment is nigh on impossible these days. We have issues with anti social behaviour due to lack of amenities available for teenagers, the local youth club has been closed down. There is a lack of police presence (the PSCO tries her best), people don't feel as safe as they should. The library is still under threat of closure, the pool is only open because of the people of Whitworth who run it. Building more houses brings more people, more cars, more strain on the infrastructure. I appreciate housing is needed but the number of houses that has been suggested will bring this town to it's knees.		I would suggest you come to Whitworth during the morning school run and see how difficult it is around Horsefield Avenue. Come sit in the traffic jams during rush hour. - - The government has spoken about creating new towns, this is a great idea, there are places that can accommodate thousands and thousands of houses. Build there not here!!!
916	Jane	Trudgeon	-	HS2.102 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	We are already an overstretched village infrastructure, the roads would not cope with an extra amount of traffic and would make the already difficult commute to exit/enter the village impossible. There are not enough schools nor would the doctor's surgery be able to cope as even now it is almost impossible to get a reasonable appointment time, - - The housing developments would impact on wildlife		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
918	Marion	Ashworth	-	HS2.107 , ALL.	Object	I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.		I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.
922	Susan	Percy	-	HS.2107 HS2.106 HS2.109	Object	I wish to object to the proposed building developments on the grounds that there is one route into and out of this village which is Market Street. This route is already very congested during morning and evening rush hour and also due to school runs at other times of the day. This is compounded by the many times that the roads are being dug up for roadworks and temporary traffic lights in situ. - - Increased traffic would be an issue for children that play in these areas. - - Schools are also over subscribed in this area and additional parking outside schools would make a bad situation even worse and dangerous. - - Doctors surgeries and Dentists are also full and additional patients would mean longer waiting times to get appointments and would be detrimental for the health and well being of local people. - - Building on green belt would result in loss of wildlife e.g newts, badgers, foxes and hares. Deer use shelter within these areas and it would be detrimental to them if they lost this facility. - - Drainage is a major issue - loss of more greenbelt would make this worse as we already have problems. There is a culvert runs through the middle of Tonacliffe which takes land drain water off the moors this is already near bursting point and we could be in danger of severe flooding. - - Has a land survey been undertaken? Some of these sites would be unsuitable for building on.		-
935	Christine	Fallon		HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	1 Whitworth has one main road which is often gridlocked the smaller access roads are grossly un suitable e.g Tonacliffe. - 2 Schools are already oversubscribed parking at drop off times would be more chaotic and dangerous. - 3 Doctors and dentists are already at capacity. - 4 Services of gas electricity and water would require major upgrade. - 5 We are seeing flooding due to inadequate drainage this would be increased. - 6 Is this acceptable use of greenbelt land where previous planning permission has been refused the effect on wildlife and trees would be immense.		-
939	Geoffrey	Fallon	-	HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a small village with one already inadequate road. Doctors dentists and schools are already oversubscribed parking in school areas is dangerous already and would be far worse. - Gas electricity and water services would need major upgrade. - This is inappropriate use of greenbelt land causing damage to wildlife and the environment drainage is a major problem now with frequent flooding.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
955	Janet	Whitehead	-		Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village, oversubscribed schools and Doctors - We have one road in and one road out which is almost impossible during peak times in the morning - The houses already exceed the heights up the sides of the valley - Our green belt is very important to wildlife and the the people the live here - If we let one builder onto greenbelt it opens the doors to far too many others - Our population is big enough and we cannot accommodate many more		Our Councillors are voted in by us and now need to stand up and fight for us - - 400 houses is a ridiculous amount of new houses for a tiny village - - We have had 2 different sites where new houses have been built in recent years we've done our bit for Government figures - - Please find somewhere else
962	Kathryn	Gill	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2104, HS2106, HS2107, HS2108, HS2109	Object	I object to any changes in use of local greenbelt land to build houses. Also, there is only one road through Whitworth and it is already congested. We have only 1 doctors surgery, and not enough school places to accommodate hundreds of additional families. Greenbelt land cannot be restored once built on, and these proposals would change the landscape of Whitworth. I am also concerned about the building of 20 properties around Cowm. This is a resource continually used for recreation by the people of Whitworth and should be preserved.		
979	Marie	Pye	-		Object	All of these developments will contribute to already existing traffic problems as there is one road in and one road out of the area. The high school is already oversubscribed with local children not being offered places.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
992	Susan	Farrell		HS2: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109	Object	<p>I strongly object to the building of houses on all the above mentioned sites for the following reasons: - Greenbelt land is of importance to all the wildlife of Whitworth and Shawforth . Deer and bats live in the forests in the area. Many badgers and foxes inhabit the countryside and rare species of wildlife live in the ponds. - The forest area at Tonacliffe would be cut down having a negative impact on the environment. - Tonacliffe road is already dangerous for children with cars parked along the length of the road at school dropping off and picking up time. The increased number of cars if more houses were built in the area would be worse for the children and residents. - Local amenities such as dentists and GPs could not cope with the increased population. It is almost impossible at the moment to get a GP appointment in less than two weeks. More housing would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Whitworth and Shawforth. - Facilities such as water, gas and electricity are already stretched and a major upgrade of the infrastructure would be required to support increased housing. - Local drainage cannot cope with the current usage. More housing could have an impact on flooding. - Public footpaths could be lost reducing the number of rights of way for walkers. - The road network both ways from Rochdale to Bacup is already gridlocked. More housing would put an increased strain on traffic and the already poor public transport in the area. - The only high school in the area is already oversubscribed. With increased housing parents may have even less chance of a first choice school for their children. They may have to travel miles to school. - I understood it is government policy to protect Greenbelt land except for 'Exceptional Circumstances'. What are the exceptional circumstances that enable housing to be built on the greenbelt land in Whitworth and Shawforth?</p>		<p>Summary - - Whitworth and Shawforth are already busy villages with oversubscribed schools and GP services with one road in and out between Rochdale and Bacup. - - Can we accommodate more housing that will put pressure on already overstretched amenities, increase traffic and change the beautiful landscape forever?</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1029	Angela	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? -7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1107	Keith	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2 108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. GP services and other related support services are already overstretched and inadequate. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 5. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 6. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 7. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 7.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 7.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 7.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 8. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		
1109	Jane	Gadsby	-		Object	<p>I wholly object to more housing being built in Whitworth!! We are a small(ish) village that can not cope already with the amount of new houses and people moving into it!! Our schools are already over subscribed; they are turning people away that don't live overly far away that a few years ago would have had no problem getting a place. The Doctors surgery can't cope with the number of patients wanting appointments. You are also increasing the risks of flooding. My house is already at risk and has already flooded twice. The main road (one road in and out) is gridlocked most mornings with commuters trying to get out of the village but most of all you are taking our beautiful green areas that Whitworth is so lucky and honoured to have. We have lots of empty properties that can't be filled already!! Please leave us and our village alone!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1134	Abigail	Leyland	-		Object	WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE HOUSING IN WHITWORTH! The schools are already oversubscribed, our local doctors can not possibly take on any more patients as it is already a struggle to get an appointment currently. We only have one road in and out of the village which gets badly effected by rush hour traffic, making it difficult for the locals to get to work/school etc. We have such a lovely view of greenery surrounding our little village and we do not want our sight ruined by building ugly, unnecessary housing.		
1166	Brendan	Doherty	-	HS2, 102,104,108,105 ,107,106,109.	Object	WHITWORTH IS FULL. This statement encapsulates all the issues surrounding any expansion of dwelling houses in the township of Whitworth. - - The negative impact of any developments in the town cannot be overstated. - - The whole nature of this small township will be irreversibly destroyed if development are allowed. - - Flora and fauna will be the first to suffer. This valley is home to an exceptional and expanding variety of animals and trees and flowers. This growth has taken decades to achieve and would by totally reversed by the stroke of a pen. - - To say that all the ingredients which go to make up Whitworth as a place for people to live are overloaded is indeed an understatement. - - Congestion of traffic and people is at its limit, any increase can only be detrimental to the health and quality of life of residents. - - Local services, schools, doctors, civic amenities are already at their serviceable optimum. - - The existing utilities of electricity,gas and water only just maintain service. There are often cuts in these making it seem that we are a third world town. - - Whitworth is a linear town with no bypass or possibility of such. Most of the day traffic is heavy and at peak times chaotic. This combined with the nature of HGV traffic leaves the roads in constant need of repair. Add a very poor public transport system and the certain increases proposed then the result is guaranteed to be disastrous.		Listen to the people of Whitworth.
1190	Nathan	Worrall	-	HS2.107 , HS2.108, HS2.109, HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104,HS2.10 6	Object	Whitworth doesn't have the infrastructure to sustain the construction of these - new houses. The local doctors and schools would struggle to meet the needs of the increased population. There is bad traffic in Whitworth already, this will only make it worse and these traffic problems are highlighted when there are roadworks and there are large queues. The proposed sites are located on greenbelt land, and this will have a negative effect on the local wildlife as well as destroying the natural beauty of this land.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1272	Michala	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS102.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	I am objecting in general to the proposed house building in various sites around Whitworth and specifically in relation to the proposed sites t Tonacliffe. My objections are based on a number of reasons: 1. Wildlife in the local area. Deer, badgers, foxes and hares live within the forest areas. Rare protected newts live in the pond. Bats nest in the forest. The importance in f this green belt land for the wildlife cannot be over emphasised. - 2. Tonacliffe forest would need to be cut down adversely affecting the local environment. - 3. The impact of more cars around local schools, especially Tonacliffe School, is of great concern due to the already high volume of traffic. Increasing this would be unacceptable. - 4. Local amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already to capacity. I have concerns that more houses will have a negative impact on the lives of current residents in relation to these amenities. - 5. Has the infrastructure of our small village been considered in relation to electricity, gas and water supply if more houses are built? Whitworth already experiences power cuts and seems to be worse since other recent building developments have been completed. - 6. The road network into Rochdale is already gridlocked. More houses will increase this problem. Public transport from Whitworth is limited to buses and I consider that if this proposed building goes ahead there will also be a negative impact on the poor public transport in and out of our village. - 7. Local drainage already struggles to cope with usage now, if the volume of residents increases would the drainage system be able to deal with the added strain? - 8. We bought our property because it is located on the last cul de sac of a small estate with no through traffic. This proposed building work will completely alter this into drive through roads. Plus the volume of traffic will - Increase which I consider to be unacceptable. - 9. I am very concerned that we may have loss of privacy as we are not currently overlooked and this was a major consideration when we bought our house.	-	-
1283	Jonathan	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	Whitworths infrastructure is already at near full capacity. The single main road through Whitworth is, at times, grid-locked. Streets around the primary schools is chaotic. There is a definite flood issue through the valley. Crime is rising unchallenged. The rich and diverse wildlife is flourishing around Whitworth. - Any of the development projects would have a negative and detrimental implication on Whitworth and it's residents.	-	-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1310	Richard	Dolan	-	HS2.101-109	Object	<p>We are vehemently opposed to all housing allocation in Whitworth. Our group has decided to vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. We will withhold our votes and encourage family, friends, and community to do likewise. - We are outraged by this proposal, especially HS2.107 that will encroach on Healy Dell. On this point we will be contacting the National Trust and other such organisations to make them away of the proposed desecration to the Green Belt. Furthermore, we are now investigating possible financial links between all Councillors, MPs, and RBC employees involved in this issue with the proposed contractors. This senseless proposal for a village far too small to accommodate a possible 300 new homes suggest an ulterior motive. No one in our community that we have spoken to is in favour of this plan and we will use our sizeable influence. - There has been more than enough housing development in Whitworth. This new proposal will destroy our green spaces and necessitate a new schools, doctors' surgery, dentist, shops, and possible a new road. All future housing development must stop. Our community can not accommodate any more. - In light of the fact that this proposal has not been advertised to a great extent (we have spoken to people who know nothing of it), we will be conducting a petition again this proposal and encouraging everyone to sign the following statement: - We will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community.</p>		<p>To reiterate, we will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community. - - The people's power will be felt if this plan is authorised.</p>
1336	Maureen	O'Mara	-		Object	<p>Whitworth is already struggling with oversubscribed schools. There is only 1 small GP surgery and 1 dentist. The village cannot cope with stretching the existing amenities. - One of the main objections I have is the traffic and parking, which is already dire. Streets are almost impossible to drive down safely due to double parking. There is only one main road, which when closed for any reason means driving via Todmorden to get around - this has happened on a number of occasions. Most roads have very steep inclines which are regularly not gritted in winter. To increase parking and traffic would destroy Whitworth. Where would access roads be and how would this affect current residents.</p>		
1363	Gareth	Dolan	-	HS2.101 to 109	Object	<p>I do not live in Whitworth but spend a lot of time there with my family. I am deeply concerned by this proposed loss of green belt and will do my utmost to object against it. - - I strongly urge RBC to re-consider its proposal. Whitworth cannot handle any more development. - - Thanks</p>		<p>If this destruction of the green belt in Whitworth is passed then I shall simply take my family and my money elsewhere as there will no longer be the same attraction Whitworth now offers.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1365	Michael	Whitehead	-		Object	The doctors is overcrowded, the schools are overcrowded and there is one road in and out. All three of the mentioned cannot cope in the current state. Whitworth has too many houses for the current infrastructure. If the proposal goes through, which I sincerely hope it does not, there will be 300+ more homes within Whitworth. This means 650+ more people needing a doctor, 300+ more children who need schools and 300+ more cars on the roads. If the current infrastructure is struggling I dread to think how the village would end up with that amount of extra people. - There are also many deer which have recently returned to the greenbelt land on either side of the valley. Moving any sort of greenbelt/urban borders is highly likely to destroy their habitat and force them away.		-
1397	John	Cavanagh		Eastgate	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve
1398	Joshua	Hopwood Mairs		Eastgate	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1402	JOANNE	WHITWORTH	-	Eastgate	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. -		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling with make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth who have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for now and for our future generations.
1405	GARETH	WHITWORTH	-	Eastgate	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for our children and our childrens children.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1417	Gillian	Middlemas	Whitworth Community High School	HS1.102 HS2.103 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	As Headteacher of the only secondary school in the Whitworth area, I am concerned that the proposals to build considerable numbers of new dwellings take no account of educational provision in the local area. - The school is already oversubscribed: for 2017 entry into Y7 over 40 families were unsuccessful in gaining a place, despite Whitworth Community High School being their first preference; over 40 families went onto on the Local Authority's waiting list for a place; over 25 families went to Appeal for a place, and very few of them were successful. The school now has 640 students and, without extra classroom space, has no capacity to increase the admissions number, nor to take additional students into existing year groups. - Likewise, many local primary schools are also full / oversubscribed, suggesting there is insufficient educational provision in the local area already. - This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed number of new dwellings goes ahead, unless the developers or Lancashire County Council are prepared to increase the school's capacity by funding additional classroom / learning / social space. The school is over 50 years old, largely of Langspan pre-tensioned concrete construction (intended life expectancy already exceeded) with HAC (high alumina cement) - In addition, the school experiences ongoing issues with the provision of utilities: the water main up the school drive is at risk of collapse; the water supply to the area has recently been affected on a number of occasions, and presumably further demand from new building would increase these issues. - The proposals for new housing does not appear to be linked to any plans to improve the traffic situation in the Whitworth area: lengthy queues heading towards Rochdale each morning already create issues for students travelling to school.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1420	Julie	bower	-	Eastgate	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. - This already over saturated with people for the small community resources there are. - There is not enough road space, and only a little amount of moorland available. We try to encourage our young in the community to go outside and be 'heathy'. There won't be anywhere left. I find the lack of advertising this proposal unacceptable. There are many more areas of fields elsewhere. Why add to an over exhausted community already? I dont understand why Whitworth has to be the target for this.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve. It isn't alot but it is valued and appreciated beyond your knowledge or understanding - all of these below would be affected adversely. - - Wildlife - Loss of trees - The local school - Landscaping - - Local amenities - Infrastructure - - - We deserve our voices to be heard.
1433	Albertina	Ripa	-		Object	infrastructare NOT suitable, especially ONE road into and out of Whitworth,which is already over used,3 hours of standing traffic NOT UNCOMMON when roadworks present		Our concerns applies to all the Housing allocations in this area above above 5-10 houses
1435	Angelo	Ripa	-		Object	infrastructare NOT suitable, especially ONE road into and out of Whitworth,which is already over used,3 hours of standing traffic NOT UNCOMMON when roadworks present		Our concerns applies to all the Housing allocations in this area above above 5-10 houses

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1440	Helen	Banham	-	HS2.107 Fern Isle Close	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
						unbearable strain on this network.		
1469	George	Salt	-		Object	Whitworth is located in a valley, this in itself presents issues with the amount of space available. 7,500 people lived in Whitworth according to the data from the 2011 Census and this is a large amount of people if you look at the services and infrastructure in Whitworth. To start off with there is one GP surgery that has 7,248 people registered with them. Whitworth Medical Centre has 4 GPs which means that for one GP there are 1,812 people. There is not any more capacity available for more people to register with the practice. - - Schools are also busy especially with just one school for secondary education. With more people living in Whitworth that would mean a greater demand on schools and could result in some children living in Whitworth not going to school there. - - Going back to Whitworth being a valley this physical feature means that infrastructure being put in can be difficult. Whitworth has one road in and out and during peak hours this is a very busy road. Most new people would probably be using a car as their main mode of transport adding more pressure to Market Street and its tributary roads. Public transport is also very poor in Whitworth meaning that it is not really a viable alternative for any new people who would come to Whitworth. - - As shown with a few of these arguments Whitworth does not have the capacity to accommodate an extra 359 houses over the next 15 years. For example an average of 3 people per house would result in 1,077 more people living in Whitworth. It is not going to work.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1493	Kathryn	Meigh	-		Object	I wish to object to the proposed site for housing off Eastgate in Whitworth because of several reasons - 1) Hall Street is already very congested with traffic especially at peak times and it takes a long time to get out on to the main road due to the school, church and residential traffic. - 2) Extra road traffic would increase the risk of safety to motorists, school children and the Elderly as there are 2 busy schools and at least 3 elderly people's residence off Hall Street i.e. Spodden Fold bungalows, Riddiough Court and Masseycroft. - I have reported issues with the blind spot on the road to pull out safely from Spodden Fold when people already speed down Hall Street towards Hallfold and Wallbank and about parents narrowing the roads to drop off and pick up their children up from school. This would only become worse with more housing. - 3) The impact this would have on local services. The schools and local Doctors surgeries are already over subscribed and it is difficult to get appointment including the local dentist. More Houses would mean even more pressure on local vital services. - 4) The extra demand for amenities of water, gas, electric, broadband, telephone etc. In Whitworth especially in the hall street area, we have had power, broadband and water cuts repeatedly. The general consensus is the increased demand created by the old Orama mill housing estate has not helped the situation and more housing will add to this problem. - I have lived in Whitworth all my life and if these plans go ahead, I will have to consider moving away from my area because of commuting difficulties and access.		
1497	Wendy	Rose	-	Eastgate	Object	The infrastructure of Whitworth cannot support or sustain further development. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth. Congestion is a serious problem now due to the volume of traffic. When there are roadworks the situation is bordering on dangerous as emergency vehicles are hindered. Further residential development would only compound this issue with higher levels of vehicles. - - Power cuts are a regular occurrence in this area, one can only assume this would get worse with the extent of the proposed developments - - Doctors surgeries are fully to capacity and cannot adequately serve the community at the moment. Waiting times for appointments is ludicrous. Schools are over subscribed. Parking around schools is dangerous and any increase in school children would seriously impact on this. - - All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - - Proposed land in some cases is not viable as parts are prone to flooding. Culverts running through a proposed sight would impact on flood defences in the area. - - - -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1502	Danielle	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	
1504	Timothy	Makin	-		Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1505	Pat	Stewart	na		Object	<p>I object to all the listed sites in whitworth. - - HS2.102 - King Street, HS2.104 - Old Lane, HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens, - HS2.105 - Albert Street, HS2.107 Fern Isle Close, HS2.106 - Moorland Cres, - HS2.109 - Horsefield Av - - 1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in</p>		Please can you inform me of how many people object to the whitworth sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
						<p>the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - - Plus please note - - Human Rights Act - Responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, - In particular - Protocol 1, Article 1. - This states that "a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land." - Additionally, Article 8 - The Human Rights Act states that "a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life." - - In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1545	Robert	Hesten		SHLAA16005	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whltworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam. Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
						<p>flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions?</p> <p>Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS.</p> <p>There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village.</p> <p>Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed?</p> <p>In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area.</p> <p>Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF.</p> <p>Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
1546	Sandra	Hesten		SHLAA16005	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam.</p> <p>Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
						<p>flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions?</p> <p>Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS.</p> <p>There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village.</p> <p>Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed?</p> <p>In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area.</p> <p>Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF.</p> <p>Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.107	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		
1744	Keren	Szelesi		Fern Isle Close	Object	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Infrastructure is already at breaking point in this area. 2) Road system, water supply, medical centre, schools are at full capacity. 3) Encroach on green spaces. 4) Whitworth will no longer be a village but an urban sprawl. 		Not enough publicity has been given regarding these proposals.
Number of comments						73	HS2.107	
Reference		HS2.108		Cowm Water Treatment Works, Whitworth				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1	Phil	Jones			Object	<p>Thanks for your prompt reply I attended the meeting and would also like to raise the following points re united utilities land next to cwm reservoir :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I live on the hedgerows the overflow runs through my garden this year it has risen higher than ever before, what impact would the extra houses have on this? 2) I was told by the environment agency I could not build within 10m of the stream when applying for planning resulting in me having land surveys to clarify application! 3) I have a badger set in my garden and bats fly over mainly at dusk coming from that direction! Has the impact on this been thought about? 4) drains in this estate are sub standard at the best mine have collapsed twice over the last ten years! 5) the roads in this estate are in poor repair and are never gritted in winter resulting in sometimes not being able to get off the estate more houses would mean risk of more vehicles being stuck at side of the road! 6) local schools are already nearly or arefull, 7) can't get into the one doctors easily more people even less chance of an appointment <p>Online survey comment:</p> <p>Access to the proposed site is no sufficient to carry the amount of traffic, also due to the fact the drainage on the cwm park estate is poor at best. It would ruin the look if cwm reservoir, the estate is never gritted in winter due to insufficient funds!!! Whitworth is a one road in and out already a nightmare, roads in poor state will be made worse due to increase of traffic</p> <p>Also I wish to be kept informed via this email of any further changes to the consultation re the united utilities land!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
5	Kimberley	Ashworth	-		Object	I am writing to object against the proposed local plan for Whitworth. - - I am unable to attend the meeting tomorrow night due to illness but I have looked at the proposal as stated below: - - http://www.rossendale.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/3700/whitworth_map_with_street_names - - I'm disappointed to see that a number of green spaces are being considered to build houses on. The green spaces behind Tonacliffe School are used by many for walking. To build on this space would be detrimental to the green space due to wildlife and other conversation in that area. - Building houses would also see an increase in traffic which is at demand during peak times at the moment. - - Other green spaces on the plans are also being considered. In a village that is at full capacity I am unsure why Rossendale Council see the need to build in places that already has adequate housing. - - There are no plans to look at new recreational and family facilities which the town needs. The closure of the children's centre means that new parents and young families have nowhere to go. The plans don't take any such new facility into consideration and I urge Rossendale Council to look at this. - - I know I speak on behalf of many in the Town when I say the option for Whitworth is option 1 'Do nothing' - - Kind regards -		I am extremely disappointed that a meeting has been arranged in Whitworth for tomorrow evening when all the other consultation meetings are taking place in September
24	Erica	Preston	-	HS2.105, HS. 107, HS2. 108, HS2.109	Object	The single road through the valley is not up to the volume of traffic using it currently. Hall St.will be a blocked junction, as will Tonacliffe Road. There are not the amenities in the area eg.doctors, dentists, schools etc. Unless major investment in the valley is made to update amenities and utilities these developments will cause immense problems and destroy the reasons people want to live here and turn the valley into yet another sprawling suburb. - I have every sympathy for the need for housing but feel the proposals are ill thought out and will lead to a detrimental effect on the township.		The need for housing must be weighed against the needs of the valley as a whole and destroying green belt and valued wildlife habitat will not make it a place people want to live.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
27	Michael	Chianca	-		Object	<p>HS2.102 - King Street - HS2.104 - Old Lane - HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens - HS2.105 - Albert Street - HS2.107 Fern Isle Close - HS2.106 Moorland Cres - HS2.109 Horsefield Av - - All these proposed sited are unsuitable for the following reasons. 1. Wildlife - This greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest area at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest itself would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action when we have other areas within Whitworth to build on that would not require the destruction of trees. 3. The local school at both dropping of and collection time around this area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists, Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative affect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. 9. Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" can you explain what those exceptional circumstances are when we have other areas more suitable for building houses on. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental affect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others would be overlooked. 14. As the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including school children. 16. This area and the surrounding area has already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
32	Paula	McNinch	-		Object	There is not the infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with extra housing. The road in and out is already too busy, the schools are full and there are no facilities for young people.		-
35	Catherine	Duffy	-	HS2.108 in particular, + all the other proposed sites in Whitworth	Object	I am very concerned about all these proposals, especially Sandbank Gardens! - - 1) Where is the access going to be? Sandbank Gardens is a cul-de-sac with private gardens at the top, it is a very narrow street with already many residents cars parked on the kerb/street. The public house close by is one of the hubs of the community and as such hosts regular events, ie meetings re the local football teams, starts for races and many more. Sandbank Gardens then takes the brunt of people attending these events parking their vehicles on Sandbank Gardens. Maybe the plan is to use Tong End as the access, again another nightmare! On a very narrow over used road. It is used every week day by the waggons up and down to the quarry, lots of visitors to the water ski centre, the reservoir and off road centre in the quarry, along with residents cars parked outside their homes on the road. - - 2) The water and electricity struggles already with the amount of properties in the village. We have frequent disruptions in services in both these areas, more properties on this clearly out of date system would surely lead to even more disruption. - - 3) The majority of the primary schools and the high school are running on full capacity (even with waiting lists), therefore, who will fund the building works and staffing, to accommodate the influx of children wishing to be educated, as I am presuming that the proposed sites would be family homes! - - 4) Our village has one road in and out, which is already busy. The slightest disruption makes for major delays, surely more users would make these delays more permanent.		Leave our village as a village, don't make it into a town. It's facilities and amenities are already at full stretch with no sight of extra funding to accommodate these proposed extra residents!!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
45	Patricia	Clegg	-		Object	- I object to the above planning proposal for the following reasons:- - The access road suggested from Tong End is not suitable, it runs alongside a listed a grade 2 listed property (nos 30 & 32). - The access road suggested also has poor visibility when turning out on to Tong End. - - Tong End and Tong Lane are already under pressure from traffic running to and from the quarries and is in serious need of repair. - - The main road through Whitworth (Market Street) is already congested with traffic especially during rush hour and is again in need of repair. - - All the schools in the valley are oversubscribed - - The Doctors surgeries at both Whitworth and Healey are under severe pressure already. - - You are developing on land that is Green Belt, near a reservoir that is used by many for walking and recreation. It should be protected not built on! - - The proposed housing will be built very near to the reservoir dam, as United Utilities recently sent out a letter advising residents what to do if the dam fails, is this a sensible thing to do? - - There is a large underground water storage facility next to the proposed housing. - - There has been a problem with surface water flooding on Tong End for a long time. No 30 had a long standing problem with water seeping into the living room which took over 2 years to sort out. None of the authorities involved could find out where that water was coming from. - -		- Although at the moment the planning proposal is only for building properties on the old water treatment works, with the amount of infrastructure that will need to take place, widening the road for example, it would only be a matter of time before more houses would be built and the whole area would be spoilt. - - - There is also a memorial woodland site along the side of the proposed access road, what would happen to this?
53	Nicola	Clegg	-		Object	I object to the above planning proposal for the following reasons:- - The access road from Tong End runs alongside 2 listed buildings (nos 30 & 32) - - There is poor visibility when turning out onto Tong End, putting people at risk who are walking up to the reservoir. - - Both Tong End and Tong Lane are already under pressure from traffic running to and from the quarry, they are permanently dusty and are in serious need of repair. - - All the school in the area are over subscribed. - - Both doctors surgeries (at Whitworth and Healey) are under severe pressure already. - - You are developing Green Belt land which according to government regulations should be protected! - - The proposed housing would be built near to a reservoir dam in an area that is already prone to flooding. United Utilities recently sent out a letter advising nearby residents want to do if the dam fails, is this a sensible thing to do. - - There is also a severe problem with surface water flooding on both Tong Eand and Tong Lane. No 30 Tong End had a long standing problem with water seeping into the living room which took nearly two years to sort out. None of the authorities involved could find out where that water was coming from. - - There is a large underground water storage facility near the proposed site. - - Have you considered air pollution, Whitworth is a ribbon development running along one road, surely a massive increase in vehicles using an already very busy road is bad for all residents. - - The bus service is not a regular as you seem to think it is! - - There is a memorial woodland alongside the proposed access road, what would happen to this. - - - -		- I have noticed that most of the sites that you have allocated for housing in Whitworth are on - Green Belt, why? There is not a great demand for housing in the valley in fact there are plenty of empty properties available already. Why build so many new houses in an area whose infrastructure is already severely stretched it doesn't make sense.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
54	David	Tod	-		Object	I object to the above planning proposal for the following reasons:- - The access road from Tong End runs alongside two listed buildings, nos 30 and 32. - - There is poor visibility when turning out onto Tong End, putting people at risk who are walking up to the reservoir. - - Both Tong End and Tong Lane are already under pressure from traffic running to and from the quarry, they are permanently dusty and are in serious need of repair. - - All the schools in the area are oversubscribed. - - Both doctors surgeries at Healey and Whitworth are under severe pressure already. - - You are developing on Green Belt land which according to government regulations should be protected. - - The proposed housing would be built near to a reservoir dam in an area that is already prone to flooding. United Utilities recently sent out a letter advising nearby residents what to do if the dam failed, is building more houses a sensible thing to do? - - There is an underground water storage facility near the proposed site. - - Have you even thought about air pollution and the detrimental effect so many new houses would have? Whitworth is a ribbon development running along one main road, surely a massive increase in vehicles using an already busy road is bad for all residents. - - The bus service is not a regular as you seem to think! - - There is a memorial woodland alongside the proposed access road, what would happen to this? - - -		Although at the moment the planning proposal is only for building on the old water treatment works, with the amount of infrastructure that will need to take place, widening the road for example, it would only be a matter of time before more and more houses would be built, spoiling a area that is loved and well used by all residents of Whitworth. - - In fact most of your proposed housing in Whitworth are on Green Belt, Why? There is not a huge demand for new housing in fact there are many empty properties available, why put more pressure on a village whose infrastructure is already stretched to the limit.
56	Valerie	McDonald	-		Object	Whilst I recognise the need for further housing within the area, I am concerned about the siting of so many proposed dwellings in this particular valley. The roads are already clogged at rush hour and as there is only one road through, movement of traffic, should there be an accident or roadworks, becomes frustratingly unpredictable. What provision is there to maintain and develop the road system in the valley? - - Whitworth High School has become more popular over the past couple of years with waiting lists existing. What provision will be made to expand the school, and will this be done with a long term objective in mind and not just a sticking plaster effort to put up some portable classrooms? - - Local services such as the Children's Centre have just been lost. What plans may be afoot to reinstate such necessary provision? I feel it is morally wrong to simply build new houses and forget about the infrastructure to support this development. - - There is a wealth of wildlife on the moors where you are proposing to site many homes. Presumably there will be checks in place to ensure some of these species are not endangered? - - Finally, there are already plenty of properties on the market at very affordable prices (in comparison with some surrounding areas). Some of these have been on the market a while? Why, if there is already affordable housing, is there a need to build more? -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
70		Anonymous			Object	<p>1. By virtue of necessity this is an industrial building on a greenfield site. I object, this proposal would place houses on this greenfield site.</p> <p>2. In 2015 I received a leadlet from L.C.C explaining evacuation procedures should the dam burst. You are proposing to build houses nearer to the dam and on a known flood plain.</p> <p>3. To designate the site for the number of houses proposed would not be a sound economic proposition. RED HERRING - there would have to be far more properties. TELL THE TRUTH Highway - Access & Egress - No Adequate highway to this site.</p> <p>4. Tong End & Tong Lane are already congested with traffic. Traffic NEVER STOPS, well after & before the quarry has closed.</p> <p>5. Adjacent to the site there is a large, deep underground water storage reservoir. WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THIS?</p> <p>6. An ecological study was carried out on the site by Bowland Ecology Unit - IN THE MIDDLE OF DECEMBER</p> <p>7. U.U has designated Cowm as an area for peaceful recreation. Pressure on this area is too great now, more houses would exacerbate this problem. The proposed development has a greater impact on the green belt</p>		
98	Jacqueline	Butterworth	-		Object	<p>I am objecting to proposed development of all the above houses around the Whitworth area. The area is overrun with traffic as it us. One way in and one way out. The schools are overloaded as are the GP surgery. It is inconceivable to build more houses and allowing more traffic to use our roads which are in a terrible state. We are already experiencing burst water pipes and our water pressure has already been reduced. We are experiencing more power cuts since all the new houses have been built on Cowm Park Way . Surely there must be someone in the planning department with some common sense and will prevent any further building of houses in Whitworth</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
131	Christine	Greenwood	-		Object	I am objecting to plans to allow the building of over £350 properties on various sites around Whithworth and Shawforth over the next 15 years. - Not only am I concerned about the building on our greenbelt sites which is part of the attraction of the area. I can understand the wind farm and can support renewable energy sources but not the creation of a collection of housing estates - whether social/affordable or not. The awful collection in Britannia speaks for itself! We have already had several builds across Rossendale but the extra Council Tax revenue does not seem to have brought many benefits to the borough. - As it stands at present the infrastructure can just about support the current residents - schools are already over subscribed and getting an appointment at our one GP surgery is already a mammoth undertaking. Planning to build or reopen a school by any chance? - Traffic is already an issue with one road in and out and a bus service that has to be one of the most unreliable in the surrounding areas! There are next to no facilities for young people/children and a library fighting to survive so I think that this needs to be given serious consideration before you go ahead.		-
150	Sheila	Morgan			Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Our doctors' we can't get an appointment it's nearly impossible 2. Schools already full 3. The infrastructure of the village facilities such as water gas electric would need a major uplift to accommodate more houses 4. Wildlife all the green belt land is of great importance to wildlife. Badgers foxes deer bats. 5. The road network both ways to Bacup and Rochdale is already gridlocked. 6. What would be the impact on the carbon footprint of the valley! 		Has the land 'HS2108' been checked for leaks, underground, reservoir etc,
151	Andrew	Smalley			Object	<p>The following points I feel have been overlooked.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to site (This road used for quarry) 2. The state of Tong Lane is a disgrace as this road would be used to access. 3. The local wildlife would suffer. 4. Infrastructure in Whithworth is overloaded already. 5. Doctors is overworked and impossible to get appointment. 6. Also house prices could depreciate over time 7. Known underground reservoir on site 8. Whithworth as a whole is at maximum with new housing already. 		I feel Whithworth was once a village now it feels more like a town and losing its village identity.
152	Morgan	Jeffrey			Not Applicable	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tong Lane is a disgrace anymore traffic and we are in danger of accidents. 2. Drs full to capacity 3. Market Street is gridlocked most days 4. Facilities, gas water selective need updating A.S.P 5. Wildlife will be extinct. 		Build by all means but no on green belt

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
154	Derek	Lord			Object	<p>1. The area at the end of sandbank gardens is a haven for wild life i.e, there are Badgers, Deer, newts, Bats + Small mammals as well as numerous species of birds.</p> <p>2. All the numerous new housing would put an insurmountable pressure on local facilities particularly doctors, where it is already difficult with appointments.</p> <p>3. There are already problems on sandbank gardens with utilities the water pressure continues to be low. Several electric cut offs in recent months</p> <p>4. Roads</p> <p>A) In general the road between Bacup + Rochdale is already almost too capacity without the extra housing.</p> <p>B) Specific to HS2.108 (Sandbank Gardens) access from market st. would be down tong lane which is a disgrace with all the potholes mainly caused by quarry vehicles & could not cope with extra traffic + then either continuing up one end which is already too narrow or down sandbank gardens which is far too narrow & would involve going through my garden (land) at no. X which incidentally is not for sale (AT ANY PRICE)</p> <p>5. The council should be doing more to protecting green belt sites & attempting to find more brown belt sites to save for future generations.</p>		Although my objections specifically refer to HS2108 (sandbank gardens) some refer to the overall strategy of the Rossendale Local Plan. Although the objection is in my name. This is a combined objection with my wife Mrs [...] as we have discussed the plan at length & agree on all matters stated and also my son [...] who also lives at this address
155	Jo	Furtado			Object	HS2.108 - there's a water treatment plant there - do United Utilities know of this plan? And how wise is any housing here, given the volume of water just above? Oppose		
159	Andrew James	Clegg			Object	<p>Wildlife</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Local Amenities</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Loss Privacy</p> <p>Noise Pollution</p> <p>Decrease Property Value</p>		
160	Jessica Megan	Clegg			Object	<p>Wildlife</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Local Amenities</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Loss Privacy</p> <p>Noise Pollution</p> <p>Decrease Property Value</p>		I will be moving over to sandbank & our house is right next to the site & my bedroom window is overlooking the proposed site meaning loss of privacy

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
161	Jessie	Clegg			Object	Wildlife Highways Local Amenities Infrastructure Loss Privacy Noise Pollution Decrease Property Value		
162	Caroline	Clegg			Object	Loss of wildlife and trees Local highways and roads already over stretched and gridlocked Local amenities schools, dentists, doctors already full More housing would have negative effect n living standards Infrastructure of whitworth is already an overstretched water, as and electric would need major uplift increase noise pollution loss of privacy property decrease in value Whitworth already has too many houses with little spending as it is in the valleyon eddential things		I feel whitworth was the short straw when it comes to anything that needs money spending on it even though we elect councillors there are only one or two that always show up to meetings and fight for whitworth valley and the people who live here
195	Janet	King	-	HS.102, HS2.104-9 inclusive	Object	Whitworth' infrastructure cannot support almost 400 new properties - it is already nigh impossible to obtain a doctors appointment and my father has had to wait iver 6 months to obtain a podiatry appointment as there is only one who has been on long term sick and no replacement cover available. The fact that there is only one main arterial road into and out of Whitworth, which already has weekly road works delaying the already totally congested road does not bear thinking about. With an extra 400 properties and the increase in traffic that these will bring and as there is no large employer in the area most of these occupants will be commuting one way or another. We lost access to an A&E in Rochdale and now the nearest is either Fairfield or Oldham with the additional traffic these proposals would create the congested roads Could be catastrophic in an emergency. - - On a personal note, my family moved to Whitworth 12 years ago, from Oldham, due to its naturally beautiful countryside and I see the addition of these properties into areas of greenery (extending Wallbank estate etc.,) is the very short end of the stick. I can see that if these are accepted, encroaching on to green belt areas, slowly but surely the green belt areas will get smaller and smaller until eventually Whitworth just becomes another concrete plot with ever creaking infrastructure. - - Finally, I understand the need for affordable housing but there are plenty of mills/brown field that could be developed. However, I feel strongly that before any proposals are accepted it is of the utmost importance that the infrastructure is in place to support them, that includes roads, schools and NHS access.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
258	Fiona	Harrison			Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village oversubscribed schools and GP Services with one road in and one road out. The pressure on the infrastructure would be immense, plus travelling to or from anywhere especially at peak times is already horrendous, nevermind with another approx 400 houses being built. Our skyline and beautiful views and countryside are also going to be lost.		-
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	This is an unbelievable plan that will stretch amenities in the area even further. - - The new estate near Cowm has already increased traffic congestion on the one road in and out of the village and schools are already struggling to cope. - - There is also the issue of wildlife and the impact it will have on their environment. - - I for one will be leaving if this idiotic plan goes through. -		This smells of greed over common sense
268	Michaela	Radford	-		Object	Whitworth has had numerous instances recently regarding the roadworks for the infrastructure repair and maintenance. As an employee of all 4 major utility asset owners in the area, I am very concerned regarding the houses proposed. We only have one road throughout the valley and this is impacted severely when roadworks are planned. My concerns are that these are not managed correctly by LCC at present, therefore; more houses and more infrastructure would have a massive impact on the people living in the village. People face unemployment now due to the frequent issues we face getting into work. - Not to mention over crowded schools and doctors as we stand at present. - - I request, here in writing, to be informed of any planned meetings regarding the houses in whitworth and notification be sent in writing to my address above.		-
297	Lindsay	Fairhurst			Object	Poor access along the length of Main Rd (Market Street) one narrow road lined with parked cars , as only access into & out of whitworth. No alternative route. No trains or trams. Buses won't must travel on same one access road both in and out as cars. No motorway access under 20 min journey both ways insufficient work in area means people must travel to Manchester, leeds, bury, Rochdale etc. Current public transport unrealistic. Traffic at peak times currently gridlocked & congested. Increased housing will add to this burden. Utilities infrastructure unable to cope currently leading to repeated remedial roadworks. Schools full Doctors full Rossendale Council Lancashire Council needs to address transport & roadways access + education access beofer building homkes where people will be unable to travel to employment and school		highway safety compromised by very narrow access. Quarry traffic adds to this burden sandbank gardens is curently a flood risk area large quarry vehicles become jammed occasionally due to residential parking issues

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
298	Andrew	Fairhurst			Object	the number of houses proposed in this local plan for infrastructure can support. Whitworth has only one road in abd out and already this is constantly being dug up by utility companies often resulting in temporary traffic lights that cause massives queues of traffic in rush hours. Not only is the road narrow and conjested but there is no alternative train service - only the bus (on the same road) This is totall useless for the number of people wo commute to Manchester, Oldham and Bury every working day. Our schools, doctors and dentists are already close to capacity. There are very few options to travel to other facilities apart from along the one road through the valley.		Without robust and achievable plans to increase the support infrastructure for travel (a train for example) and health and education and culture this building should not go ahead. For people to afford these houses they need jobs first. Currently you need to move out of the valley to commute to work. Regeneration of the area and existing housing stock should come first.
335	Venkatesh	Thoppae	-		Object	Currently, due to traffic I am already starting 30 minutes early to work, with the school run, I believe the roads towards Haslingden and Rochdale will be much congested for office goers if proposed plans are executed without proper plans to widen the roads and making new ways to connect to the various part of the main roads(motor way). - - Also the schools, GP services will be under much more strain if those are not equipped to address the increasing population.		-
544	Lois	Lees	-		Object	The access to the proposed land at Cowm is not sufficient to accommodate further housing. Tong Lane is used daily by waggons from the quarry and is in a poor state of repair. - Sandbank Gardens is not ideal for 2 way traffic. - Access in and out of the vi		Whitworth is a lovely village which is just managing to deal with the number of cars, houses and people that exist here. - There is already damage to the roads and water supply. Adding extra housing and more people will only cause more issues with the roa

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
561	Lynne	Meigh	Retired	SHLAA16016	Object	<p>I wish to strongly object to this proposal on the grounds that: - 1). There is numerous wildlife in this area plus mature trees and natural plants. Also Owls, Bats, plus visiting birds to the reservoir etc. This proposal will most definitely change our landscape. - 2). The roads leading to this sight are narrow and are already heavily congested not only with many vehicles but also quarry wagons who often block the road due to their size and the many parked vehicles. Since the houses named The Stable was built and the only exit they have via the narrow road named Cockhall Lane this has lead to even more congestion and there have been many occasions where a near accident has occurred. The parked vehicle from the Cock and Magpie public house often close Sandbank Gardens down and it is too narrow for an ambulance to travel through. When exiting the street it is impossible to get clear vision of oncoming traffic. - 3). There is one main road through Whitworth which already on numerous occasions does not cope with the volume of traffic at peak times and if it snows or roadworks are taking place it is horrendous. A ten minute journey can take one hour. - 4). THE INFRASTRUCTURE is not coping now let alone with further growth. - 5). Since moving into our home 50 years ago Whitworth had grown in excess. Our schools are oversubscribed. The doctors are over stretched. As is the social care facilities. Further housing would over burden these and I fear it could lead to suffering or even death. - The proposals will, I fear make Whitworth NOT the place to live and will change our landscape for ever. Enough is enough</p>		
590		Ashworth			Object	<p>Absolutely ridiculous One way in and out of whitworth no extra schools or doctors when you have two or three cars per household. This is ruining our villages. We strongly object to this. Listen to the people who vote you in, as we have long memories</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
692	Gregory William	Meigh	-		Object	<p>I strongly object to this proposal on the grounds that: - - 1. The roads are already congested in the area and in a terrible state of repair. There is only one main road Market Street, to service all the traffic not only from Whitworth but the surrounding areas. This already gets gridlocked. - - 2. Our schools are already oversubscribed. The GPS and health services are already at full stretch. Our amenities are gradually breaking down. - - 3. There is a large amount of wildlife and trees in this proposed site which will be destroyed/altered to the detriment of the area. There are bats and owls and visiting birds to the reservoir. - - 4. I have lived in my home for nearly 50 years and with all the houses which have been built in this area recently and the amount of traffic from the quarry (large lorries) and the increased parking from both the public house and reservoir when there are events on it is extremely difficult and even dangerous to negotiate the roads. I personally have witnessed many near misses. At these times the parked vehicles close the road down so much so an emergency vehicle e.g. Ambulance can not get through. - - It is a nonsense to propose building any more houses.</p> <p>I strongly object to this proposal: - - 1. The roads to this site are narrow and congested. Traffic is heavy which includes quarry wagons. When there are events on at either the public house (The Cock & Magpie) or the reservoir parking becomes horrendous closing our road down to the extent emergency vehicles cannot get through. Also the roads are in a very poor state of repair. I personally have witnessed many near misses at the junction of Cockhall Lane, Tong End and crossroads at Tong Lane and Cowm Park Way, due to vision being blocked. - - 2. This area has a great amount of wildlife, plus, owls, bats and visiting birds to the reservoir. There are mature trees and plants on this proposed site. Housing would change the whole landscape to its detriment. - - 3. Whitworth only has one main road which serves all Whitworth & surrounding towns, which on numerous occasions this becomes gridlocked. Roadworks or snow will cause caos. A ten minute journey will take one hour. - - 4. Already our schools are oversubscribed, our GP and health services are already overstretched. All amenities are already showing strain. Any further housing would break our village. - - I have lived on Sandbank Gardens for 49 years and since the already recent developments in the area I would seriously consider leaving Whitworth if anymore houses are built. Whitworth will change for the worst.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
701	Christine	Dodd	-		Object	<p>Following discussion with my solicitor, notification of such a development from the council would have been preferable to chance hearsay. Myself and several neighbours occupy homes within listed building status. We strive to upkeep and maintain the character and quaintness of the buildings and surrounding area. We were disturbed to hear that a proposed access point was directly adjacent to our properties. - - We feel privileged to live in an area we consider to be one of Whitworths most outstanding. It is a place which attracts many people such as walkers who seek pleasure and peacefulness within a beautiful landscape. - - I feel a housing development would have a great negative impact on the skyline, losing its quaintness and inherent character. Visually it would detract from the current open feel to the area, over bearing and out of scale within the size of area to be developed. It would adversely affect the character of the listed buildings and its surroundings. - - I also have great concerns with the proposed site and access point in relation to the Life for a Life Memorial forest. The trees form an avenue along the proposed entrance site. Benches are sited to over look the natural surroundings, offering bereaved and grieving families a peaceful haven to remember their loved ones. As a widow myself I can only imagine how devastated these people would be to have a building development and all that it entails passing through their chosen memorial (for which they have specially chosen and paid good money for). Grieving families should be afforded the dignity and respect they so rightly deserve. - - Tong End already has a multitude of ongoing problems without additional issues. Over the years the quarry alone has thrown up many factors. The wagons and low loaders often cause the road to be blocked. Several times I have been unable to leave or re-enter my property without a lengthy delay. Visibility is compromised, hence safety. On four occasions my bins have been dragged off the pavement and their contents strewn over the road. I reported one such time as my young boy was stood next to the bin. Another occasion my gardener was jet washing when a bin close by (on top of which was his cup of hot coffee) was dragged off again. - - My property has also been directly impacted. I incurred thousands of pounds in legal fees following an ingress of water/flooding issues. This involved a multitude of agencies - highways, insurance, united utilities, environment, environmental. It was felt that the volume of traffic outside the house had to contributed to cracked and broken drains. Drains were 80% full of silt and debris. Water was running directly off the road and into my property, often resembling a rive. I spent hours dealing with the above whilst raising four young children on my own. - - The gullies are supposed to be on a regular maintenance plan. Needless to say this does not happen. The gully once again is blocked, I reported this many weeks ago and it still remains blocked. Silt and debris remain commonplace with huge expense in car valeting and jet washing. Speed, noise, smells, emissions are</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
						troublesome. The road itself causes the wagons to wake us up as they hit the dents in the road at the crack of dawn. Grit and dirt fly in peoples faces at its heights. - - Additional thorough fare would only exacerbate these problems.		
743			Whitworth Town Council		Object	HS2.108 Cowm water treatment works, Whitworth Council have concerns about the safety of this site following the information members were given during public question time. There are also concerns over the access and egress passing buildings with heritage status. Another concern is that there is an underground storage reservoir in the area. Developing this site would also have a negative impact on the nature and natural habitats in this area.		
773	Susan	Worrall	-		Object	Whitworth is a village, a small community. Building these housing developments will change Whitworth into a town. - There is not the infrastructure to support this additional housing. There is one road in and out of Whitworth which is already struggling to cope with the increasing volume of traffic. Especially at peak times. If there are any traffic disruptions it can take 1-2 hours to get to Rochdale . We do not need more cars and the pollution they bring! - - There are limited school places both secondary and primary and local children born in the village will struggle to get places. - The one and only GP practice can not manage to provide the necessary health care for patients with no appointments pre bookable for weeks in advance. This healthcare will be diluted further. Living in Whitworth if A&E treatment is required which is often a life or death situation your chances of survival are reduced add more traffic on market street and your chance of survival diminishes further - - The people who live in Whitworth , live here because it is a village , it is quiet and the countryside is on the door step. Yet the plans want to destroy the village life, increase demands on exisiting services and increase pollution - - To consider building on greenbelt land in Whitworth is unbelievable and irresponsible, Planning has already - spoilt the view of the countryside at the side of Daneswood ave and the wind farms are also affecting the views and countryside. - - Whitworth has lots of wildlife from deer, owls, herons, wild ponies as well as lots of insect life butterflies, bees etc which will all be at risk if the countryside is used for housing. - - There is empty housing all over the borough - fill these , not build more especially in our little village -		Stop putting profits first and put existing residents first

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
803	Marietta	Galbraith	-		Object	<p>My objections for the proposed building of housing on the above sites is based on a number of reasons: - 1. Infrastructure. The current housing situation is already at (possibly beyond) capacity with regards to schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists, employment and traffic. There are no more schools planned and no way to expand the ones already here. Some children have to travel miles to schools out of the area due to oversubscribed local schools. This is the same for doctor's surgeries and many other amenities. - 2. Traffic. There is one main road in and out of Whitworth that already has issues with raised levels of traffic. In the four years we have lived here, there have been many occasions where traffic has been an issue due to constant roadworks (for various reasons relating to increased housing and traffic) which has caused major problems. Also, most people are employed outside of Whitworth so traffic is high anyway. More housing would increase this issue with no solution being given as to how it could be rectified. - 3. Utilities. More and more power cuts have been happening recently in Whitworth due to new housing as well as burst water pipes and problems with drainage. This has contributed to the traffic issues with roads having to be dug up every few weeks to 'fix' the problem. - 4. More housing would mean taking up land that is natural drainage for flooding. Recently, my area was put into the 'flood risk' category (although we haven't flooded), significantly increasing my home insurance. If more homes are built, this would increase risk of flooding to many homes around Whitworth, which would cause loss of market value and would reduce the chances of being able to sell the property. - 5. Much of the 'green land' would be lost which is detrimental to the wildlife around Whitworth. The Government have a duty to protect greenbelt land and our environment! The carbon footprint would be horrific! - In conclusion, building over 300 houses in Whitworth would cause issues beyond repair! Environment, traffic, pollution, infrastructure, drainage etc. would all be dramatically affected in the most negative and damaging way. Whitworth was not meant for so much housing and so many people.</p>		-
818	Niall	Hayden-Pawson	-		Object	<p>Location considered unsuitable for further housing development due to: - poor vehicle access to the area and site - already over stretched local facilities ie doctors, schools - unsuitable location at the foot of a reservoir dam - potential risk to dam structural integrity due to excavation/piling/construction works - the land on Sandbank Gardens is poor building land, often waterlogged and properties have suffered subsidence, the land at the foot of the reservoir is likely to be similar - the location is well used by families, both during summer walks and also winter activities (sledging etc) - Whitworth has a single access road between Bacup and Rochdale which is often congested and additional housing will increase this -</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
819	Jacqueline	Hayden-Pawson	-		Object	Poor vehicle access to the area. - Roads already degraded. - Flooding already on Sandbank Gardens. - No capacity in local community resources e.g. doctors, schools. - Unsuitable location at the bottom of a reservoir, potential risk to dam due to proposed buildings work. - Damage to Trees and Wildlife. - Access via one road to Rochdale and Bacup already overwhelmed at times. - Power supply already challenged. - The location is well used by families during summer and winter activities. - Danger to children playing out due to increased traffic when families have chosen the location on a culdesac to purchase their homes. - access to Tong Lane is already over capacity, the roads are already degraded because of the excessive use and lack of up keep by the council. - Prospsed site is a well used local recreational area both in summer and winter. - there is a potential risk from building at the bottom of a reservoir and risk to the dam stability by building on proposed site. - sandbank Gardens Drains cannot already cope and floods have been regularly reported to Lancashire County Council - damaging to trees and wildlife. - local community resources already at capacity - The one road to Rochdale and Bacup is already congested with frequent delays. - safety of children comprised due to increase in cars and families have chosen to live in culdesacs to promote the safety of their children. - The corner of Sandbank Gardens and Sandbank Cottages has already been reported to the local authority because restricted access due to overcrowded parking. -		-
886	Michael	Banham	-	HS2.102 to HS2.109	Object	The infrastructure of whitworth is over stretched as it is,the school's cannot cater for such an undertaking. Theres only one road in or out of whitworth any problems on this road causes absolute mayhem. The winter months are an absolute nightmare just to get onto market street.		I cannot understand why anyone would want to over populate an area that is already struggling.
889	Derek	Lord	-	HS 102, HS105, HS104, HS106, HS107, HS108, HS109.	Object	We in Whitworth are sure that there are enough houses here at the present time.There are large estates at Cowm Park, Tonacliffe, Wain Gap, Wallbank, Knot Hill, Orama Mill Site, Edgemoor Close, and a small estate at Facit. The exits onto the one main road are at present full of traffic. The Doctors, Schools etc are now at bursting point. We in Whitworth have done our share in housing. Please think again before building any more. Thank You. -		-
892	Mandy	Sanderson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105,HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2108, HS2.109	Object	The transport system around Whitworth cannot cope with the volume of traffic . Also local aminities are already at braking point..		No
911	Julie	Latham	-		Object	In principle I don't object to more houses or people. However I will until I am convinced that the planners are committed to the infrastructure improvements required to support the extra influx of people and cars . - The main bottlenecks caused by Whitwo		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
913	Michelle	Ashcroft	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108 & HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a geographical challenge at the best of times, positioned in a valley, consisting of ONE main road with multiple roads stemming from this leading to many properties that are built on the hillside. There are many green areas which are used by local farmers for their livestock. During times of heavy rain many of the roads are flooded, and during winter many roads are very dangerous in the snow. It is not uncommon for Whitworth to be gridlocked as there are far too many cars on the roads, all it needs is one set of road works and the town becomes inaccessible. The local schools are now over subscribed, the High school has had to turn away many children who only live a couple of miles away. The primary schools are also subscribed making it very difficult for teachers to provide a good education to the children. The local doctors are unable to cope with the number of patients, trying to get a same day appointment is nigh on impossible these days. We have issues with anti social behaviour due to lack of amenities available for teenagers, the local youth club has been closed down. There is a lack of police presence (the PSCO tries her best), people don't feel as safe as they should. The library is still under threat of closure, the pool is only open because of the people of Whitworth who run it. Building more houses brings more people, more cars, more strain on the infrastructure. I appreciate housing is needed but the number of houses that has been suggested will bring this town to it's knees.		I would suggest you come to Whitworth during the morning school run and see how difficult it is around Horsefield Avenue. Come sit in the traffic jams during rush hour. - - The government has spoken about creating new towns, this is a great idea, there are places that can accommodate thousands and thousands of houses. Build there not here!!!
916	Jane	Trudgeon	-	HS2.102 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	We are already an overstretched village infrastructure, the roads would not cope with an extra amount of traffic and would make the already difficult commute to exit/enter the village impossible. There are not enough schools nor would the doctor's surgery be able to cope as even now it is almost impossible to get a reasonable appointment time, - - The housing developments would impact on wildlife		-
918	Marion	Ashworth	-	HS2.107 , ALL.	Object	I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.		I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
935	Christine	Fallon		HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	1 Whitworth has one main road which is often gridlocked the smaller access roads are grossly un suitable e.g Tonacliffe. - 2 Schools are already oversubscribed parking at drop off times would be more chaotic and dangerous. - 3 Doctors and dentists are already at capacity. - 4 Services of gas electricity and water would require major upgrade. - 5 We are seeing flooding due to inadequate drainage this would be increased. - 6 Is this acceptable use of greenbelt land where previous planning permission has been refused the effect on wildlife and trees would be immense.		-
939	Geoffrey	Fallon	-	HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a small village with one already inadequate road. Doctors dentists and schools are already oversubscribed parking in school areas is dangerous already and would be far worse. - Gas electricity and water services would need major upgrade. - This is inappropriate use of greenbelt land causing damage to wildlife and the environment drainage is a major problem now with frequent flooding.		-
955	Janet	Whitehead	-		Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village, oversubscribed schools and Doctors - We have one road in and one road out which is almost impossible during peak times in the morning - The houses already exceed the heights up the sides of the valley - Our green belt is very important to wildlife and the the people the live here - If we let one builder onto greenbelt it opens the doors to far too many others - Our population is big enough and we cannot accommodate many more		- Our Councillors are voted in by us and now need to stand up and fight for us - - 400 houses is a ridiculous amount of new houses for a tiny village - - We have had 2 different sites where new houses have been built in recent years we've done our bit for Government figures - - Please find somewhere else
962	Kathryn	Gill	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2104, HS2106, HS2107, HS2108, HS2109	Object	I object to any changes in use of local greenbelt land to build houses. Also, there is only one road through Whitworth and it is already congested. We have only 1 doctors surgery, and not enough school places to accommodate hundreds of additional families. Greenbelt land cannot be restored once built on, and these proposals would change the landscape of Whitworth. I am also concerned about the building of 20 properties around Cowm. This is a resource continually used for recreation by the people of Whitworth and should be preserved.		
979	Marie	Pye	-		Object	All of these developments will contribute to already existing traffic problems as there is one road in and one road out of the area. The high school is already oversubscribed with local children not being offered places.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
992	Susan	Farrell		HS2: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109	Object	I strongly object to the building of houses on all the above mentioned sites for the following reasons: - Greenbelt land is of importance to all the wildlife of Whitworth and Shawforth . Deer and bats live in the forests in the area. Many badgers and foxes inhabit the countryside and rare species of wildlife live in the ponds. - The forest area at Tonacliffe would be cut down having a negative impact on the environment. - Tonacliffe road is already dangerous for children with cars parked along the length of the road at school dropping off and picking up time. The increased number of cars if more houses were built in the area would be worse for the children and residents. - Local amenities such as dentists and GPs could not cope with the increased population. It is almost impossible at the moment to get a GP appointment in less than two weeks. More housing would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Whitworth and Shawforth. - Facilities such as water, gas and electricity are already stretched and a major upgrade of the infrastructure would be required to support increased housing. - Local drainage cannot cope with the current usage. More housing could have an impact on flooding. - Public footpaths could be lost reducing the number of rights of way for walkers. - The road network both ways from Rochdale to Bacup is already gridlocked. More housing would put an increased strain on traffic and the already poor public transport in the area. - The only high school in the area is already oversubscribed. With increased housing parents may have even less chance of a first choice school for their children. They may have to travel miles to school. - I understood it is government policy to protect Greenbelt land except for 'Exceptional Circumstances'. What are the exceptional circumstances that enable housing to be built on the greenbelt land in Whitworth and Shawforth?		Summary - - Whitworth and Shawforth are already busy villages with oversubscribed schools and GP services with one road in and out between Rochdale and Bacup. - - Can we accommodate more housing that will put pressure on already overstretched amenities, increase traffic and change the beautiful landscape forever?
1000	carol	Thomson	-		Object	I object to the amount of houses that will be built affecting the countryside. Are there any more schools being built to accommodate?		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1029	Angela	Hannam	-		Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? -7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1107	Keith	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2 108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. GP services and other related support services are already overstretched and inadequate. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 5. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 6. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 7. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 7.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 7.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 7.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 8. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		
1109	Jane	Gadsby	-		Object	<p>I wholly object to more housing being built in Whitworth!! We are a small(ish) village that can not cope already with the amount of new houses and people moving into it!! Our schools are already over subscribed; they are turning people away that don't live overly far away that a few years ago would have had no problem getting a place. The Doctors surgery can't cope with the number of patients wanting appointments. You are also increasing the risks of flooding. My house is already at risk and has already flooded twice. The main road (one road in and out) is gridlocked most mornings with commuters trying to get out of the village but most of all you are taking our beautiful green areas that Whitworth is so lucky and honoured to have. We have lots of empty properties that can't be filled already!! Please leave us and our village alone!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1118	Gary	Calderbank	-		Object	<p>There are a great number of reasons why Whitworth township should not be blighted with further development, particularly on land which has been designated as green belt for a large number of years. I wish to summarise these as below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Traffic - Whitworth is served by one road from both the north and south and is a major arterial route to people accessing the m62 and surrounding towns from the valley, Burnley and beyond. It is therefore very busy all of the time without even considering the effect of increasing local traffic even further. This route is regularly disrupted as a result of failing infrastructure resulting in severe delays and tailbacks. - - Schools - The existing schools in the town are already over subscribed and there is no capacity for further children without again significant development of schools. The road where I live is already gridlocked by vehicles dropping off children twice a day, illegally parked and causing obstructions. In relation to developments at Tonacliffe and Horsefield the thought of construction traffic too would be completely unmanageable and dangerous. Further development would exacerbate the problem. - - Policing - Whitworth already suffers from insufficient community policing resulting in many issues which do not get resolved, from burglary to bad behaviour and fly tipping. The town can not afford a further increase of population on this scale bringing with it its percentage of problems. - - Planning Policy - Brown Field Sites - Whitworth and the valley in general is a town built on industrial heritage and just like other cities should be primarily developing brownfield developments not green belt. There are many derelict spaces which can be developed to improve the area whilst providing suitable additional housing. There is no real justification for building on moorland in lieu of this. - - Construction Difficulties - Much of Whitworth moorland is unsuitable to build on, primarily due to poor access to the developments earmarked, mine shafts, poorly drained ground, sloping sites, poor infrastructure, marshland and biodiversity issues. - - Biodiversity - The land surrounding Whitworth is a haven for many wild animals which can be seen on a daily basis. From our house we can regularly observe, a family of foxes, badgers, deer, birds of prey, pipistrelle bats, cows, horses and sheep. This is a gift without price. - - Infrastructure - We regularly have power cuts, water bursts and the A671 is constantly being dug up as existing services are updated resulting in major delays. The drains in our road are currently running 24/7 as a result of water run off off the moors even when it has not rained for a number of days. When it does rain the water backs up out of the covers as the drains are undersize and cannot cope. This would be totally unsuitable for further development, especially considering a greater amount of hard surfacing. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1134	Abigail	Leyland	-		Object	WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE HOUSING IN WHITWORTH! The schools are already oversubscribed, our local doctors can not possibly take on any more patients as it is already a struggle to get an appointment currently. We only have one road in and out of the village which gets badly effected by rush hour traffic, making it difficult for the locals to get to work/school etc. We have such a lovely view of greenery surrounding our little village and we do not want our sight ruined by building ugly, unnecessary housing.		
1152	angela	Jordan	-		Object	I do not think whitworth has enough resources to sustain further housing estates .The one and only road is already impossible at peak times,our doctors surgery is bursting with no appointments,and our school children cant get a place at our local school. - The wildlife is also important to whitwoth people but is being pushed further and further out of its natural habitat.		
1166	Brendan	Doherty	-	HS2, 102,104,108,105 ,107,106,109.	Object	WHITWORTH IS FULL. This statement encapsulates all the issues surrounding any expansion of dwelling houses in the township of Whitworth. - - The negative impact of any developments in the town cannot be overstated. - - The whole nature of this small township will be irreversibly destroyed if development are allowed. - - Flora and fauna will be the first to suffer. This valley is home to an exceptional and expanding variety of animals and trees and flowers. This growth has taken decades to achieve and would by totally reversed by the stroke of a pen. - - To say that all the ingredients which go to make up Whitworth as a place for people to live are overloaded is indeed an understatement. - - Congestion of traffic and people is at its limit, any increase can only be detrimental to the health and quality of life of residents. - - Local services, schools, doctors, civic amenities are already at their serviceable optimum. - - The existing utilities of electricity,gas and water only just maintain service. There are often cuts in these making it seem that we are a third world town. - - Whitworth is a linear town with no bypass or possibility of such. Most of the day traffic is heavy and at peak times chaotic. This combined with the nature of HGV traffic leaves the roads in constant need of repair. Add a very poor public transport system and the certain increases proposed then the result is guaranteed to be disastrous.		Listen to the people of Whitworth.
1190	Nathan	Worrall	-	HS2.107 , HS2.108, HS2.109, HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104,HS2.10 6	Object	Whitworth doesn't have the infrastructure to sustain the construction of these - new houses. The local doctors and schools would struggle to meet the needs of the increased population. There is bad traffic in Whitworth already, this will only make it worse and these traffic problems are highlighted when there are roadworks and there are large queues. The proposed sites are located on greenbelt land, and this will have a negative effect on the local wildlife as well as destroying the natural beauty of this land.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1272	Michala	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS102.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	I am objecting in general to the proposed house building in various sites around Whitworth and specifically in relation to the proposed sites t Tonacliffe. My objections are based on a number of reasons: 1. Wildlife in the local area. Deer, badgers, foxes and hares live within the forest areas. Rare protected newts live in the pond. Bats nest in the forest. The importance in f this green belt land for the wildlife cannot be over emphasised. - 2. Tonacliffe forest would need to be cut down adversely affecting the local environment. - 3. The impact of more cars around local schools, especially Tonacliffe School, is of great concern due to the already high volume of traffic. Increasing this would be unacceptable. - 4. Local amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already to capacity. I have concerns that more houses will have a negative impact on the lives of current residents in relation to these amenities. - 5. Has the infrastructure of our small village been considered in relation to electricity, gas and water supply if more houses are built? Whitworth already experiences power cuts and seems to be worse since other recent building developments have been completed. - 6. The road network into Rochdale is already gridlocked. More houses will increase this problem. Public transport from Whitworth is limited to buses and I consider that if this proposed building goes ahead there will also be a negative impact on the poor public transport in and out of our village. - 7. Local drainage already struggles to cope with usage now, if the volume of residents increases would the drainage system be able to deal with the added strain? - 8. We bought our property because it is located on the last cul de sac of a small estate with no through traffic. This proposed building work will completely alter this into drive through roads. Plus the volume of traffic will - Increase which I consider to be unacceptable. - 9. I am very concerned that we may have loss of privacy as we are not currently overlooked and this was a major consideration when we bought our house.	-	
1283	Jonathan	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	Whitworths infrastructure is already at near full capacity. The single main road through Whitworth is, at times, grid-locked. Streets around the primary schools is chaotic. There is a definite flood issue through the valley. Chime is rising unchallenged. The rich and diverse wildlife is flourishing around Whitworth. - Any of the development projects would have a negative and detrimental implication on Whitworth and it's residents.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1310	Richard	Dolan	-	HS2.101-109	Object	<p>We are vehemently opposed to all housing allocation in Whitworth. Our group has decided to vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. We will withhold our votes and encourage family, friends, and community to do likewise. - We are outraged by this proposal, especially HS2.107 that will encroach on Healy Dell. On this point we will be contacting the National Trust and other such organisations to make them away of the proposed desecration to the Green Belt. Furthermore, we are now investigating possible financial links between all Councillors, MPs, and RBC employees involved in this issue with the proposed contractors. This senseless proposal for a village far too small to accommodate a possible 300 new homes suggest an ulterior motive. No one in our community that we have spoken to is in favour of this plan and we will use our sizeable influence. - There has been more than enough housing development in Whitworth. This new proposal will destroy our green spaces and necessitate a new schools, doctors' surgery, dentist, shops, and possible a new road. All future housing development must stop. Our community can not accommodate any more. - In light of the fact that this proposal has not been advertised to a great extent (we have spoken to people who know nothing of it), we will be conducting a petition again this proposal and encouraging everyone to sign the following statement: - We will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community.</p>		<p>To reiterate, we will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community. - - The people's power will be felt if this plan is authorised.</p>
1336	Maureen	O'Mara	-		Object	<p>Whitworth is already struggling with oversubscribed schools. There is only 1 small GP surgery and 1 dentist. The village cannot cope with stretching the existing amenities. - One of the main objections I have is the traffic and parking, which is already dire. Streets are almost impossible to drive down safely due to double parking. There is only one main road, which when closed for any reason means driving via Todmorden to get around - this has happened on a number of occasions. Most roads have very steep inclines which are regularly not gritted in winter. To increase parking and traffic would destroy Whitworth. Where would access roads be and how would this affect current residents.</p>		
1363	Gareth	Dolan	-	HS2.101 to 109	Object	<p>I do not live in Whitworth but spend a lot of time there with my family. I am deeply concerned by this proposed loss of green belt and will do my utmost to object against it. - - I strongly urge RBC to re-consider its proposal. Whitworth cannot handle any more development. - - Thanks</p>		<p>If this destruction of the green belt in Whitworth is passed then I shall simply take my family and my money elsewhere as there will no longer be the same attraction Whitworth now offers.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1365	Michael	Whitehead	-		Object	The doctors is overcrowded, the schools are overcrowded and there is one road in and out. All three of the mentioned cannot cope in the current state. Whitworth has too many houses for the current infrastructure. If the proposal goes through, which I sincerely hope it does not, there will be 300+ more homes within Whitworth. This means 650+ more people needing a doctor, 300+ more children who need schools and 300+ more cars on the roads. If the current infrastructure is struggling I dread to think how the village would end up with that amount of extra people. - There are also many deer which have recently returned to the greenbelt land on either side of the valley. Moving any sort of greenbelt/urban borders is highly likely to destroy their habitat and force them away.		-
1383	JOHN	DUFFY	-		Object	There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and this cannot take all the traffic now. - There is a serious problem with flooding at the moment especially on Sandbank Gardens, so building more houses will only increase this. - the schools in Whitworth are already at maximum capacity and cannot sustain any more potential pupils. - Access to these sites will increase traffic on the already busy roads that are falling to bits, due to waggons coming down from the quarry. - Crime is already becoming a problem due to lack of policing, additional housing will inevitably add to this. - We already have problems with water and electricity supplies so increased housing will only make this worse.		-
1397	John	Cavanagh		water works	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1398	Joshua	Hopwood Mairs		water works	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve
1402	JOANNE	WHITWORTH -		water works	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. -		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling with make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth who have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for now and for our future generations.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1405	GARETH	WHITWORTH	-	water works	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for our children and our childrens children.
1417	Gillian	Middlemas	Whitworth Community High School	HS1.102 HS2.103 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	As Headteacher of the only secondary school in the Whitworth area, I am concerned that the proposals to build considerable numbers of new dwellings take no account of educational provision in the local area. - The school is already oversubscribed: for 2017 entry into Y7 over 40 families were unsuccessful in gaining a place, despite Whitworth Community High School being their first preference; over 40 families went onto on the Local Authority's waiting list for a place; over 25 families went to Appeal for a place, and very few of them were successful. The school now has 640 students and, without extra classroom space, has no capacity to increase the admissions number, nor to take additional students into existing year groups. - Likewise, many local primary schools are also full / oversubscribed, suggesting there is insufficient educational provision in the local area already. - This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed number of new dwellings goes ahead, unless the developers or Lancashire County Council are prepared to increase the school's capacity by funding additional classroom / learning / social space. The school is over 50 years old, largely of Langspan pre-tensioned concrete construction (intended life expectancy already exceeded) with HAC (high alumina cement) - In addition, the school experiences ongoing issues with the provision of utilities: the water main up the school drive is at risk of collapse; the water supply to the area has recently been affected on a number of occasions, and presumably further demand from new building would increase these issues. - The proposals for new housing does not appear to be linked to any plans to improve the traffic situation in the Whitworth area: lengthy queues heading towards Rochdale each morning already create issues for students travelling to school.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1420	Julie	bower	-	water works	Object	<p>I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate???</p> <p>Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. - This already over saturated with people for the small community resources there are. - There is not enough road space, and only a little amount of moorland available. We try to encourage our young in the community to go outside and be 'heathy'. There won't be anywhere left. I find the lack of advertising this proposal unacceptable. There are many more areas of fields elsewhere. Why add to an over exhausted community already? I dont understand why Whitworth has to be the target for this.</p>		<p>Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve. It isn't alot but it is valued and appreciated beyond your knowledge or understanding - all of these below would be affected adversely. - - Wildlife - Loss of trees - The local school - Landscaping - - Local amenities - Infrastructure - - - We deserve our voices to be heard.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1440	Helen	Banham	-	HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

unbearable strain on this network.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1453	Jordan	Collier			Object	<p>Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1469	George	Salt	-		Object	<p>residents put an unbearable strain on this network. -</p> <p>Whitworth is located in a valley, this in itself presents issues with the amount of space available. 7,500 people lived in Whitworth according to the data from the 2011 Census and this is a large amount of people if you look at the services and infrastructure in Whitworth. To start off with there is one GP surgery that has 7,248 people registered with them. Whitworth Medical Centre has 4 GPs which means that for one GP there are 1,812 people. There is not any more capacity available for more people to register with the practice. - - Schools are also busy especially with just one school for secondary education. With more people living in Whitworth that would mean a greater demand on schools and could result in some children living in Whitworth not going to school there. - - Going back to Whitworth being a valley this physical feature means that infrastructure being put in can be difficult. Whitworth has one road in and out and during peak hours this is a very busy road. Most new people would probably be using a car as their main mode of transport adding more pressure to Market Street and its tributary roads. Public transport is also very poor in Whitworth meaning that it is not really a viable alternative for any new people who would come to Whitworth. - - As shown with a few of these arguments Whitworth does not have the capacity to accommodate an extra 359 houses over the next 15 years. For example an average of 3 people per house would result in 1,077 more people living in Whitworth. It is not going to work.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1475	Kim	March	-	shlaa16016	Object	<p>This site is is the bottom of big hills on two sides of the proposed development. The rear north boundary of my property backs onto this site, and the side boundary of my property backs on the hill to the west. I am the only property owner that has this placement in terms of boundaries. I have significant flood problems in the winter and although water has not encroached into my house yet, it came very close (ie two or less inches) a couple of years ago, and I have retained the video footage showing the level of water going over the step up to my back door. The proposed site would create water flow off the site and my property is immediately beneath the site and so instead of water being absorbed into the land as it currently is on that site after heavy rain or snow (flowing off the hills onto a flat surface albeit my back garden) it will increase the level of water on my land. This increase of surface water off the site onto my property will make all the difference and create a flood problem to the extent that my house will likely be flooded. I have provided notice of the risk to you by way of this email and should this risk actually occur, you and or the developer and or future residents of properties on the site will be liable to me for damage as you have deliberately created an unnatural flow of water onto my property knowing that it would likely be flooded. I will serve notice on the developer and each resident of properties on the site (should they proceed) to that effect so that if flooding occurs, I can take legal action to recover my losses and any future loss. It is the same as creating fire on a property in the knowledge that it would spread to adjoining properties and cause damage to them. I also understand that the stability of the reservoir built in 1878 is also insufficient for current use, and so building works underneath it are likely to cause further stability issues and a potential flood risk. The site is full of newts as I have seen them on the land and in my back garden, together with bats and much other wildlife that should not be disturbed. There is insufficient infrastructure to accommodate the proposed site as the road is simply too narrow to enable use for additional properties.</p>		-
1493	Kathryn	Meigh	-		Object	<p>I also wish to object to the development proposed at Cowm Waterworks. I was born and grew up on Sandbank Gardens and go back there daily to my parental home. I remember this land being green belt not long ago, therefore why is it now brown belt land ?</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1497	Wendy	Rose	-	Cowm Water Works	Object	The infrastructure of Whitworth cannot support or sustain further development. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth. Congestion is a serious problem now due to the volume of traffic. When there are roadworks the situation is bordering on dangerous as emergency vehicles are hindered. Further residential development would only compound this issue with higher levels of vehicles. - - Power cuts are a regular occurrence in this area, one can only assume this would get worse with the extent of the proposed developments - - Doctors surgeries are fully to capacity and cannot adequately serve the community at the moment. Waiting times for appointments is ludicrous. Schools are over subscribed. Parking around schools is dangerous and any increase in school children would seriously impact on this. - - All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - - Proposed land in some cases is not viable as parts are prone to flooding. Culverts running through a proposed sight would impact on flood defences in the area. - - - -	-	
1502	Danielle	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1504	Timothy	Makin	-		Object	<p>The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1505	Pat	Stewart	na		Object	<p>I object to all the listed sites in whitworth. - - HS2.102 - King Street, HS2.104 - Old Lane, HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens, - HS2.105 - Albert Street, HS2.107 Fern Isle Close, HS2.106 - Moorland Cres, - HS2.109 - Horsefield Av - - 1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in</p>		Please can you inform me of how many people object to the whitworth sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
						<p>the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - - Plus please note - - Human Rights Act - Responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, - In particular - Protocol 1, Article 1. - This states that "a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land." - Additionally, Article 8 - The Human Rights Act states that "a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life." - - In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. -</p>		
1517	Thomas Edward	Hobson	-	HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens	Object	<p>We have several concerns. 1. We were informed that our house was in the danger area should the reservoir bursts its banks. On your proposals there is a plan to build 20 houses in the danger area we were warned about. There are also reservoir tasks, underground pipes, valves plus other engineering works. 2. We are concerned that the suggested houses would be behind our property and would therefore affect our outlook. 3. The current access to Tong Lane is very difficult. Your proposals would make the situation virtually impossible.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1538	Mike	Burgess			Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
					unbearable strain on this network.			<p>accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
								<p>footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - DON'T FORGET EACH ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CAN PUT IN THEIR OWN OBJECTION FORM TO THE BUILDING WORK. Extract from the Governments Planning Policy Statement - Protection and Enhancement of the Environment 17. The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. Those with national and international designations should receive the highest level of protection. 18. The condition of our surroundings has a direct impact on the quality of life and the conservation and improvement of the natural and built environment brings social and economic benefit for local communities. Planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design, conservation and the provision of public space. 19. Plan policies and planning decisions should be based on: –up-to-date information on the environmental characteristics of the area; – the</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
								<p>potential impacts, positive as well as negative, on the environment of development proposals (whether direct, indirect, cumulative, long-term or short-term); and, – recognition of the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage. Planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, planning authorities and developers should consider possible mitigation measures. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. In line with the UK sustainable development strategy, environmental costs should fall on those who impose them – the “polluter pays” principle.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1545	Robert	Hesten		SHLAA16016	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam. Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
						<p>flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
1546	Sandra	Hesten		SHLAA16016	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam.</p> <p>Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
						<p>flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions?</p> <p>Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS.</p> <p>There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village.</p> <p>Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed?</p> <p>In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area.</p> <p>Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF.</p> <p>Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.108	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		
1744	Keren	Szelesi		Sandbank Gardens	Object	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Infrastructure is already at breaking point in this area. 2) Road system, water supply, medical centre, schools are at full capacity. 3) Encroach on green spaces. 4) Whitworth will no longer be a village but an urban sprawl. 		Not enough publicity has been given regarding these proposals.
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>HS 2:108 – Tong Lane itself is constrained in width by buildings and has poor pedestrian provision. There is a higher than average percentage of HGV traffic on Tong lane due to the Quarry to the north. The site access off Tong End is too narrow currently and requires widening and what is potentially third party land. The provision of 20 houses appears high considering the site is crossed by the reservoir spillways however the provision of any additional housing would be a concern due to the constraints of Tong Lane and the site access.</p>		
Number of comments		HS2.108				89		
Reference		HS2.109				Site of Horsefield Avenue, Tonacliffe		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
5	Kimberley	Ashworth	-		Object	I am writing to object against the proposed local plan for Whitworth. - - I am unable to attend the meeting tomorrow night due to illness but I have looked at the proposal as stated below: - - http://www.rossendale.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/3700/whitworth_map_with_street_names - - I'm disappointed to see that a number of green spaces are being considered to build houses on. The green spaces behind Tonacliffe School are used by many for walking. To build on this space would be detrimental to the green space due to wildlife and other conversation in that area. - Building houses would also see an increase in traffic which is at demand during peak times at the moment. - - Other green spaces on the plans are also being considered. In a village that is at full capacity I am unsure why Rossendale Council see the need to build in places that already has adequate housing. - - There are no plans to look at new recreational and family facilities which the town needs. The closure of the children's centre means that new parents and young families have nowhere to go. The plans don't take any such new facility into consideration and I urge Rossendale Council to look at this. - - I know I speak on behalf of many in the Town when I say the option for Whitworth is option 1 'Do nothing' - - Kind regards -		I am extremely disappointed that a meeting has been arranged in Whitworth for tomorrow evening when all the other consultation meetings are taking place in September
12	Chloe	Halliday	-		Object	Already too much traffic in this area during school hours with cars often dangerously parked. Would also result in the habitats of many wildlife being disrupted.		-
20	Jamie	Ward	-		Object	The objection is simple on the grounds of traffic management, a majority of the streets do not have proper paving and the hills up to Tonacliffe have a lot of problems with traffic and parking already, especially when there is a primary school on two of the roads.unless new access roads are added or the existing roads are considerably improves including traffic calming measures and possibly a one way system then you would sing be making the roads too congested and also very dangerous.		-
24	Erica	Preston	-	HS2.105, HS. 107, HS2. 108, HS2.109	Object	The single road through the valley is not up to the volume of traffic using it currently. Hall St.will be a blocked junction, as will Tonacliffe Road. There are not the amenities in the area eg.doctors, dentists, schools etc. Unless major investment in the valley is made to update amenities and utilities these developments will cause immense problems and destroy the reasons people want to live here and turn the valley into yet another sprawling suburb. - I have every sympathy for the need for housing but feel the proposals are ill thought out and will lead to a detrimental effect on the township.		The need for housing must be weighed against the needs of the valley as a whole and destroying green belt and valued wildlife habitat will not make it a place people want to live.
26	Christine	Bamford	Childminder		Object	This is a quiet cul de sac, never in this world can the Avenue cope with more traffic!! Online survey submitted 09/10/17: HorsefieldAvenue could not cope with more houses, no room in school, no room for that amount of traffic thro the Avenue, it's a crazy proposal!		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
27	Michael	Chianca	-		Object	<p>HS2.102 - King Street - HS2.104 - Old Lane - HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens - HS2.105 - Albert Street - HS2.107 Fern Isle Close - HS2.106 Moorland Cres - HS2.109 Horsefield Av - - All these proposed sited are unsuitable for the following reasons. 1. Wildlife - This greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest area at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest itself would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action when we have other areas within Whitworth to build on that would not require the destruction of trees. 3. The local school at both dropping of and collection time around this area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists, Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative affect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. 9. Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" can you explain what those exceptional circumstances are when we have other areas more suitable for building houses on. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental affect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others would be overlooked. 14. As the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including school children. 16. This area and the surrounding area has already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
28	Karen	Ward	N/a	HS2.109 and HS2.106 relating to the Tonacliffe area.	Object	<p>I object to the proposed planning for houses in my local area (Whitworth). The local infer-structure of Whitworth Village cannot possible take the volume of traffic these proposed houses will generate. The increased in cars commuting out/in especially at peaks times would cause a residential and commuting nightmare as there is one road in and one road out of Whitworth. Most houses proposed to be built are two to three bedroom family homes, and therefore in reality this could mean that each home will be a two car family. This will add to commuting time as more traffic is on the road (one road in and out of Whitworth). This means that more time travelling is cutting into precious work-life balance time with family and children. Also, the local surgeries/dentists are already full to capacity with appointments not being able to be given the same day or appointments not able to be given the same week, meaning residents have to wait in some cases one to two weeks to see a local GP. How many extra people wanting to sign on at Whitworth/Healey medical centre for medical attention which is over stretched as it is. Building in the area would only add to these already stretched services within the area. In view of this there is also the emergency services to consider and are these able to cope with demand? Has this been looked into in regards to emergency response times and that the nearest A&E is Oldham hospital? Some of the planned access roads are classed as un-adopted/private. These are not suitable for heavy or extra traffic and who will maintain these roads? Building more houses in the area would mean the current schools in the area would not be able to cope with demand. With the local schools already at near capacity and with no current plans in the proposal to build another local school this will only get worse. Since schools are no longer ring-fenced in regards to places/applications, there are many of the local children not getting into their local Whitworth school/nurse. By adding more houses within the Whitworth Valley this would add to the demand for school/nursery places. Local children (who currently live within the Valley) are having to travel outside of the Valley as places are being taken up from children outside the immediate area, therefore adding more houses in Whitworth would cause additional placement/schooling and nursery demands to mean the out local children's needs are not being met. Currently the need, sheer capacity and demand as it is falling short of residents needs without adding more houses to the area. More research and investment needs to be been done, looking at how many children locally are wanting nursery, school places in Whitworth as there are many parents struggling to place their children in a school near to the home/first choice for intake 2017. Traffic in the area is already at dangerous levels around Tonacliffe primary school in the mornings and afternoon and therefore adding houses and extra traffic to the streets that are not suitable for the extra capacity will increase the risk of accidents. The roads are narrow with resident's double parking on the side in which they live.</p>		Whitworth infer-structure can't take the amount of proposed housing that these plans show. I find it disgraceful that local residence and Whitworth council have not been consulted from the start.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						Building houses on Green-belt will lead to the destruction of the local wildlife, flora and fauna. This needs to be considered in regards to building on land and this is the natural habitat for many birds, animals, insects and flowers. - - -		
32	Paula	McNinch	-		Object	There is not the infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with extra housing. The road in and out is already too busy, the schools are full and there are no facilities for young people.	-	
39	Claire	Butterworth	-		Object	There is no infrastructure to place extra houses in this location. Wildlife in the area bats, deer, foxes and badgers all reside in this area with there homes in these locations these will be destroyed. The roads are not wide enough to accommodate extra houses and are not maintained by the council (it has taken 3 years of complaints to resurface a road a few hundred yards in length) the grit bins do not get filled in the winter and the road turns to sheet ice with the water off the moor, this would worsen. the doctors have no space for extra patients nor does the school. Children out playing will become more vulnerable with extra traffic, as the countryside is there playground and you are removing this. Winter fetches flood water off the hills and with extra property this will put our houses st risk of flooding when water finds it's natural pathway flooding has increased in the area over the last couple of years as the council is already aware. One road in and one out this will cause traffic problems at peak times. You will be reducing the price of my property as I bought the property for its views and location, my views will be gone (am I going to compensated for this).		There are certain areas which would benefit from extra property but these locations are not the best option.
40	Jason	Butterworth	-		Object	1 traffic congestion problems already causing danger to children at school before said planning. 2 roads are very narrow already causing people to park on the paths. 3 land is very wet at all times with numerous streams throughout the land and would need large scale infrastructure to cure . 4 there is no infrastructure in place to accommodate e.g. Doctors schools already full. 5 traffic is already bad getting in or out of Whitworth due to one road in and would make a problem worse than already is. 6 there is a lot of wildlife in both areas badger sets bats deer which would be upsetting to all involved. 7 people use the land for walking,children play on the land taking it away would leave them with only streets to play on making them more vulnerable. 8 with flooding problems already in Whitworth would only make matter worse. 9 people bought houses at a price which reflected the area and would de value all properties being over looked by lots of houses. 10 the area would need large scale earth moving to accommodate these plans leaving the area having the feel of a valley taken away.		This would cause a lot of stress to the community and cause divisions throughout Whitworth.
46	Ian	Hills	-		Object	Increase in traffic pollution and the lack of new access to these sites		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
56	Valerie	McDonald	-		Object	<p>Whilst I recognise the need for further housing within the area, I am concerned about the siting of so many proposed dwellings in this particular valley. The roads are already clogged at rush hour and as there is only one road through, movement of traffic, should there be an accident or roadworks, becomes frustratingly unpredictable. What provision is there to maintain and develop the road system in the valley? - - Whitworth High School has become more popular over the past couple of years with waiting lists existing. What provision will be made to expand the school, and will this be done with a long term objective in mind and not just a sticking plaster effort to put up some portable classrooms? - - Local services such as the Children's Centre have just been lost. What plans may be afoot to reinstate such necessary provision? I feel it is morally wrong to simply build new houses and forget about the infrastructure to support this development. - - There is a wealth of wildlife on the moors where you are proposing to site many homes. Presumably there will be checks in place to ensure some of these species are not endangered? - - Finally, there are already plenty of properties on the market at very affordable prices (in comparison with some surrounding areas). Some of these have been on the market a while? Why, if there is already affordable housing, is there a need to build more? -</p>		
60	Valerie	Archibald	-		Object	<p>This site is moorland edge and is the habitat of roe deer,badgers, foxes,birds of prey,squirrels,hedgehogs,weasels frogs and bats as well as countless species of birds,butterflies.and insects.It has not been cultivated for more than 40 years and there is a diversity of wild flowers.It is a completely wild place,mostly untouched by Man and as such it should be preserved. - - The gradient of most of the site makes it totally unsuitable for building,the subsoil is sand and shale and the - run off of rainwater from the site [and into my property] means that if building proceeded my property could be substantially damaged . - - Because of the gradient of the site any buildings would overlook my property and the value of my property would thus be greatly reduced.As well as this,the building work needed to get the site fit for building would mean a good deal of disruption for all living nearby as well as the disappearance of a wildlife habitat. - - The local road leading to this site is heavily congested at times because of the local school and if further houses were built this would make the present unpleasant situation even worse.As most employment opportunities mean commuting towards Rochdale,this would mean that the busy main road into Rochdale would be even more congested than it is at present. - - The local school is at present full and there are insufficient Doctors locally to serve the present population as it is not at all easy to get an appointment now. - - With an additional 120 houses in the vicinity,the any amenity value of Tonacliffe would be gone.</p>	No	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
73	Caroline	Lord			Object	<p>This is green space where wildlife thrives, there are badgers, foxes, deer, hare, newts in the river and many many more, to build here would destroy their habitat. The local schools are at saturation point I work in the local Secondary school and we are full to bursting with the council still allowing more and more students in on appeal it is causing disruption to student learning. Parking by Tonacliffe primary school is a nightmare at the moment to introduce more cars will cause total gridlock. A culvert runs through Tonacliffe and this is at bursting point when it rains heavily our garden is flooded. The landscape is totally unsuitable for building and will most certainly cause flooding should building commence. Local amenities will not cope with more people doctors dentist etc are already full. Whitworth as a village comes to a standstill at the drop of a hat and total carnage occurs should there be traffic lights etc. Recent demolition of the local mill was an example of this as there is only one road in and out of the village. Access roads to Tonacliffe are narrow and will cause problems for emergency vehicles with more traffic it will be dangerous for children playing, basically if councillors came and looked at this beautiful green moorland I am fairly certain they could not agree to build and surely a brief walk through Whitworth would show this village is totally at saturation point . Come on counsellors have some sense!</p>		I really hope you take into consideration local peoples feelings for once instead of sitting in your ivory towers making decisions that affect local people
98	Jacqueline	Butterworth	-		Object	<p>I am objecting to proposed development of all the above houses around the Whitworth area. The area is overrun with traffic as it is. One way in and one way out. The schools are overloaded as are the GP surgery. It is inconceivable to build more houses and allowing more traffic to use our roads which are in a terrible state. We are already experiencing burst water pipes and our water pressure has already been reduced. We are experiencing more power cuts since all the new houses have been built on Cowm Park Way . Surely there must be someone in the planning department with some common sense and will prevent any further building of houses in Whitworth</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
131	Christine	Greenwood	-		Object	I am objecting to plans to allow the building of over £350 properties on various sites around Whitiworth and Shawforth over the next 15 years. - Not only am I concerned about the building on our greenbelt sites which is part of the attraction of the area. I can understand the wind farm and can support renewable energy sources but not the creation of a collection of housing estates - whether social/affordable or not . The awful collection in Britannia speaks for itself! We have already had several builds across Rossendale but the extra Council Tax revenue does not seem to have brought many benefits to the borough. - As it stands at present the infrastructure can just about support the current residents - schools are already over subscribed and getting an appointment at our one GP surgery is already a mammoth undertaking. Planning to build or reopen a school by any chance? - Traffic is already an issue with one road in and out and a bus service that has to be one of the most unreliable in the surrounding areas ! There are next to no facilities for young people/children and a library fighting to survive so I think that this needs to be given serious consideration before you go ahead.		-
149	Hellen	Hills			Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wildlife, lots of different species 2. Conservation of moorland 3. Traffic is already an issue so more would be catastrophic also access would be a maor issue. 4. I blieve the proposed site would be totally unsuitable to build on and would cause damage to an area that already has water problems mainly leaks. 5. Schools, dentists, general practice (doctors) are already struggling 6. roads are already in a poor state more traffic would only compound this issue. 7. Pollution 		I strongly believe this would be catastrophic for the people of tonacliffe and all of whiteworth from too many vehicles on already poor roads to the pollution they would cause. Also to the local wildlife that have lived and continue to thrive on the proposed sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
153	G.N	Royds			Not Applicable	<p>As I have indicated before, a prerequisite for a community is sustainable employment. A complete hash has been made by not providing this. Former mill sites have been used for housing, such as Orama Mill, Facit Mill, Albert Mill and the mill near Spodden Fold (which I think may have been called Old Kays). Most of these are easily accessible. Now Spring Mill is proposed for similar treatment! On the other hand, peripheral businesses have been allowed, e.g. tattoo parlours and tanning centres, which debase the human body; the type of potentially smelly fast food outlets that encourage unhealthy eating.</p> <p>Housing without local employment means commuting, causing traffic congestion and pollution. The kind of industry needed is that involved in green energy, recycling, sensible clothing and the production of healthy food. The former site of Spring Mill is a place where a sensitively designed industrial estate might be possible. It is already surrounded by trees and has foundations remaining but it is not on a regular public transport route and is less accessible than previously mentioned sites that have been precluded. It is absurd to think of building on HS2.102/103/106/109 and on that part of HS2.107 not formerly occupied by Spring Mill. These are large areas of countryside enjoyed at present as part of the natural environment. HS2.104 also appears to be countryside, with a few established houses, and also should be protected from further building. Cowm Water Treatment Works (HS2.108) is ideal for industrial development. Let us have local jobs and ensure adequate facilities are available before any more houses are built in Whitworth.</p>		<p>P.S. I did not make this response online because it was mandatory to provide an e-mail address. Please change this, so that more people are encouraged to respond.</p> <p>P.P.S. Please keep me informed of developments.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
155	Jo	Furtado			Object	<p>HS2.106 and 109 -those areas of land are d'etightful to walk on; they might be delightful to live on, if the houses are well built and well insulated BUT access to/from those houses, via Tonacliffe Way, would put real pressure on narrow"estate roads, particularly at school start and finish times. The two big issues are broader, however. 1. The numbers of houses proposed pose a real challenge/threat in terms of schools, health services and road infrastructure, as outlined above. The proximity of these sites to the southern end of the valley means they would almost certainly be occupied disproportionately by those who work in or beyond Rochdale, with obvious consequences for the A671 and its users. 2. These are two sizeable chunks of Green Belt, carefully shown as such on your own Green Belt Assessment document (which was available along with the DLP maps/document/Infrastructure Delivery document at the Library), though mysteriously appearing as Urban Area on the DLP map.</p> <p>Whitworth's Green Belt is mostly moorland, and there will be those who see moorland as worthless. But the moorland is a large part of what gives Whitworth the character its residents value: we should not be giving it up so easily. (The moorland surrounding is already disproportionately given up to wind turbines.) Let the government meet its housebuilding targets by throwing up estates in the Cotswolds, or the South Downs, or the Chilterns, or the South Hams. Perhaps we should redesignate our moorland a "Heritage Asset": in ENV2 you yourselves say that historic landscapes could be so designated. Oppose vigorously, in both cases.</p> <p>In SD2 the DLP states, "All new developments in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundary defined in the Policies map ... " which begs the question, when, and by whose authority, did the parcels of land numbered HS2.106 and 109 transfer from Green Belt to Urban Land? The DLP goes on, " ... except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area." (My italics) Put bluntly, they don't, and they wouldn't. The spirit ofthe DLP is quite clear: it would be wrong to build houses on either of these two sites.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
195	Janet	King	-	HS.102, HS2.104-9 inclusive	Object	Whitworth' infrastructure cannot support almost 400 new properties - it is already nigh impossible to obtain a doctors appointment and my father has had to wait iver 6 months to obtain a podiatry appointment as there is only one who has been on long term sick and no replacement cover available. The fact that there is only one main arterial road into and out of Whitworth, which already has weekly road works delaying the already totally congested road does not bear thinking about. With an extra 400 properties and the increase in traffic that these will bring and as there is no large employer in the area most of these occupants will be commuting one way or another. We lost access to an A&E in Rochdale and now the nearest is either Fairfield or Oldham with the additional traffic these proposals would create the congested roads Could be catastrophic in an emergency. - - On a personal note, my family moved to Whitworth 12 years ago, from Oldham, due to its naturally beautiful countryside and I see the addition of these properties into areas of greenery (extending Wallbank estate etc.,) is the very short end of the stick. I can see that if these are accepted, encroaching on to green belt areas, slowly but surely the green belt areas will get smaller and smaller until eventually Whitworth just becomes another concrete plot with ever creaking infrastructure. - - Finally, I understand the need for affordable housing but there are plenty of mills/brown field that could be developed. However, I feel strongly that before any proposals are accepted it is of the utmost importance that the infrastructure is in place to support them, that includes roads, schools and NHS access.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
208	Tracie	Dexter	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife - there would be a huge impact on the wildlife in this area. We have regular sightings of foxes, badgers, deer, kestrels and bats. There are also rare protected newts living in the pond in this area. 2. Trees - there are a significant amount of trees in this area which would have to be cut down and this would have a negative affect on the wildlife and local environment. 3. Schools - Parking in this area at the local school is already a concern for the school and local residents at dropping off and collection times. The road is regularly gridlocked and there has been a number of incidents and 'near misses' involving cars and pedestrians. The inevitable increase in traffic will only make this worse. 4. Flooding/drainage - a culvert runs through the middle of this area which takes land/drain water off the moors. This is already at near bursting point during heavy rain and a number of properties which back onto the open moorland frequently have rain water/ mud flooding into their gardens. I believe that increased flooding is a risk if this site goes ahead. 5. Landscaping - This site is geographically unsuitable for housing and the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. The site is extremely steep and there is an electricity pylon at the bottom of the hill. The site would have to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local Amenities - Tonacliffe school is already at full capacity, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctors/dentist appointment and more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of people living in Whitworth. 7. Infrastructure - We regularly suffer power cuts and loss of water supply which indicates that these utilities are already stretched. These would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing. 8. Roads -there is only one road in/out of Whitworth and this is already gridlocked at peak times and when roadworks/accidents occur. This road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic and more housing/ residents would have a massive impact. 9. Access - if access to the proposed site is to be through Horsefield Ave, which is currently a cul de sac, the lives of residents living in the area would be endangered, as would the large numbers of children that play freely and safely in this area. 10 Policy - it is Government Policy to protect greenbelt areas except for 'exceptional circumstances'. What are those exceptional circumstances? 11. Noise Pollution - this area is peaceful and surrounded by wildlife which is one of the main reasons local residents chose to live here. Building in this area would increase noise pollution and would have a detrimental affect on both. 12. Loss of privacy - my house backs onto open moorland. The proposed building plans would mean that I would most likely be overlooked and would lose the privacy I currently enjoy. 13. Public footpath - there is a public footpath (right of way) that runs across the moorland and this would be lost.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
209	Andrew	Dexter	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife - there would be a huge impact on the wildlife in this area. We have regular sightings of foxes, badgers, deer, kestrels and bats. There are also rare protected newts living in the pond in this area. - - 2. Trees - there are a significant amount of trees in this area which would have to be cut down and this would have a negative affect on the wildlife and local environment. - - 3. Schools - Parking in this area at the local school is already a concern for the school and local residents at dropping off and collection times. The road is regularly gridlocked and there has been a number of incidents and 'near misses' involving cars and pedestrians. The inevitable increase in traffic will only make this worse. - - 4. Flooding/drainage - a culvert runs through the middle of this area which takes land/drain water off the moors. This is already at near bursting point during heavy rain and a number of properties which back onto the open moorland frequently have rain water/ mud flooding into their gardens. I believe that increased flooding is a risk if this site goes ahead. - - 5. Landscaping - This site is geographically unsuitable for housing and the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. The site is extremely steep and there is an electricity pylon at the bottom of the hill. The site would have to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - - 6. Local Amenities - Tonacliffe school is already at full capacity, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctors/dentist appointment and more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of people living in Whitworth. - - 7. Infrastructure - We regularly suffer power cuts and loss of water supply which indicates that these utilities are already stretched. These would need a major uplift to accomodate more housing. - - 8. Roads - there is only one road in/out of Whitworth and this is already gridlocked at peak times and when roadworks/accidents occur. This road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic and more housing/ residents would have a massive impact. - - 9. Access - if access to the proposed site is to be through Horsefield Ave, which is currently a cul de sac, the lives of residents living in the area would be endangered, as would the large numbers of children that play freely and safely in this area. - - 10 Policy - it is Government Policy to protect greenbelt areas except for 'exceptional circumstances'. What are those exceptional circumstances? - - 11. Noise Pollution - this area is peaceful and surrounded by wildife which is one of the main reasons local residents chose to live here. Building in this area would increase noise pollution and would have a detrimental affect on both. - - 12. Loss of privacy - my house backs onto open moorland. The proposed building plans would mean that I would most likely be overlooked and would lose the privacy I currently enjoy. - - 13. Public footpath - there is a public footpath (right of way) that runs across the moorland and this would be lost. - -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
258	Fiona	Harrison			Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village oversubscribed schools and GP Services with one road in and one road out. The pressure on the infrastructure would be immense, plus travelling to or from anywhere especially at peak times is already horrendous, nevermind with another approx 400 houses being built. Our skyline and beautiful views and countryside are also going to be lost.		-
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	This is an unbelievable plan that will stretch amenities in the area even further. - - The new estate near Cowm has already increased traffic congestion on the one road in and out of the village and schools are already struggling to cope. - - There is also the issue of wildlife and the impact it will have on their environment. - - I for one will be leaving if this idiotic plan goes through. -		This smells of greed over common sense
268	Michaela	Radford	-		Object	Whitworth has had numerous instances recently regarding the roadworks for the infrastructure repair and maintenance. As an employee of all 4 major utility asset owners in the area, I am very concerned regarding the houses proposed. We only have one road throughout the valley and this is impacted severely when roadworks are planned. My concerns are that these are not managed correctly by LCC at present, therefore; more houses and more infrastructure would have a massive impact on the people living in the village. People face unemployment now due to the frequent issues we face getting into work. - Not to mention over crowded schools and doctors as we stand at present. - - I request, here in writing, to be informed of any planned meetings regarding the houses in whitworth and notification be sent in writing to my address above.		-
297	Lindsay	Fairhurst			Object	Poor access along the length of Main Rd (Market Street) one narrow road lined with parked cars , as only access into & out of whitworth. No alternative route. No trains or trams. Buses won't must travel on same one access road both in and out as cars. No motorway access under 20 min journey both ways insufficient work in area means people must travel to Manchester, leeds, bury, Rochdale etc. Current public transport unrealistic. Traffic at peak times currently gridlocked & congested. Increased housing will add to this burden. Utilities infrastructure unable to cope currently leading to repeated remedial roadworks. Schools full Doctors full Rossendale Council Lancashire Council needs to address transport & roadways access + education access beofer building homkes where people will be unable to travel to employment and school		highway safety compromised by insufficient access up tonacliffe road past primary school - children at risk also

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
298	Andrew	Fairhurst			Object	the number of houses proposed in this local plan for infrastructure can support. Whitworth has only one road in abd out and already this is constantly being dug up by utility companies often resulting in temporary traffic lights that cause massives queues of traffic in rush hours. Not only is the road narrow and conjested but there is no alternative train service - only the bus (on the same road) This is totall useless for the number of people wo commute to Manchester, Oldham and Bury every working day. Our schools, doctors and dentists are already close to capacity. There are very few options to travel to other facilities apart from along the one road through the valley.		Without robust and achievable plans to increase the support infrastructure for travel (a train for example) and health and education and culture this building should not go ahead. For people to afford these houses they need jobs first. Currently you need to move out of the valley to commute to work. Regeneration of the area and existing housing stock should come first.
335	Venkatesh	Thoppae	-		Object	Currently, due to traffic I am already starting 30 minutes early to work, with the school run, I believe the roads towards Haslingden and Rochdale will be much congested for office goers if proposed plans are executed without proper plans to widen the roads and making new ways to connect to the various part of the main roads(motor way). - - Also the schools, GP services will be under much more strain if those are not equipped to address the increasing population.		-
405	Sheila	Sutcliffe	-		Object	Whitworth and in particular the area around Tonacliffe Primary School is already a very busy area with extreme access and parking problems. - - This area is already saturated with housing and there is no advantage to be gained by the proposal of increasing housing in the area. This would only increase the associated problems brought by a new housing development i.e. extra traffic, parking problems, school places, GP and dentist places. - - The traffic problems alone would be horrific, the proposal of building a further 120 new houses would bring 240 more vehicles to the area, bearing in mind that most houses have at least 2 vehicles. The proposed site in Tonacliffe has only one access road, Tonacliffe Way, which is already heavily congested as it includes the main entrance to a primary school. Police are continually requested to show a presence to deter traffic issues on Tonacliffe Way and residents already suffer terribly with obstruction problems outside their properties. - - Tonacliffe School is already up to capacity on the pupil roll number and is oversubscribed in some year groups. It would not be able to sustain the increase in school places that 120 new houses in the area would undoubtedly bring. Tonacliffe School also has no further space within the building to increase the number of classrooms.		I implore all counsellors to reconsider these proposals which would destroy a greenbelt area providing countryside on the doorstep of current residents and an Outstanding Ofsted primary school. - - The area provides a natural habitat for wildlife, I have personally enjoyed watching deer, falcons, and owls in the area. It provides a safe haven for children to play, families enjoy walks together and many, many dog owners exercise their pets on the hillside. - - - -
441	Sharon	Brown	-		Object	Tonacliffe is already congested. Water pipes have burst, the road is in a state of disrepair. - - In addition concerns on how the school would cope with 120 new families moving directly to that street. Plus the additional - - I have lived at Ainsdale for 12 months now and have had 3 power cuts already.		Whitworth Road couldn't cope with the extra through traffic.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
446	Paula	Todd	-		Object	Whitworth is a small community with only one main road to access it. I feel that if all these purposed houses are built the traffic congestion for commuting will be very difficult for the local residents. Other than the bus service residents have no alternative to drive to and from work. - - My children go to local Tonnacliffe school and the traffic and parking is extremely heavy and if more houses are built in that area the roads would not be able to cope. - - Flooding is a massive problem at present in Whitworth, united utilities are constantly out trying to fix problems, having more houses I believe would make the flooding worse. - - Whitworth is also known for its beauty, walks and wildlife and to purpose building on the greenbelt areas of Whitworth would cause a detrimental effect on this. - - Whitworth does not have access to a local A&E dept, Rochdale hospital only has a urgent care centre as does Burnley. Residents of Whitworth closes A&E is either Oldham or Blackburn. Having more residents in Whitworth with limited healthcare facility's could increase morbidity rate. Along side no local A&E we only have one GP practice in the area, having more residence would cause strain on their service, this also includes only one dental practice. - - Will there be enough places in the schools for all the new children to the area? The local high school is only small and as I believe was over subscribed this school year. - -		-
509	Joanne	Robinson	-	HS2.106 & HS2.109	Object	The changing of usage of these 2 areas from greenbelt so you can use them to build 120 houses is totally unacceptable. To begin with more houses in Whitworth itself is going to create more problems on our main road which is already so busy as it is one main road in & out of the village. Any roadworks that occurs (which are frequently) because of water mains constantly bursting due to overuse & other utilities constantly having to upgrade because of new houses already being built. The back up of traffic is appalling. We also need to think about ruining the natural beauty of the area, the wildlife that will be disturbed , we have 2 ponds in these areas also. Already when we get alot of rain we have flooding in our gardens. Your plan is proposing to use our street as one of the access roads again this would be a nightmare as the amount of cars on all the streets over Tonnacliffe would make the congestion unbearable. We have a primary school at the bottom which at school time again congestion of cars ridiculous. What about local amenities schools, doctors, dentists will they be able to take the influx of more people ?		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
510	Philip andrew	Robinson	-	HS2.106 & HS2.109	Object	I am not happy with you proposal to change these 2 areas from greenbelt so you can build 120 houses on them. The area has an abundance of wildlife, 2 ponds and would be a great loss to our community. Taking this piece of greenbelt would ruin our beautiful landscape. The problems with congestion on our main road through the village is getting worse as of new houses already bejng built and the constant digging up of our roads by the utilitie department to try and fix problems that are constatly occuring. The state of our main roads and roads around Tonnacliffe are appallingly and will only get worse with more cars. The access to these sites coming of our street and others on Tonnacliffe would be a nightmare because ahain with the number of cars at the houses already there. When the school is open again the congestion is ridiculous. We also have trouble with flooding after alot of rain in our gardens coming off the moors so again more houses would not be helping that .		-
578	Enid Jean	Ainsworth	-		Object	I believe the proposal to build 52 houses on the green belt land on the site of Horsfield Avenue is inappropriate for a number of reasons. - This is greenbelt land that is dedicated to the community for leisure e.g. dog walking, children's play. Also to encourage wild life to thrive in whatever form e.g. freshwater newts, flowers, birds, foxes and badgers. - The people who have chosen to live their lives alongside this peaceful area of Whitworth, live there because they value the land adjoining them, for the reasons that it is designated greenbelt land, or to simply enjoy the benefits of the scenery. - The entrance to the new site may be from the road at the side of Tonacliffe school. This area is already a potential danger zone for children and adults due to it's close proximity to the school. The entrance to the existing estate from Whitworth Road onto Oakfield Avenue is already very busy with cars coming onto the estate to access homes and the school. - Tonacliffe school is already over-subscribed and the building is not large enough to accommodate an increase in children. - Whitworth village itself is accessed by two roads from Rochdale. Then, from Healey Corner the road becomes one. The route to Whitworth and beyond is increasingly busy due to the new builds on the far side of Whitworth and the new builds in and around Bacup. - I believe there are too many reasons why we should not accommodate any new houses, especially in this part of Whitworth. Both regarding the very real problems of infra-structure and of the natural, greenbelt area.		-
590		Ashworth			Object	Absolutely ridiculous One way in and out of whitworth no extra schools or doctors when you have two or three cars per household. This is ruining our villages. We strongly object to this. Listen to the people who vote you in, as we have long memories		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
627	alan	lord		HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	Whitworth as a whole is an over developed village, the schools do not have enough places the doctors and dentist are full but more importantly the village is chock a block with traffic. There is one road in and one road out and traffic is a night mare for local people. On Tonacliffe we have badgers, deer, rabbits, foxes and newts just to name a few animals, what happens to these animals where do they go I am not sure they understand the prospect of new houses being built and having to find a new habitat. TRaffic at Tonacliffe school in the mornings and evenings is awful, I came home at 3.30pm on Friday to look for myself I do not know how there are not more accidents or children hurt or injured we just cannot cope with any more people or vehicles in this village		I suggest the planning officer actually visits the area he is planning to decimate and see for himself the beauty of the place and how much he would be ruining. At evenings and weekends the moors off Tonacliffe are full of mountain bikers, walkers and people just enjoying the fresh air which he wants to take away. No doubt the planners will return to their ivory towers and enjoy peace and quiet in their villages why does Whitworth have to have more houses we have more than enough for local people. I havent even touched on emergency vehicles who struggle to get through due to parking on narrow roads that are already full For once councillors think about your actions and decisions and see which people and animals this will affect Greenbelt should stay that protected
705	Sandra	Collier	-		Object	The site is completely unsuitable for development access to the existing housing is already extremely difficult and more traffic would make it impossible and dangerous. The nearby school is already full and traffic at school opening and closing times is horrendous. Whitworth is already experiencing major difficulties accessing public services and increasing numbers will put further strain on these already overstretched resources.		-
706	Jackie	Taylor	-		Object	This is a natural area supporting wildlife that is protected - - Access routes are unclear but likely to impact on High Peak Road a small lane serving a small cluster of homes - This is not feasible to use and any short cuts taken by new home owners will negatively impact - Traffic in Tonacliffe is peak now and more would affect negatively on existing residents - Schools, medical services are I understand already at capacity in these areas - - I object to any green belt areas being destroyed		I trust our council will consider the unintended consequences of harming our village and take a responsible decision to safeguard our environment for the people and wildlife
717	Joanne	Banks	-		Object	As above. The same reasons for objecting against site HS2.106		I believe Rossendale Council should think really hard about further developments in Whitworth. The local amenities are already overstretched with only 4 primary schools, 1 high school and 1 GP surgery.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
743			Whitworth Town Council		Object	HS2.106 Land to the east of Tonacliffe School Avenue, Tonacliffe Council have strong concerns about removing this land from greenbelt and feel that brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenbelt. Developing this area would have an adverse impact on the diversity of nature and wildlife in this area. Additionally, there is a pylon and electricity cables located in the site off Horsefield Avenue which has not been identified on the plan. These areas have formed part of previous greenbelt reviews and the studies have recommended that these areas remain in greenbelt.		
773	Susan	Worrall	-		Object	Whitworth is a village, a small community. Building these housing developments will change Whitworth into a town. - There is not the infrastructure to support this additional housing. There is one road in and out of Whitworth which is already struggling to cope with the increasing volume of traffic.Especially at peak times. If there are any traffic disruptions it can take 1-2 hours to get to Rochdale . We do not need more cars and the pollution they bring! - - There are limited school places both secondary and primary and local children born in the village will struggle to get places. - The one and only GP practice can not manage to provide the necessary health care for patients with no appointments pre bookable for weeks in advance. This healthcare will be diluted further. Living in Whitworth if A&E treatment is required which is often a life or death situation your chances of survival are reduced add more traffic on market street and your chance of survival diminishes further - - The people who live in Whitworth , live here because it is a village , it is quiet and the countryside is on the door step. Yet the plans want to destroy the village life, increase demands on existing services and increase pollution - - To consider building on greenbelt land in Whitworth is unbelievable and irresponsible, Planning has already - spoil the view of the countryside at the side of Daneswood ave and the wind farms are also affecting the views and countryside. - - Whitworth has lots of wildlife from deer, owls, herons, wild ponies as well as lots of insect life butterflies, bees etc which will all be at risk if the countryside is used for housing. - - There is empty housing all over the borough - fill these , not build more especially in our little village -		Stop putting profits first and put existing residents first
796	Steven	Smith	Wagg		Object	Already an overcrowded infrastructure..object to greenbelt land being used and local wildlife being destroyed.the proposed site on horsefield av site would be built under or very near electricity pylons.the roads or already overused to and from whitworth so more traffic will mean longer delays on worse roads.the schools and doctors are already full..more traffic passing tonacliffe primary school would endanger the pupils at school opening and closing.previous mining at tonacliffe makes the proposed site unsuitable for building on.the transportation of heavy plant will damage the roads.		Don't use greenbelt land and build somewhere else.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
797	Louise	Madden	-		Object	<p>1. The roads around Horsefield Ave are already extremely busy at school times, parking is a increasingly growing concern and the impact of more traffic around this are is quite worrying. My son attends this school and I see first hand how dangerous the current situation is without adding more traffic to the mix. - 2. I live on Market St which is the main thoroughfare from Rochdale to Bacup. We are often gridlocked (especially when there are road closures / traffic lights in the area). As an example, myself and my son often 'play a game' about how many cars pass us before we can pull out into traffic. Our record is 122 cars without a break in traffic. This road was never intended to take this level of traffic, what impact would this have on the already poor level of public transport. - 3. The proposed site is on greenbelt land, which the government is supposedly protecting. What would happen to the wildlife currently in this area, not only during the building process but also the higher level of pollution around this area. - 4. Amenities are already stretched, almost every month there are some works being done to water, electric, gas etc. would further impact these services. Tonacliffe Road has been dug up every winter for the last few years due to burst pipes, this situation won't improve with increased usage and traffic. -</p>		<p>There are several proposed housing sites in Whitworth, and in general I object to them all. This is due to the infrastructure of the valley already at breaking point. - Due to only one road in / one road out, Market St is often gridlocked at peak times. 4 years ago, there was a bad accident outside our house. Due to this, the road was closed for 3 hours, this meant a diversion, either back through Bacup through Littleborough or through Rawtenstall / Bury. Increased traffic through the whole valley is just putting further pressure on the valley. - We often have temporary traffic lights on this main road, as our current facilities (water / gas / electric etc) struggle to cope with demand. Have this services been contacted, are any plans to improve their facilities - again this will lead to further problems already highlighted. - Our doctors / dentists are already fully loaded (I know this through hearsay as I am a patient at surgeries in Rochdale). I often hear complaints about the amount of time it takes to see a doctor. - - I feel that major improvements need to be made to the current infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with the current population, adding to this is just putting so much pressure on an already failing situation.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
803	Marietta	Galbraith	-		Object	<p>My objections for the proposed building of housing on the above sites is based on a number of reasons: - 1. Infrastructure. The current housing situation is already at (possibly beyond) capacity with regards to schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists, employment and traffic. There are no more schools planned and no way to expand the ones already here. Some children have to travel miles to schools out of the area due to oversubscribed local schools. This is the same for doctor's surgeries and many other amenities. - 2. Traffic. There is one main road in and out of Whitworth that already has issues with raised levels of traffic. In the four years we have lived here, there have been many occasions where traffic has been an issue due to constant roadworks (for various reasons relating to increased housing and traffic) which has caused major problems. Also, most people are employed outside of Whitworth so traffic is high anyway. More housing would increase this issue with no solution being given as to how it could be rectified. - 3. Utilities. More and more power cuts have been happening recently in Whitworth due to new housing as well as burst water pipes and problems with drainage. This has contributed to the traffic issues with roads having to be dug up every few weeks to 'fix' the problem. - 4. More housing would mean taking up land that is natural drainage for flooding. Recently, my area was put into the 'flood risk' category (although we haven't flooded), significantly increasing my home insurance. If more homes are built, this would increase risk of flooding to many homes around Whitworth, which would cause loss of market value and would reduce the chances of being able to sell the property. - 5. Much of the 'green land' would be lost which is detrimental to the wildlife around Whitworth. The Government have a duty to protect greenbelt land and our environment! The carbon footprint would be horrific! - In conclusion, building over 300 houses in Whitworth would cause issues beyond repair! Environment, traffic, pollution, infrastructure, drainage etc. would all be dramatically affected in the most negative and damaging way. Whitworth was not meant for so much housing and so many people.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
852	Christine	O'Malley	-		Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed housing sites 'to the land east of Tonacliffe School' 68 houses and 'site off Horsefield Avenue, Tonacliffe' 52 houses. I live at number one Tonacliffe Way and I have a birds eye view of how congested the traffic is on Tonacliffe Way and Tonacliffe Road. This is especially serious when in the mornings, afternoons and evenings when the school is open. Cars park on the pavement forcing pedestrians including those with prams and young children into the road and oncoming traffic. When the cars park on either side of the road only one car can pass up the road at once causing congestion, chaos and a very dangerous situation. Rossendale Council recognised this a couple of years ago by adding double yellow lines on both sides of the road. This hasn't reduced the traffic risk as drivers ignore the restrictions and park on the lines every day. Occasionally the local enforcement officer drives round and gives parking tickets but it's not often enough to put off drivers parking wherever they want on the restricted areas. If the proposed 120 new houses are approved in the Tonacliffe area then this situation will be magnified and put the children and parents lives in more risk of an accident. - Outside of school times there are many drivers who do not abide to the 20 mile an hour speed restriction and as far as I'm aware no-one has been fined for going over this speed limit. - There is also the problem of accommodating the new children that these houses would bring into local schools. All the schools in this area are over subscribed and could mean children having to travel a long way from home to attend a primary school. This would then increase the traffic in and out of Whitworth. The infrastructure can only just accommodate the current traffic flow if all the local housing plans are approved then the main road in and out of Whitworth would grind to a halt including the emergency services that would not be able to pass through. - The local GP practices can't expand any further and new developments would increase the demand for accessing gp services. Many residents would then be put off trying to access the local health services and would potentially increase the risk of early intervention of health conditions in local residents and increase pressure and spend on hospital services and specialist care in local Health Authorities. - Other potential health problems would increase by building on green belt land by not allowing residents to enjoy the beautiful land that surrounds Tonacliffe. Walking has been proven by many health professionals as having a positive impact on our health and reducing the access to this land would discourage many residents of doing this cost free exercise. - On the many walks I have done on this green belt land around Tonacliffe I have seen lots of different wildlife including badgers, deer, rabbits and squirrels. Building the 120 new homes on this green belt will inevitably destroy the habitat for these animals. - During the last few years heavy rain fallen and has seen many houses flooded in this area. We are especially vulnerable at Tonacliffe as we are at the mid point on a hill side. The</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						moorland that is proposed for housing developments is currently soaking up a lot of the rain. If this land is developed on then this flood barrier will be removed and houses all over Tonacliffe will be susceptible to flooding.		
866	Robert	Atkinson	-		Object	I strongly oppose the proposed plan to build additional houses on the Greenfield site Horsefield Avenue. •The proposed build will overlook my property and as such will result in a loss of privacy. •Access to the the proposed development is restricted and increased traffic levels would cause unacceptable noise and congestion. •Unacceptable over development of the site. •Open aspect views of the countryside would be lost adversely affecting the residential amenity of neighbouring owners. •Generally the schools, medical centres, roads (namely Tonacliffe Road and Tonacliffe Way) and other amenities and infrastructure in Whitworth are unable to support further development. •Previous applications have been refused		No
873	Terence	Burke	N/A	HS2.106 HS2.109	Object	This location is heavily congested with traffic and can be extremely dangerous with speeding traffic. The Council have been helpful in a limited way with educational signs but the police have not shown much interest with speeding or illegal parking in the whitworth area. - There have been a number of accidents (some serious) and tonacliffe Rd is particularly hazardous because vehicles meet head on round a blind bend. - - The Idea that Whitworth will benefit commercially from development is illogical because of poor network links; at certain times it can take half an hour to reach Rochdale and longer to access the motorway, on days with roadworks it is considerably longer. - - Subsidence is also an issue. There are many mine shafts all around this area; there is one mine shaft at the top of High Peak Rd that has been capped with concrete. All the cottages on High Peak were miners cabins many years ago; my bungalow still has the cabin in the walls and roof space. - - The schools in Whitworth are already stretched with some local children having to travel out off the area. - - The local wildlife will suffer like the newts in the pond and the badgers and foxes in the area, although I don't think developers care much about wildlife, or about the local residents either. - If the proposed housing is to be built like the small houses leading up to Whitworth cemetery which looks like a prison block then the village is going down hill fast. Any development should be sympathetic to its local surroundings with both design and the existing social environment blending together. -		
886	Michael	Banham	-	HS2.102 to HS2.109	Object	The infrastructure of whitworth is over stretched as it is, the school's cannot cater for such an undertaking. There's only one road in or out of whitworth any problems on this road causes absolute mayhem. The winter months are an absolute nightmare just to get onto market street.		I cannot understand why anyone would want to over populate an area that is already struggling.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
889	Derek	Lord	-		Object	We in Whitworth are sure that there are enough houses here at the present time. There are large estates at Cowm Park, Tonacliffe, Wain Gap, Wallbank, Knot Hill, Orama Mill Site, Edgemoor Close, and a small estate at Facit. The exits onto the one main road are at present full of traffic. The Doctors, Schools etc are now at bursting point. We in Whitworth have done our share in housing. Please think again before building any more. Thank You. -	-	
892	Mandy	Sanderson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105,HS2.10 4, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2108, HS2.109	Object	The transport system around Whitworth cannot cope with the volume of traffic . Also local amenities are already at braking point..	No	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
899	Julie	Bywater	N/a	HS2.106 & HS2.109	Object	<p>The Tonacliffe area cannot take any more traffic. Tonacliffe way and Tonacliffe rd are dangerously congested especially at School times and the roads are full of pot holes due to the excess traffic. Additional traffic could be fatal to a child including my own. - - Both of these proposed areas have local wildlife including deer, badgers, foxes, hares, bats and newts. A family of deer is seen on a daily basis grazing on the moorland crescent site which is a wonderful site for residents and children to see these in their natural habitat. Building here will mean the loss of all this wildlife and their natural habitat. - - In addition as a resident that backs onto this land I can confirm that the land including my own back garden is flooded all year round. We have had drainage laid in our garden but this has not stopped the flooding and our garden is unusable all year round. Additional houses will mean less natural drainage and will cause a severe and dangerous flooding risk to all residents. There is a culvert that runs through the land which is always running water away from the houses however this is at bursting point every time there is even a bit of rain. - - We are regularly experiencing power cuts and burst water pipes impacting on this area. This causes roads to be dug up meaning horrendous tailbacks of traffic through Whitworth as far as shawforth. More houses will mean more frequent utility issues and therefore longer tailbacks due to the increase in population. The traffic is gridlocked down market st and Whitworth rd everyday! This small village simply cannot take any additional traffic, existing residents lives are already miserable enough sitting in this rush hour traffic everyday!! - - The schools and GP surgeries are oversubscribed, will there be new schools and GP surgeries built? The existing ones cannot take the amount of residents as it is. - - Finally, my husband and I purchased our house in 2010 due to the corner plot location. We wanted our children to grow up surrounded by nature and knew this was greenbelt land when we bought it. Greenbelt land used to mean something and was protected for a reason, we feel incredibly sad that it is even being considered to change the usage of this beautiful and natural landscape. From a financial point of view, if these houses go ahead the value of our house will decrease effectively putting us into negative equity. This will leave us unable to move to another area impacting on our children's upbringing significantly. If we had wanted to raise our children in the middle of a large housing estate we would have bought a house in one. The Human Rights Act, protocol 2, Article 1 states that 'a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land'. -</p>		Please please rethink these plans, there are better and more appropriate areas to build than this saturated village.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
901	Adam	Bywater	N/a		Object	<p>The Tonacliffe area cannot take any more traffic. Tonacliffe way and Tonacliffe rd are dangerously congested especially at School times and the roads are full of pot holes due to the excess traffic. Additional traffic could be fatal to a child including my own. - - Both of these proposed areas have local wildlife including deer, badgers, foxes, hares, bats and newts. A family of deer is seen on a daily basis grazing on the moorland crescent site which is a wonderful site for residents and children to see these in their natural habitat. Building here will mean the loss of all this wildlife and their natural habitat. - - In addition as a resident that backs onto this land I can confirm that the land including my own back garden is flooded all year round. We have had drainage laid in our garden but this has not stopped the flooding and our garden is unusable all year round. Additional houses will mean less natural drainage and will cause a severe and dangerous flooding risk to all residents. There is a culvert that runs through the land which is always running water away from the houses however this is at bursting point every time there is even a bit of rain. - - We are regularly experiencing power cuts and burst water pipes impacting on this area. This causes roads to be dug up meaning horrendous tailbacks of traffic through Whitworth as far as shawforth. More houses will mean more frequent utility issues and therefore longer tailbacks due to the increase in population. The traffic is gridlocked down market st and Whitworth rd everyday! This small village simply cannot take any additional traffic, existing residents lives are already miserable enough sitting in this rush hour traffic everyday!! - - The schools and GP surgeries are oversubscribed, will there be new schools and GP surgeries built? The existing ones cannot take the amount of residents as it is. - - Finally, my wife and I purchased our house in 2010 due to the corner plot location. We wanted our children to grow up surrounded by nature and knew this was greenbelt land when we bought it. Greenbelt land used to mean something and was protected for a reason, we feel incredibly sad that it is even being considered to change the usage of this beautiful and natural landscape. From a financial point of view, if these houses go ahead the value of our house will decrease effectively putting us into negative equity. This will leave us unable to move to another area impacting on our children's upbringing significantly. If we had wanted to raise our children in the middle of a large housing estate we would have bought a house in one. The Human Rights Act, protocol 2, Article 1 states that 'a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land'. -</p>		No
911	Julie	Latham	-		Object	<p>In principle I don't object to more houses or people. However I will until I am convinced that the planners are committed to the infrastructure improvements required to support the extra influx of people and cars . - The main bottlenecks caused by Whitwo</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
912	Amanda	Greenwood	-	HS2.106 and HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a beautiful and unspoilt village. It has a fantastic community and is supported by one local secondary school and three Primary schools. There is one road in and out; and traffic is usually busy. I live in the Tonacliffe part of Whitworth and with school runs and work commutes etc, we already see enough traffic. The various proposals for housing developments in the area are ludicrous. They are proposing building a further 359 houses that will cause more problems with already oversubscribed schools, more local traffic, more pressure on already stretched services such as doctors and not forgetting what this will do to a stunning area of natural beauty.		No.
913	Michelle	Ashcroft	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108 & HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a geographical challenge at the best of times, positioned in a valley, consisting of ONE main road with multiple roads stemming from this leading to many properties that are built on the hillside. There are many green areas which are used by local farmers for their livestock. During times of heavy rain many of the roads are flooded, and during winter many roads are very dangerous in the snow. It is not uncommon for Whitworth to be gridlocked as there are far too many cars on the roads, all it needs is one set of road works and the town becomes inaccessible. The local schools are now over subscribed, the High school has had to turn away many children who only live a couple of miles away. The primary schools are also subscribed making it very difficult for teachers to provide a good education to the children. The local doctors are unable to cope with the number of patients, trying to get a same day appointment is nigh on impossible these days. We have issues with anti social behaviour due to lack of amenities available for teenagers, the local youth club has been closed down. There is a lack of police presence (the PSCO tries her best), people don't feel as safe as they should. The library is still under threat of closure, the pool is only open because of the people of Whitworth who run it. Building more houses brings more people, more cars, more strain on the infrastructure. I appreciate housing is needed but the number of houses that has been suggested will bring this town to it's knees.		
916	Jane	Trudgeon	-	HS2.102 HS2.105 HS2.104 HS2.106 HS2.107 HS2.108 HS2.109	Object	We are already an overstretched village infrastructure, the roads would not cope with an extra amount of traffic and would make the already difficult commute to exit/enter the village impossible. There are not enough schools nor would the doctor's surgery be able to cope as even now it is almost impossible to get a reasonable appointment time, - - The housing developments would impact on wildlife		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
918	Marion	Ashworth	-	HS2.107 , ALL.	Object	I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.		I object to all proposed planing in Whitworth, if these house are built Whitworth will not be a good place to live, Dr's and schools are full to bursting, the roads will be gridlocked they are now at busy times, the wildlife we are very lucky to have will have their habitats decimated, please NO more houses in Whitworth.
922	Susan	Percy	-	HS.2107 HS2.106 HS2.109	Object	I wish to object to the proposed building developments on the grounds that there is one route into and out of this village which is Market Street. This route is already very congested during morning and evening rush hour and also due to school runs at other times of the day. This is compounded by the many times that the roads are being dug up for roadworks and temporary traffic lights in situ. - - Increased traffic would be an issue for children that play in these areas. - - Schools are also over subscribed in this area and additional parking outside schools would make a bad situation even worse and dangerous. - - Doctors surgeries and Dentists are also full and additional patients would mean longer waiting times to get appointments and would be detrimental for the health and well being of local people. - - Building on green belt would result in loss of wildlife e.g newts, badgers, foxes and hares. Deer use shelter within these areas and it would be detrimental to them if they lost this facility. - - Drainage is a major issue - loss of more greenbelt would make this worse as we already have problems. There is a culvert runs through the middle of Tonacliffe which takes land drain water off the moors this is already near bursting point and we could be in danger of severe flooding. - - Has a land survey been undertaken? Some of these sites would be unsuitable for building on.		-
935	Christine	Fallon		HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	1 Whitworth has one main road which is often gridlocked the smaller access roads are grossly un suitable e.g Tonacliffe. - 2 Schools are already oversubscribed parking at drop off times would be more chaotic and dangerous. - 3 Doctors and dentists are already at capacity. - 4 Services of gas electricity and water would require major upgrade. - 5 We are seeing flooding due to inadequate drainage this would be increased. - 6 Is this acceptable use of greenbelt land where previous planning permission has been refused the effect on wildlife and trees would be immense.		-
939	Geoffrey	Fallon	-	HS2.102 HS2.104. HS2.106 HS2.107. HS2.108. HS2.109	Object	Whitworth is a small village with one already inadequate road. Doctors dentists and schools are already oversubscribed parking in school areas is dangerous already and would be far worse. - Gas electricity and water services would need major upgrade. - This is inappropriate use of greenbelt land causing damage to wildlife and the environment drainage is a major problem now with frequent flooding.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
944	N/A	N/A	Britannia Hotels Limited		Support	Allocation of land at Horsefield Avenue, Tonacliffe for housing development is welcomed and supported by the landowner. This support relates to Local Plan site reference HS2.109.		No
955	Janet	Whitehead	-		Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village, oversubscribed schools and Doctors - We have one road in and one road out which is almost impossible during peak times in the morning - The houses already exceed the heights up the sides of the valley - Our green belt is very important to wildlife and the the people the live here - If we let one builder onto greenbelt it opens the doors to far too many others - Our population is big enough and we cannot accommodate many more		Our Councillors are voted in by us and now need to stand up and fight for us - - 400 houses is a ridiculous amount of new houses for a tiny village - - We have had 2 different sites where new houses have been built in recent years we've done our bit for Government figures - - Please find somewhere else
962	Kathryn	Gill	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2104, HS2106, HS2107, HS2108, HS2109	Object	I object to any changes in use of local greenbelt land to build houses. Also, there is only one road through Whitworth and it is already congested. We have only 1 doctors surgery, and not enough school places to accommodate hundreds of additional families. Greenbelt land cannot be restored once built on, and these proposals would change the landscape of Whitworth. I am also concerned about the building of 20 properties around Cowm. This is a resource continually used for recreation by the people of Whitworth and should be preserved.		
979	Marie	Pye	-		Object	All of these developments will contribute to already existing traffic problems as there is one road in and one road out of the area. The high school is already oversubscribed with local children not being offered places.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
992	Susan	Farrell		HS2: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109	Object	I strongly object to the building of houses on all the above mentioned sites for the following reasons: - Greenbelt land is of importance to all the wildlife of Whitworth and Shawforth . Deer and bats live in the forests in the area. Many badgers and foxes inhabit the countryside and rare species of wildlife live in the ponds. - The forest area at Tonacliffe would be cut down having a negative impact on the environment. - Tonacliffe road is already dangerous for children with cars parked along the length of the road at school dropping off and picking up time. The increased number of cars if more houses were built in the area would be worse for the children and residents. - Local amenities such as dentists and GPs could not cope with the increased population. It is almost impossible at the moment to get a GP appointment in less than two weeks. More housing would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Whitworth and Shawforth. - Facilities such as water, gas and electricity are already stretched and a major upgrade of the infrastructure would be required to support increased housing. - Local drainage cannot cope with the current usage. More housing could have an impact on flooding. - Public footpaths could be lost reducing the number of rights of way for walkers. - The road network both ways from Rochdale to Bacup is already gridlocked. More housing would put an increased strain on traffic and the already poor public transport in the area. - The only high school in the area is already oversubscribed. With increased housing parents may have even less chance of a first choice school for their children. They may have to travel miles to school. - I understood it is government policy to protect Greenbelt land except for 'Exceptional Circumstances'. What are the exceptional circumstances that enable housing to be built on the greenbelt land in Whitworth and Shawforth?		Summary - - Whitworth and Shawforth are already busy villages with oversubscribed schools and GP services with one road in and out between Rochdale and Bacup. - - Can we accommodate more housing that will put pressure on already overstretched amenities, increase traffic and change the beautiful landscape forever?
1000	carol	Thomson	-		Object	I object to the amount of houses that will be built affecting the countryside. Are there any more schools being built to accommodate?		
1011	Paul	Williams	-		Object	Gardens already liable to flooding. Parking is a nightmare. Schools already full. - Traffic through Whitworth centre gridlocked most rush hours.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1025	Warren	Madden	-		Object	<p>1. The roads around Horsefield Ave are already extremely busy at school times, parking is a increasingly growing concern and the impact of more traffic around this are is quite worrying. My son attends this school and I see first hand how dangerous the current situation is without adding more traffic to the mix. - 2. I live on Market St which is the main thoroughfare from Rochdale to Bacup. We are often gridlocked (especially when there are road closures / traffic lights in the area). This road was never intended to take this level of traffic, what impact would this have on the already poor level of public transport. - 3. The proposed site is on greenbelt land, which the government is supposedly protecting. What would happen to the wildlife currently in this area, not only during the building process but also the higher level of pollution around this area. - 4. Amenities are already stretched, almost every month there are some works being done to water, electric, gas etc. would further impact these services. Tonacliffe Road has been dug up every winter for the last few years due to burst pipes, this situation won't improve with increased usage and traffic. -</p>		<p>There are several proposed housing sites in Whitworth, and in general I object to them all. This is due to the infrastructure of the valley already at breaking point. - Due to only one road in / one road out, Market St is often gridlocked at peak times. 4 years ago, there was a bad accident outside our house. Due to this, the road was closed for 3 hours, this meant a diversion, either back through Bacup through Littleborough or through Rawtenstall / Bury. Increased traffic through the whole valley is just putting further pressure on the valley. - We often have temporary traffic lights on this main road, as our current facilities (water / gas / electric etc) struggle to cope with demand. Have this services been contacted, are any plans to improve their facilities - again this will lead to further problems already highlighted. - Our doctors / dentists are already fully loaded (I know this through hearsay as I am a patient at surgeries in Rochdale). I often hear complaints about the amount of time it takes to see a doctor. - - I feel that major improvements need to be made to the current infrastructure in Whitworth to cope with the current population, adding to this is just putting so much pressure on an already failing situation. -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1029	Angela	Hannam	-		Object	1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? -7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.		
1035	Nadeen	Whitworth	-	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	The schools and gp surgeries are already at capacity in this area. - - Floods already around Tonacliffe areas and beyond. - - Traffic to and from Rochdale is horrendous, the road cannot cope with anymore traffic. Especially when there are roadworks. - - Badgers, foxes, owls and hares have been seen on the fields also we believe there are old coaling mines around the area. - - There have already been new houses built Hall fold, new line and bacup we do not need anymore affecting our countryside and wildlife. -		Why are you destroying the lovely countryside and wildlife we have left. You need to look at renovating abandoned building before new builds.
1037	Derick	Whitworth	-	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	The schools and gp surgeries are already at capacity in the area. - - Floods around Tonacliffe areas and beyond. - - Traffic to and from Rochdale in horrendous the road cannot cope with anymore traffic especially when there are roadworks. - - Badgers, Foxes, owls and hares live in this area and their homes are protected. There is historic coal mining in the area of HS2.109. - - There have already been new houses built at hall fold, new line, bacup and shawclough. We do not need any more new built houses affecting our countryside and wildlife. - - The area is also used for recreation by local children especially when it has snowed.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1038	Brenda	Whitworth	-	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	The schools and gp surgeries are already at capacity in the area. - - Floods around Tonacliffe areas and beyond. - - Traffic to and from Rochdale in horrendous the road cannot cope with anymore traffic especially when there are roadworks. - - Badgers, Foxes, owls and hares live in this area and their homes are protected. There is historic coal mining in the area of HS2.109. - - There have already been new houses built at hall fold, new line, bacup and shawclough. We do not need any more new built houses affecting our countryside and wildlife. - - The area is also used for recreation by local children especially when it has snowed.	-	
1039	Derick	Whitworth	-	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	The schools and gp surgeries are already at capacity in the area. - - Floods around Tonacliffe areas and beyond. - - Traffic to and from Rochdale in horrendous the road cannot cope with anymore traffic especially when there are roadworks. - - Badgers, Foxes, owls and hares live in this area and their homes are protected. There is historic coal mining in the area of HS2.109. - - There have already been new houses built at hall fold, new line, bacup and shawclough. We do not need any more new built houses affecting our countryside and wildlife. - - The area is also used for recreation by local children especially when it has snowed.	-	
1072	David	Thomson	-	HS2.106 HS2.109	Object	No infrastructure. For more houses .The destruction of trees and to our wildlife which is ever growing of all kinds of animals .Traffic problems which there already is without more vehicles adding to it and also spoiling a beautifull countryside !!!!!!!!!!!		Not right now !!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1107	Keith	Hannam	-	HS2 102; HS2 103; HS2 104; HS2 105; HS2 106; HS2 107; HS2 108; HS2 109	Object	<p>1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 2. GP services and other related support services are already overstretched and inadequate. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. 5. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 6. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 7. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 7.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 7.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 7.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 8. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		
1109	Jane	Gadsby	-		Object	<p>I wholly object to more housing being built in Whitworth!! We are a small(ish) village that can not cope already with the amount of new houses and people moving into it!! Our schools are already over subscribed; they are turning people away that don't live overly far away that a few years ago would have had no problem getting a place. The Doctors surgery can't cope with the number of patients wanting appointments. You are also increasing the risks of flooding. My house is already at risk and has already flooded twice. The main road (one road in and out) is gridlocked most mornings with commuters trying to get out of the village but most of all you are taking our beautiful green areas that Whitworth is so lucky and honoured to have. We have lots of empty properties that can't be filled already!! Please leave us and our village alone!!</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1118	Gary	Calderbank	-		Object	<p>There are a great number of reasons why Whitworth township should not be blighted with further development, particularly on land which has been designated as green belt for a large number of years. I wish to summarise these as below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Traffic - Whitworth is served by one road from both the north and south and is a major arterial route to people accessing the m62 and surrounding towns from the valley, Burnley and beyond. It is therefore very busy all of the time without even considering the effect of increasing local traffic even further. This route is regularly disrupted as a result of failing infrastructure resulting in severe delays and tailbacks. - - Schools - The existing schools in the town are already over subscribed and there is no capacity for further children without again significant development of schools. The road where I live is already gridlocked by vehicles dropping off children twice a day, illegally parked and causing obstructions. In relation to developments at Tonacliffe and Horsefield the thought of construction traffic too would be completely unmanageable and dangerous. Further development would exacerbate the problem. - - Policing - Whitworth already suffers from insufficient community policing resulting in many issues which do not get resolved, from burglary to bad behaviour and fly tipping. The town can not afford a further increase of population on this scale bringing with it its percentage of problems. - - Planning Policy - Brown Field Sites - Whitworth and the valley in general is a town built on industrial heritage and just like other cities should be primarily developing brownfield developments not green belt. There are many derelict spaces which can be developed to improve the area whilst providing suitable additional housing. There is no real justification for building on moorland in lieu of this. - - Construction Difficulties - Much of Whitworth moorland is unsuitable to build on, primarily due to poor access to the developments earmarked, mine shafts, poorly drained ground, sloping sites, poor infrastructure, marshland and biodiversity issues. - - Biodiversity - The land surrounding Whitworth is a haven for many wild animals which can be seen on a daily basis. From our house we can regularly observe, a family of foxes, badgers, deer, birds of prey, pipistrelle bats, cows, horses and sheep. This is a gift without price. - - Infrastructure - We regularly have power cuts, water bursts and the A671 is constantly being dug up as existing services are updated resulting in major delays. The drains in our road are currently running 24/7 as a result of water run off off the moors even when it has not rained for a number of days. When it does rain the water backs up out of the covers as the drains are undersize and cannot cope. This would be totally unsuitable for further development, especially considering a greater amount of hard surfacing. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1127	William	Calderbank	Tonacliffe Resident	HS2.109 & HS2.106	Object	I understand that for some people in this day and age, the natural beauty of the countryside may not seem important or significant in perspective to more immediate problems. I have lived in Whitworth my whole life and have spent almost 22 years surrounded by the wonders of the open fields, hills, and moors. I may be a "Millennial" but that does not mean that I can not appreciate more than just technology, growing up the moors behind Tonacliffe was my playground, where my siblings, friends, neighbour children and I would all play using nothing but our imaginations and the local natural environment for entertainment. However, I am no longer a child but an adult who has learned to appreciate the peaceful and pleasing aesthetic of the natural land for what it is. For 3 years I lived away from home and attended Nottingham Trent University and had to endure living in the cramped hustle and bustle of the inner city, fast-paced, noisy and dismally grey in comparison to my life back home and the tranquil green of the countryside. - Whilst studying at university my family got a dog named Todd, He is a young "Staffy" (which if you know dogs, are one of the most athletic and playful breeds). For nearly 3 years he also has had the privilege of being raised with the moorland behind Tonacliffe as his playground. The moors offer him long leisurely local walks from Brown Wardle Hill, Healey Stones and Healey Fisheries, a safe place to play and explore (to satisfy his inquisitive nature). He may be a dog, yet the destruction of this land not only affects people but the pets of locals. - It seems to be quite incomprehensible to understand that with all the fuss the last few years over recycling and saving the planet that you blatantly wish to outright destroy the natural environment, destroying the habitats of hundreds of multiple species of plants, insects and animals in order to create more houses in an already overpopulated village.		-
1134	Abigail	Leyland	-		Object	WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE HOUSING IN WHITWORTH! The schools are already oversubscribed, our local doctors can not possibly take on any more patients as it is already a struggle to get an appointment currently. We only have one road in and out of the village which gets badly effected by rush hour traffic, making it difficult for the locals to get to work/school etc. We have such a lovely view of greenery surrounding our little village and we do not want our sight ruined by building ugly, unnecessary housing.		
1152	angela	Jordan	-		Object	I do not think whitworth has enough resources to sustain further housing estates .The one and only road is already impossible at peak times,our doctors surgery is bursting with no appointments,and our school children cant get a place at our local school. - The wildlife is also important to whitwoth people but is being pushed further and further out of its natural habitat.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1153	Katie	Offley	-		Object	The proposed site is directly behind my house where me and my family have lived for nearly 15 years. Building on the area behind the houses on Tonacliffe Way will not only completely take away the amazing view that we all have but will increase the traffic flow on the roads near by which is already an issue when The school at the bottom of the street is open.	-	
1166	Brendan	Doherty	-	HS2, 102,104,108,105 ,107,106,109.	Object	WHITWORTH IS FULL. This statement encapsulates all the issues surrounding any expansion of dwelling houses in the township of Whitworth. - - The negative impact of any developments in the town cannot be overstated. - - The whole nature of this small township will be irreversibly destroyed if development are allowed. - - Flora and fauna will be the first to suffer. This valley is home to an exceptional and expanding variety of animals and trees and flowers. This growth has taken decades to achieve and would by totally reversed by the stroke of a pen. - - To say that all the ingredients which go to make up Whitworth as a place for people to live are overloaded is indeed an understatement. - - Congestion of traffic and people is at its limit, any increase can only be detrimental to the health and quality of life of residents. - - Local services, schools, doctors, civic amenities are already at their serviceable optimum. - - The existing utilities of electricity,gas and water only just maintain service. There are often cuts in these making it seem that we are a third world town. - - Whitworth is a linear town with no bypass or possibility of such. Most of the day traffic is heavy and at peak times chaotic. This combined with the nature of HGV traffic leaves the roads in constant need of repair. Add a very poor public transport system and the certain increases proposed then the result is guaranteed to be disastrous.		Listen to the people of Whitworth.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1172	Racheal	Biggs	-	HS2.109 HS2.106	Object	<p>I would like to object to the building of more housing on this site for the following reasons: - 1. Due to existing school and it's growing numbers of families this has caused a significant increase in the amount of cars in the area and causes substantial problems with access and volume of traffic. If more houses were to be built in this area then i believe the impact on existing residents would be very concerning. We already have issues of safety for the children coming out of school and our resident children due to the large numbers of cars and road layout: Small streets, cul de sacs, one small road into the area, more cars would make an existing bottle-neck even worse. Increase in volume of traffic in such a small area is compromising the safety of these children and would have a negative affect on existing residents. - 2. Living in a semi rural environment means that we are able to enjoy the landscape and the wildlife within it. More houses in this area could potentially see the loss of not only tress but wildlife including.. Deer, badgers, foxes, protected species of pondlife, bats, owls and other birds. Increased noise pollution and construction in this area would see this wildlife disrupted and potentially at risk of harm. Over the last 15 years we have seen an increase in the wildlife and this adds to our rural environment that as residents we would like to continue to enjoy. Government policy is to protect Greenbelt areas except for 'exceptional circumstances'. Building in this area I believe would not be regarded as 'exceptional' and is not needed. - 3.In the past few years we have suffered from local flooding and have had many drains in the road flooding out due to poor drainage and excessive water. More building in this area is going to take away the moorland which I believe soaks up this excess water and helps prevent residential properties from being flooded. There is a culvert which runs through the middle of the proposed site and this helps with drainage, building would impact on this and create problems with local flooding. - 4. Infrastructure of the village is already stretched and schools, GP's, care homes etc are full to capacity making it increasingly difficult to access in its current state. Adding more houses to this area is going to create overcrowding and would have a negative effect on living standards of the residents of Whitworth. We have had over the past 3 years over 150 new houses built in the area which has impacted on school intake, making what i would consider local people, unable to access their chosen school and this will worsen with another 400 new homes in this area. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and increases in traffic will put a significant strain on transport. Any roadworks in our small village creates huge problems and the prospect of 400 more families which potentially equates to 800 more cars would be catastrophic. We have seen an increase in power cuts and water bursts over the last few years and I feel this may be due to the current addition of new housing with no improvement to existing infrastructure. Roads in and around Whitworth are in dire need of repair and this is getting</p>		<p>We understand the need for more housing in the borough but it was highlighted in a survey which was conducted in 2015 by Turley on behalf of Peel investments that the need was not in the East (Whitworth & Bacup) but more in the west (Helmshore & Haslingden). The current housing minister Sajid Javid has now pointed out in his September 2017 speech that we need to assess where that demand is and 'Nor does it impress local people who see their area taking on a huge number of new homes while a town on the other side of a local authority boundary barely expands at all'. I understand this means other local authorities but it is also true of our own authority. If you were to include the increase of new houses built in Whitworth and the overwhelming number of new houses built in Shawforth and Bacup, then take into account that those new residents may work in Rochdale then their only choice of route is through Whitworth... creating substantial pressure on the volume of traffic in the area. This factor must be a consideration when evaluating where Rossendale needs new housing.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						worse with each year. - In conclusion I believe that the council would be going against government policies on planning and Greenbelt conservation and would be affecting the human rights and 'the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land' - (Human Rights Act- Protocol 1, Article 1) of every single resident in this area and that you have a duty to respect the community and their welfare standards.		
1174	Timothy	Southwick	-	HS2.106- HS2.109	Object	Well for a start the fields and fishing lodges are habitat to many different types of wildlife and walking areas for many residents. There are deer regularly visiting the area, herons and swallows feeding from the insects from the ponds, as well as newts, frogs ect. There are badgers and birds of prey, Buzzards, sparrow hawks and kestrels. This is a nature reserve for many animals and an area of natural beauty. It would be preposterous to use this area for further development. - The traffic also seems to be at it worst its ever been, living at Tonacliffe I have experienced increasing problems with school traffic and serous wear to the surrounding roads. This Urban sprawl in whitworth gets worse year on year and the grid lock at the bottom of Whitworth Road and Shawclough Road is soul destroying in the mornings. Even on my street parking and disputes are becoming a issue and tempers on the roads are increasing, so instead of thinking about revenue and development, maybe try thinking about the consequences and Highway compatibility first. People are not happy with the traffic getting out of Whitworth in the mornings and the grid lock at Rochdale Junctions. So with regards to future Local plan, do not regard Whitworth as an appropriate village for increasing housing, Whitworth will gain a reputation as a place not to come and live, reducing housing prices due to the dense population and unable to get to work in the mornings. -		Develop nearer the motorways and not small inadequate villages.
1190	Nathan	Worrall	-	HS2.107 , HS2.108, HS2.109, HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104,HS2.106	Object	Whitworth doesn't have the infrastructure to sustain the construction of these - new houses. The local doctors and schools would struggle to meet the needs of the increased population. There is bad traffic in Whitworth already, this will only make it worse and these traffic problems are highlighted when there are roadworks and there are large queues. The proposed sites are located on greenbelt land, and this will have a negative effect on the local wildlife as well as destroying the natural beauty of this land.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1260	Rita	Banham	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife - There are Deer and Badgers (which are protected) - According to The government planning policy statement Protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - 2. Newts living in ponds, bats nests in the forrest, foxes and hares. - - 3. Loss of Trees - - 4. Increased traffic could cause further danger to children. The impact of more cars passing through could be fatal. Parking around this area is already a concern - increased traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - 5. A culvert runs through the middle of the tonacliffe proposed site which takes drain water off the moors - this is already at near bursting point when there is heavy rain. If this site goes a head I worry we are at danger of flooding, - - 6. landscaping - the site is geographically unsuitable for housing. The features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. Has a land survey been done?? - - 7. Local Amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already full. Building would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. - - 9. If access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs - this would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - - 10. it is government policy to protect greenbelt areas except for "exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances? - - 11. Local drainage cannot cope with the useage now - more residents would put an unbearable strain on this network. - - 12. A public footpath (right of way) could be lost. - - 13. Loss of privacy. - - 14. Increased noise pollution - the area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents. Building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - -</p>		<p>We highly protest against this building development. Our community is already under enough pressure and the safety of our children does not need to be compromised any further by incremental traffic, especially the roads leading up to Moorland Crescent via Tonacliffe road the traffic is already too dangerous.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1262	Roland	banham	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife - There are Deer and Badgers (which are protected) - According to The government planning policy statement Protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - 2. Newts living in ponds, bats nest in the forrest, foxes and hares. - - 3. Loss of Trees - - 4. Increased traffic could cause further danger to children. The impact of more cars passing through could be fatal. Parking around this area is already a concern - increased traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - 5. A culvert runs through the middle of the tonacliffe proposed site which takes drain water off the moors - this is already at near bursting point when there is heavy rain. If this site goes a head I worry we are at danger of flooding, - - 6. landscaping - the site is geographically unsuitable for housing. The features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. Has a land survey been done?? - - 7. Local Amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already full. Building would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. - - 9. If access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs - this would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - - 10. it is government policy to protect greenbelt areas except for "exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances? - - 11. Local drainage cannot cope with the useage now - more residents would put an unbearable strain on this network. - - 12. A public footpath (right of way) could be lost. - - 13. Loss of privacy. - - 14. Increased noise pollution - the area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents. Building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - -</p>		<p>I highly object to the proposed building work at Moorland Crescent and Horsefield avenue. - - Our children do not need to be put in any further danger from increased traffic. - - The Wildlife needs to be protected along with the elderly. - - Any building work on these areas will cause too much damage to our wildlife and land. - -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1265	Jade	Toolan	-		Object	<p>1. Wildlife - There are Deer and Badgers (which are protected) - According to The government planning policy statement Protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - 2. Newts living in ponds, bats nest in the forrest, foxes and hares. - - 3. Loss of Trees - - 4. Increased traffic could cause further danger to children. The impact of more cars passing through could be fatal. Parking around this area is already a concern - increased traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - 5. A culvert runs through the middle of the tonacliffe proposed site which takes drain water off the moors - this is already at near bursting point when there is heavy rain. If this site goes a head I worry we are at danger of flooding, - - 6. landscaping - the site is geographically unsuitable for housing. The features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. Has a land survey been done?? - - 7. Local Amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already full. Building would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. - - 9. If access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs - this would endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - - 10. it is government policy to protect greenbelt areas except for "exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances? - - 11. Local drainage cannot cope with the useage now - more residents would put an unbearable strain on this network. - - 12. A public footpath (right of way) could be lost. - - 13. Loss of privacy. - - 14. Increased noise pollution - the area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents. Building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - -</p>		<p>I highly object to the proposed building site on Moorland Crescent and Horsefield Avenue. - There are a number of Deer and Badgers living where the proposed site is due to be built. Government policy states our wildlife is to be protected. Please advise what justifies destroying their homes? - Increased traffic is extremely concerning with roads already grid locked now. Children's safety is also a major concern. - - The privacy of home on Moorland Crescent will be imposed. - -</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1266	Will	Biggs	-	HS2.106, HS2.109	Object	1) Impact of more traffic around Tonacliffe area- we have limited routes in and out of Tonacliffe and particularly around school times it suffers with congestion already- this will be compounded by a further increase. There will be more risk to safety of children walking to/from school due to increase in traffic and local parking - There is only two routes into the village from Rochdale and one out towards Bacup that will suffer with the additional traffic.. - 2) Local schools, doctors and dentists are already at capacity and increased housing will create issues with services being compromised without further provision. - 3) Would expect facilities such as Water, electric and gas to need further uplift to support this - I have witnessed a number of water leaks on Tonacliffe recently as well as power cuts over the years- will our services cope with the additional demand for these proposals - 4) Loss of trees and wildlife on the green belt- This will impact our environment and need for our wildlife habitats. - 5) Many children play on the local area around Moorland Crescent & Tonacliffe way (Cottesmore Close, Horsefield Ave, Bell Isle etc) and more through traffic from the new estates will create further risk of injury or even fatality		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1272	Michala	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.105, HS2.104, HS2.106, HS102.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	I am objecting in general to the proposed house building in various sites around Whitworth and specifically in relation to the proposed sites t Tonacliffe. My objections are based on a number of reasons: 1. Wildlife in the local area. Deer, badgers, foxes and hares live within the forest areas. Rare protected newts live in the pond. Bats nest in the forest. The importance in f this green belt land for the wildlife cannot be over emphasised. - 2. Tonacliffe forest would need to be cut down adversely affecting the local environment. - 3. The impact of more cars around local schools, especially Tonacliffe School, is of great concern due to the already high volume of traffic. Increasing this would be unacceptable. - 4. Local amenities such as schools, doctors, dentists are already to capacity. I have concerns that more houses will have a negative impact on the lives of current residents in relation to these amenities. - 5. Has the infrastructure of our small village been considered in relation to electricity, gas and water supply if more houses are built? Whitworth already experiences power cuts and seems to be worse since other recent building developments have been completed. - 6. The road network into Rochdale is already gridlocked. More houses will increase this problem. Public transport from Whitworth is limited to buses and I consider that if this proposed building goes ahead there will also be a negative impact on the poor public transport in and out of our village. - 7. Local drainage already struggles to cope with usage now, if the volume of residents increases would the drainage system be able to deal with the added strain? - 8. We bought our property because it is located on the last cul de sac of a small estate with no through traffic. This proposed building work will completely alter this into drive through roads. Plus the volume of traffic will - Increase which I consider to be unacceptable. - 9. I am very concerned that we may have loss of privacy as we are not currently overlooked and this was a major consideration when we bought our house.	-	
1283	Jonathan	Geldard	-	HS2.102, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	Whitworths infrastructure is already at near full capacity. The single main road through Whitworth is, at times, grid-locked. Streets around the primary schools is chaotic. There is a definite flood issue through the valley. Chime is rising unchallenged. The rich and diverse wildlife is flourishing around Whitworth. - Any of the development projects would have a negative and detrimental implication on Whitworth and it's residents.	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1298	Carol	Williams	-	HS2.109 Horsefield Avenue	Object	<p>Infrastructure is inadequate already without more houses being built. Primary schools are already over subscribed along with the local High School. Dentists and doctors are full and with more houses this would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - Facilities such as water, electric and gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We suffer from low water pressure and power cuts as it is. The road through the valley is often gridlocked and adding more houses would just add to the existing problems. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic and rush hour is already a nightmare. - If access is required via Horsefield Avenue, a quiet cul d sac thus making this road a drone through this would endanger the lives of residents especially young children. The roads are already littered with parked cars due to the local school, getting through is near on impossible at school opening and closing times. The area is already very dangerous for the children. Local residents regularly voice their concerns. Loss of privacy, my house would be overlooked by the new builds and suffer a potential loss of light. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now and extra residents would put too much strain on this network. Increased noise pollution on a quiet cul d sac - this area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - Wildlife - this is green belt land and is of great importance yo local wildlife. We have deer, badgers, foxes and Hares, rare newts in the pond and bats. What will happen to the culvert that runs through the middle of the proposed site? This is already near to busting point when we have heavy rain. The loss of trees would also have a negative effect on our local environment. The safety of local residents would be put at risk with all the additional cars/traffic especially off Tonacliffe. Some of the areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife.</p>		<p>I believe the council is going against the Government policies on planning and green belt conservation - - A high level of protection should be given to most valued landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. - - I object to the policy itself and the proposed housing developments on individual sites mentioned namely HS2.109 Horsefield Avenue, HS2.106 Moorland Crescent, HS2.102 king Street and HS2.104 Quarry Street</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1302	Tegan	Calderbank	Student	HS2.109 and HS2.106	Object	<p>How would you describe England's land? Green? My favourite part of growing up was running and playing on the vast fields that my house backs onto. The fields around Tonacliffe are scattered with wildflowers of all kinds the variations of grasses, shrubs and flowers helps expand the biodiversity of the land. - - When I heard of the plan to build houses on the green belt land surrounding Tonacliffe I was shocked, appalled and disgusted at the notion of it. How could anyone possibly want to destroy the habitats of countless animals? It made me think of the precious memories I have of the land, from of watching fox cubs play fight with each other, to seeing deer graze in the fields, watching a fawn prance through the grass, or bucks play fight. Rabbits have burrows in the hillside and there is no better sight than watching them feast on the lush grass in spring. Badgers make tracks in the grass, tracks that tell you a story. - - If you build houses on this land these animals will have nowhere to live, Doe will have nowhere to feed their fawns or watch them grow, Rabbits have nowhere to burrow, Foxes have nowhere to raise their cubs and Badgers cannot make their journey along the tracks they made to get food. For what? Houses? Will people buy your houses when they know how much suffering they were made from? Do the lives of these animals mean nothing to you? Programs like Countryfile encourage you to enjoy the great outdoors, to support wildlife nearby and to preserve natural beauty. If you take this land away from its local residents to cover it in tarmac and stick masses of brick and metal on it you are taking the countryside away from us. We would not be able to enjoy the great outdoors, we would not be able to support wildlife or preserve its natural beauty because it won't be there. You are the ones damaging the biodiversity of the world, you are the ones killing these animals. If you build houses on the green belt land around Tonacliffe you are just proving me right. - - There are many protected animals in the area surrounding Tonacliffe, including pipistrel bats the population of pipistrelle bats has declined in the UK over the past 30 years, between 1978 and 1993 there was a national decrease of 70 percent. All the UK species of bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and it is illegal to harm them or disturb their roost sites. Over the years the habitats e.g. hedges, ponds and old grassland, where bats like to hunt have declined in number and they have also lost many of their traditional roosting places, such as hollow trees. - - Traffic around tonacliffe is bad enough as it is, if you build an estate on the land around Tonacliffe then imagine how bad the road traffic will be. 52 houses of the site of Horsefield Ave and 68 houses on the land east of Tonacliffe means 120 houses. Suppose if these housed nuclear families and each parent had a car that would mean 240 more cars on Whitworth's roads causing more road erosion and more traffic. With Whitworth having only one road in and one road out, it's extremely obvious that there is a lot of traffic going in and out already. Can we really deal with anymore? - - When</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>Tonacliffe Primary School closes at 3:30 pm parents park their cars ANYWHERE in order to pick their child up from school. They park on double yellow lines, block your drive, park on corners and park where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles these all come under rule 243 from the department of transport as illegal. Imagine how hard it is to drive up the hill you live on, squeezing through gaps, fighting for road space only to arrive at your drive and find it blocked by a parent picking their child up from school. Obviously building houses on the lands around Tonacliffe will escalate the problem, with more residents trying to get up or down the road. - - Another issue is local schools in Whitworth are already OVERSUBSCRIBED. Primary schools e.g. Tonacliffe Primary School, St Anselm's RC Primary School and other local primary schools in the area. High schools are sparsely distributed in Rossendale and high schools like All Saints Catholic High School and Whitwoth High School are ALSO oversubscribed. How is Whitworth supposed to manage with more residents? It's a simple answer, it cant.</p>		
1307	Jenny	Lowe	-	Object		<p>Done my objection :- 1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. - 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. - 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. - 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. - 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? - 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. - 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1310	Richard	Dolan	-	HS2.101-109	Object	<p>We are vehemently opposed to all housing allocation in Whitworth. Our group has decided to vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. We will withhold our votes and encourage family, friends, and community to do likewise. - We are outraged by this proposal, especially HS2.107 that will encroach on Healy Dell. On this point we will be contacting the National Trust and other such organisations to make them away of the proposed desecration to the Green Belt. Furthermore, we are now investigating possible financial links between all Councillors, MPs, and RBC employees involved in this issue with the proposed contractors. This senseless proposal for a village far too small to accommodate a possible 300 new homes suggest an ulterior motive. No one in our community that we have spoken to is in favour of this plan and we will use our sizeable influence. - There has been more than enough housing development in Whitworth. This new proposal will destroy our green spaces and necessitate a new schools, doctors' surgery, dentist, shops, and possible a new road. All future housing development must stop. Our community can not accommodate any more. - In light of the fact that this proposal has not been advertised to a great extent (we have spoken to people who know nothing of it), we will be conducting a petition again this proposal and encouraging everyone to sign the following statement: - We will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community.</p>		<p>To reiterate, we will vote against and actively campaign against all Councillors and MPs in favour of this proposal. All persons voting in favour of this should expect and strong reaction from the community. - - The people's power will be felt if this plan is authorised.</p>
1321	Andrew	Lowe	-		Object	<p>The roads are already at capacity in our area and village. The School traffic creates chaos daily. More houses in the area will only create more problems. This is a accident waiting to happen. - The risk to the wildlife is to big a risk. Animals such as deer, foxes and the bats each evening would be in severe danger of losing their habitat. - The High school is already full with local having to travel as far as Todmorden which is completely wrong. - The doctors and dentist are at braking point. - New houses will only put more pressure on our local services which are already at braking point. Crime is already a problem in the village. Bigger population will only create more crime.</p>		<p>New housing will ruin our village and our wildlife. I am completely against new housing in the village of Whitworth.</p>
1336	Maureen	O'Mara	-		Object	<p>Whitworth is already struggling with oversubscribed schools. There is only 1 small GP surgery and 1 dentist. The village cannot cope with stretching the existing amenities. - One of the main objections I have is the traffic and parking, which is already dire. Streets are almost impossible to drive down safely due to double parking. There is only one main road, which when closed for any reason means driving via Todmorden to get around - this has happened on a number of occasions. Most roads have very steep inclines which are regularly not gritted in winter. To increase parking and traffic would destroy Whitworth. Where would access roads be and how would this affect current residents.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1341	Katie	Pauline	-		Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development on the end of Horsefield Av for a number of reasons, detailed below:</p> <p>1. Traffic: - Tonacliffe is accessible by just 3 roads, 2 of which are narrow with residents cars parked down both sides meaning only one car can pass at any time. With the proposed extra houses at Horsefield Ave as well as the proposed site at the end of Bell Isle Ave this will cause an unsustainable amount of traffic in what is already a busy residential area making it unattractive for working age families. At school times the roads are gridlocked, drives are blocked and commuting is extremely difficult - extra vehicles would make it impossible.</p> <p>2. Safety: - Further to this the roads are all 20mph as there is a primary school and young kids playing at weekends and in the evenings, a lot of people drive over 20mph and there have been a number of near accidents especially around school dropping off and picking up time - the proposed housing would double the amount of vehicle on these roads making it unsafe for children and unsuitable for families.</p> <p>3. Access: - At HS2.109 there are two proposed access roads. The first is via Horsefield Avenue which is currently not a through route. This will hugely increase the traffic on what is currently a quiet road with cars parked up both sides, kids playing in the street and a popular cut through for dog walkers. The proposed access and resulting traffic will significantly alter the character and usage of the Avenue making it unsafe, unattractive and bringing down the value of the houses already there. The second access road High Peake Rd is a tiny, bumpy track road, partly cobbled, completely unsuitable for increased traffic. Even if resurfaced no one would choose to take that access as it's extremely difficult to turn out of meaning the majority of traffic for the new houses would rely on Horsefield Ave causing traffic issues as outlined above. I also believe High Peake Rd is owned privately. It is also the site of an old coal mining shaft so increased traffic is unlikely to be sustainable.</p> <p>4. Infrastructure: - The majority of the schools in Whitworth are at full capacity with those not currently at full capacity due to reach capacity in the next 2-5 years, The provision of GP and dental services are already under pressure and could not meet the needs of increased housing. Public transport is completely unreliable and not suitable for commuting for work or education. There is one road in, one road out of Whitworth and traffic is already awful, at peak times it can be extremely problematic to get in or out of Whitiworth and the smallest of road works can back up traffic for miles as there are no alternative routes and any small cut round become quickly gird locked. What should be 10 minute car journey to the train station to get in to Manchester takes 30-40 minutes at peak times meaning travel time to Manchester is 60 mins if you're lucky and get a fast train (which are at most every 25 minutes and jam packed so you can't always get on a train). More vehicles commuting in and out of Whitworth each day would make commuting to Manchester unjustifiable with travel time making it an</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>unattractive place to live for city workers wishing to live there and commute in. There is an acute lack of jobs in the area meaning there would be a need for those moving in to the area to commute out to work. Problems with the power supply to Tonacliffe continue to cause power cuts each year and the flooding in the area has meant periods of brown water or low pressure at certain points each year - more houses will worsen these issues. 5: Wildlife: The moorland adjacent to and behind Horsefield Ave is home to an array of wildlife. I have concerns in particular for the deer that graze there and the red crested newts (which I believe are a protected species) that live in the two pond areas on the moors. There are also bats that live in the nearby woodland and fly over the moors in the evening. Building on this Moorland would disrupt the wildlife, put it in danger and drive it away and housing situated there in the long term would take away their natural habitat. The proposed building site covers some greenbelt land which the greenbelt report advises against. Without demonstrating 'exceptional circumstances' this should be absolutely out of the question, especially on a site which poses such a number of other issues. 6: Topography & flooding - The moorland adjacent to Horsefield Avenue where building I proposed is steep, marshy and has heavy water flowing down it when it rains - I find it difficult to understand how this can be suitable for homes. I'm aware it was also a coal mining site and in addition to this our house on Horsefield Avenue and others on the row show evidence of subsidence in ours and other properties on Horsefield Ave. 7: Landscape and leisure: - Whitworth is an attractive place to live due to the beautiful moorland, Tonacliffe in particular is popular with dog walkers, hikers, photographers, runners and cyclists. Taking away the green land will make it a less attractive place to live. There is little by way of entertainment, retail or transport links meaning protecting the moors and green areas is crucial to ensuring Whitworth doesn't fall in to decline like other areas of the valley. The moorland in question is used during all seasons by residents and hikers from outside of Whitworth. It is also worth noting there is an electricity pylon above where the new houses are proposed which is really loud. You only need to stand on the end of Horsefield Ave to hear it and I think this would be really off putting to any one looking to buy a property any closer to the pylon. At the end of Horsefield Ave on the right there is a row of terraced house that look out on to the moorland. The proposed plans would put housing directly in front of those houses, obscuring their view and drastically changing the character of the houses, the access to sunlight as well as severely reducing the value of those houses. Loss of privacy, noise pollution and loss of green space are a huge concern to these houses and the rest of the residents on Tonacliffe. - - The plans entirely change the character and environment of Tonacliffe as well as having a huge impact on lifestyle with the strain on infrastructure and increased traffic. Houses being built here would be unattractive to buyers based on these issues, drive down property prices and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

would likely drive current residents away.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1347	Joseph	Pauline	-		Object	<p>1. Traffic: - Limited access to the site with narrow roads and majority on street parking. Two proposed housing sites on Tonacliffe will cause an unsustainable amount of traffic in what is already a busy residential area making it unattractive for working age families. School times cause gridlock on the roads, blocking drives and rendering Tonacliffe inaccessible. 2. Safety: - Despite the 20mph limit there have been a number of near accidents with primary school and young kids playing especially around school run times - the proposed housing would double the amount of vehicle on these roads making it unsafe for children and unsuitable for families. 3. Access: - At HS2.109 there are two proposed access roads. The first is via Horsefield Avenue which is currently not a through route. This will hugely increase the traffic on what is currently a quiet road with cars parked up both sides, kids playing in the street and a popular cut through for dog walkers. The proposed access and resulting traffic will significantly alter the character and usage of the Avenue making it unsafe, unattractive and bringing down the value of the houses already there. The second access road High Peake Rd is a tiny, bumpy track road, partly cobbled, completely unsuitable for increased traffic. Even if resurfaced no one would choose to take that access as it's extremely difficult to turn out of meaning the majority of traffic for the new houses would rely on Horsefield Ave causing traffic issues as outlined above. We also believe High Peake Rd is owned privately. It is also the site of an old coal mining shaft so increased traffic is unlikely to be sustainable. 4. Infrastructure: - The majority of the schools in Whitworth are at full capacity with those not currently at full capacity due to reach capacity in the next 2-5 years, The provision of GP and dental services are already under pressure and could not meet the needs of increased housing. Public transport is completely unreliable and not suitable for commuting for work or education. There is one road in, one road out of Whitworth and traffic is already awful, at peak times it can be extremely problematic to get in or out of Whitworth and the smallest of road works can back up traffic for miles as there are no alternative routes and any small cut round become quickly gridlocked. What should be 10 minute car journey to the train station to get in to Manchester takes 30-40 minutes at peak times meaning travel time to Manchester is 60 mins if you're lucky and get a fast train (which are at most every 25 minutes and jam packed so you can't always get on a train and this often means your commute time is 90 mins). More vehicles commuting in and out of Whitworth each day would make commuting to Manchester unjustifiable with travel time making it an unattractive place to live for city workers wishing to live there and commute in. There is an acute lack of jobs in the area meaning there would be a need for those moving in to the area to commute out to work. Problems with the power supply to Tonacliffe continue to cause power cuts each year and the flooding in the area has meant periods of brown water or low pressure at</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>certain points each year - more houses will worsen these issues. 5: Wildlife: The moorland adjacent to and behind Horsefield Ave is home to an array of wildlife. I have concerns in particular for the deer that graze there and the red crested newts (which I believe are a protected species) that live in the two pond areas on the moors. There are also bats that live in the nearby woodland and fly over the moors in the evening. Building on this Moorland would disrupt the wildlife, put it in danger and drive it away and housing situated there in the long term would take away their natural habitat. The proposed building site covers some greenbelt land which the greenbelt report advises against. Without demonstrating 'exceptional circumstances' this should be absolutely out of the question, especially on a site which poses such a number of other issues. 6: Topography & flooding - The moorland adjacent to Horsefield Avenue where building I proposed is steep, marshy and has heavy water flowing down it when it rains - I find it difficult to understand how this can be suitable for homes. I'm aware it was also a coal mining site and in addition to this our house on Horsefield Avenue and others on the row show evidence of subsidence in ours and other properties on Horsefield Ave. 7: Landscape and leisure: - Whitworth is an attractive place to live due to the beautiful moorland, Tonnacliffe in particular is popular with dog walkers, hikers, photographers, runners and cyclists. Taking away the green land will make it a less attractive place to live. There is little by way of entertainment, retail or transport links meaning protecting the moors and green areas is crucial to ensuring Whitworth doesn't fall in to decline like other areas of the valley. The moorland in question is used during all seasons by residents and hikers from outside of Whitworth. It is also worth noting there is an electricity pylon above where the new houses are proposed which is really loud. You only need to stand on the end of Horsefield Ave to hear it and I think this would be really off putting to any one looking to buy a property any closer to the pylon. At the end of Horsefield Ave on the right there is a row of terraced house that look out on to the moorland. The proposed plans would put housing directly in front of those houses, obscuring their view and drastically changing the character of the houses, the access to sunlight as well as severely reducing the value of those houses. Loss of privacy, noise pollution and loss of green space are a huge concern to these houses and the rest of the residents on Tonacliffe. The plans entirely change the character and environment of Tonacliffe as well as having a huge impact on lifestyle with the strain on infrastructure and increased traffic. Houses being built here would be unattractive to buyers based on these issues, drive down property prices and would likely drive current residents away. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1363	Gareth	Dolan	-	HS2.101 to 109	Object	I do not live in Whitworth but spend a lot of time there with my family. I am deeply concerned by this proposed loss of green belt and will do my utmost to object against it. - - I strongly urge RBC to re-consider its proposal. Whitworth cannot handle any more development. - - Thanks		If this destruction of the green belt in Whitworth is passed then I shall simply take my family and my money elsewhere as there will no longer be the same attraction Whitworth now offers.
1365	Michael	Whitehead	-		Object	The doctors is overcrowded, the schools are overcrowded and there is one road in and out. All three of the mentioned cannot cope in the current state. Whitworth has too many houses for the current infrastructure. If the proposal goes through, which I sincerely hope it does not, there will be 300+ more homes within Whitworth. This means 650+ more people needing a doctor, 300+ more children who need schools and 300+ more cars on the roads. If the current infrastructure is struggling I dread to think how the village would end up with that amount of extra people. - There are also many deer which have recently returned to the greenbelt land on either side of the valley. Moving any sort of greenbelt/urban borders is highly likely to destroy their habitat and force them away.		-
1387	Victoria	Mairs			Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1391	rachel	maddock	-		Object	I am objecting to the above proposal of housing. - - I am a Bacup resident who travels regularly to Whitworth for work and schooling. The proposal of changing the beautiful greenbelt land on Tonacliffe for more housing is outrageous. I have lived in Whitworth and Bacup all my life and grew up on the moors surrounding Tonacliffe. ...the beautiful moors that we are very lucky to have. Has anyone thought of the wildlife?.....where will they go?..... - To build housing in an area which is already fit to burst is madness. The schools and public services in Whitworth or already oversubscribed. ...getting a doctors apt or dentist apt takes weeks to get. ...adding more people to these services will bring it to breaking point,. - The traffic is also a major problem already. There is one road in and one road out. A simple traffic light brings the village to a halt already, let alone having another cohort of cars and people added to the equation.		-
1392	Anthony	Maddock	-	HS106 HS109	Object	I am objecting to the above proposal of housing. - - I am a Bacup resident who travels regularly to Whitworth for work and schooling. The proposal of changing the beautiful greenbelt land on Tonacliffe for more housing is outrageous. I have lived in Whitworth and Bacup all my life and grew up on the moors surrounding Tonacliffe. ...the beautiful moors that we are very lucky to have. Has anyone thought of the wildlife?.....where will they go?..... - To build housing in an area which is already fit to burst is madness. The schools and public services in Whitworth or already oversubscribed. ...getting a doctors apt or dentist apt takes weeks to get. ...adding more people to these services will bring it to breaking point,. - The traffic is also a major problem already. There is one road in and one road out. A simple traffic light brings the village to a halt already, let alone having another cohort of cars and people added to the equation.		
1394	Rhys	Maddock	-	HS106 HS109	Object	I am objecting to the above proposal of housing. - - I am a Bacup resident who travels regularly to Whitworth for work and schooling. The proposal of changing the beautiful greenbelt land on Tonacliffe for more housing is outrageous. I have lived in Whitworth and Bacup all my life and grew up on the moors surrounding Tonacliffe. ...the beautiful moors that we are very lucky to have. Has anyone thought of the wildlife?.....where will they go?..... - To build housing in an area which is already fit to burst is madness. The schools and public services in Whitworth or already oversubscribed. ...getting a doctors apt or dentist apt takes weeks to get. ...adding more people to these services will bring it to breaking point,. - The traffic is also a major problem already. There is one road in and one road out. A simple traffic light brings the village to a halt already, let alone having another cohort of cars and people added to the equation.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1397	John	Cavanagh		Horsefield Ave	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve
1398	Joshua	Hopwood Mairs		Horsefield Ave	Object	would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1402	JOANNE	WHITWORTH	-	Horsefield Ave	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. -		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling with make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth who have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for now and for our future generations.
1405	GARETH	WHITWORTH	-	Horsefield Ave	Object	I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full to bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable.		Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve for our children and our childrens children.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1417	Gillian	Middlemas	Whitworth Community High School		Object	As Headteacher of the only secondary school in the Whitworth area, I am concerned that the proposals to build considerable numbers of new dwellings take no account of educational provision in the local area. - The school is already oversubscribed: for 2017 entry into Y7 over 40 families were unsuccessful in gaining a place, despite Whitworth Community High School being their first preference; over 40 families went onto on the Local Authority's waiting list for a place; over 25 families went to Appeal for a place, and very few of them were successful. The school now has 640 students and, without extra classroom space, has no capacity to increase the admissions number, nor to take additional students into existing year groups. - Likewise, many local primary schools are also full / oversubscribed, suggesting there is insufficient educational provision in the local area already. - This situation will be exacerbated if the proposed number of new dwellings goes ahead, unless the developers or Lancashire County Council are prepared to increase the school's capacity by funding additional classroom / learning / social space. The school is over 50 years old, largely of Langspan pre-tensioned concrete construction (intended life expectancy already exceeded) with HAC (high alumina cement) - In addition, the school experiences ongoing issues with the provision of utilities: the water main up the school drive is at risk of collapse; the water supply to the area has recently been affected on a number of occasions, and presumably further demand from new building would increase these issues. - The proposals for new housing does not appear to be linked to any plans to improve the traffic situation in the Whitworth area: lengthy queues heading towards Rochdale each morning already create issues for students travelling to school.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1420	Julie	bower	-	Horsefield Ave	Object	<p>I would like to object to the above sites being changed to buildings lands on the following basis, Whitworth is already full of bursting Doctors, schools, dentist are all full. Traffic has one road in and one road out, all it takes is one set of traffic lights and the whole village comes to a stand still causing problems for local businesses in the surrounding areas. The area around Tonacliffe is home to wildlife such as badgers, foxes, bats, deer, newts, frogs where will these animals go will they be simply expected to relocate??? Local people use the moorland for walking, cycling it is a play area for children and is simply the last green space we have that the council haven't built on. We have ponds where fish and pondlife live geese spend summer here . - - Drainage is very much a problem already we flood when we have a regular amount of rainfall, when it rains heavily the drains cannot cope and the area in Tonacliffe is heavily saturated. - - Access at Tonacliffe is already bad for emergency vehicles and large vehicles, once you include more housing and the school traffic it will simply become impassable. - This already over saturated with people for the small community resources there are. - There is not enough road space, and only a little amount of moorland available. We try to encourage our young in the community to go outside and be 'heathy'. There won't be anywhere left. I find the lack of advertising this proposal unacceptable. There are many more areas of fields elsewhere. Why add to an over exhausted community already? I dont understand why Whitworth has to be the target for this.</p>		<p>Yes absolutely let the planning officers spend some time actually in Whitworth village they will see how much traffic there is and how we are struggling to cope, the new Tesco is an accident blackspot which the planners felt fit to approve. Come down from your ivory tower and look what normal people are struggling make a decision that is right for the people and community in Whitworth and have to struggle everyday with traffic, leave us the green space that we deserve. It isn't alot but it is valued and appreciated beyond your knowledge or understanding - all of these below would be affected adversely. - - Wildlife - Loss of trees - The local school - Landscaping - - Local amenities - Infrastructure - - - We deserve our voices to be heard.</p>
1425	Paul & Gillian	Marshall	Hindle Pastures (Self Catering Holiday Accommodation)	SHLAA16001	Object	<p>From a Business point of view we would suffer further loss of business due to horrendous track problems getting out of Whitworth into Rochdale and Motorway network. We get amazing reviews but little repeat business mostly due to current traffic problems. - - From a personal point of view over subscribed Schools and Doctors surgery will be hugely affected . - - Tonacliffe Road is very narrow and there's a primary school on it which already causes huge traffic problems in the morning and afternoon. - - At the lower end due to the steepness of houses there is no footpath in places, cars have to be parked on the road causing particular problems when walking up with children (in our case granddaughter); with pushchairs having to move in behind parked cars to allow cars coming the other way to pass and with all these proposed new houses it is only going to create havoc and chaos. This is an ill thought out planning application without thought to access and/or increase of traffic. Has anyone actually been to see the proposed sites to assess the implications of the extra traffic? - - Whitworth has very poor access to public transport eg distance from a rail way station and access to motorways. A huge percentage of the traffic in Whitworth goes in the direction of Rochdale/Manchester. To increase this would be detrimental to the environment and the people of Whitworth. - - - -</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1436	Louise	Currie	-		Object	<p>1. The plans to build in this area, will reduce the natural environment within the area, which the government's planning policy is committed to protect. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. 2. Utilities are already stretched with the current housing stock - drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. 3. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. 4. There are currently parking issues and high traffic volumes around Tonacliffe Primary, without creating additional through traffic to new houses in the vicinity along a narrow road, which requires resurfacing and who's current 20 mile an hour speed limit is not enforced. 5. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. Continuing roadworks to address ongoing issues with failing water mains often leaves Whitworth gridlocked with long queues of traffic trying to leave the Village in the morning and return in the evening. Additional housing will compound this problem 6. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. 7. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. 8. Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? 9. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem.</p>		As well as these particular developments, the others sited in the plan will also increase volumes of traffic along Market Street (A671), adding to congestion and putting pressure on water mains and utilities and the road's surface leading to increased road works and further problems entering and leaving the Village at peak times. - - Whitworth and the other villages along the A671 cannot simply continue to expand without addressing the wider infrastructure of utilities and access in and out of the village through neighbouring authority areas

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1440	Helen	Banham	-	HS2.109 - Horsefield Av	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

unbearable strain on this network.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1442	Tracy	Thompson	-	HS2.102, HS2.105 & HS2.109	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen within this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						residents put an unbearable strain on this network. -		
1446	Rachael	Atkinson	-		Object	I object to this proposal for many reasons, traffic in and out of whitworth is already horrendous so adding more houses and people will increase this. Local amenities ie schools doctors are already full so more house would not be accommodate in these places. Dangers of flooding due to poor drainage already surely more house will increase this! It is a green belt area and these should be protected! Local wildlife will become endangered! The safety of residents with more traffic hitting the roads!		-
1448	Christine	Atkinson	-		Object	I strongly object to this proposal due to a variety of reasons including infrastructure being stretched to a limit.The proposed land is greenbelt the local wildlife would be seriously affected.Our street would be an access road to one of the developments which would cause major disruptions and impact on greenbelt land. It would cause serious traffic problems due to one road in and out of Whitworth, and could cause serious problems particularly in the winter months. Community services such as health centres, dentists, schools would be over suscribed.		I think this proposal of new houses would not be in the interest of Whitworth as a community and cause major disruptions to this small village.
1452	vikki	Megram			Object	1. Whitworth is already overburdened by the current housing stock. Drains, water supplies, power supplies all fail on a regular basis. The infrastructures are aged and insufficient to sustain further demands. - 2. The schools in Whitworth, in particular the high school, are at capacity and cannot sustain any addition to the number of potential pupils. - 3. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth and at peak times in particular this road is congested with idling traffic contributing to air pollution. People travelling from Bacup and beyond to get to Rochdale all come through Whitworth and add to the problem. - 4. There is already a serious problem with flooding in the Whitworth valley, which is getting worse each year. Additional development will increase the potential for more severe incidents. - 5. Access to most of these sites will increase traffic hazards on an already inadequate highway. - 6. I challenge the need for more housing in Whitworth. - 6.1. Where is the evidence of any demand? - 6.2 There are countless houses left empty and neglected in Whitworth, why are these not modernised and made available? - 6.3 Where are the job opportunities for the proposed residents? Presumably in another town or city, because there are few or none in Whitworth, so why not build within easy commute of employment and help avoid road traffic congestion and pollution? - 7. The wildlife around Whitworth is rich and diverse with several protected species making their homes in the area. The council has a duty to protect these habitats. - 8. Crime and lack of effective policing is already becoming an unwelcome fact of life in Whitworth, additional housing will inevitably add to the problem		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1453	Jordan	Collier			Object	<p>Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1464	R	Platts	-		Object	<p>residents put an unbearable strain on this network. -</p> <p>Overall I object to upwards of 300 houses being built in a small village of only 7,500 residents. There is only one road in and one road out and traffic is already slow moving, if indeed moving at all, at peak times. The village is already susceptible to flooding, a problem that more building will only exacerbate. Local amenities such as our schools, our local doctors and dentists are already oversubscribed. In short, the village can't support such a surge in population. - The two sites I mainly object to are Horsefield Avenue and land to the East of Tonacliffe School. These sites are both Greenfield. Greenfield should not be built on unless absolutely necessary. In this case, it isn't absolutely necessary. If Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances", then Rossendale Council should take heed of this and concentrate it's focus on other areas instead. - The roads around this area surround Tonacliffe Primary School, and twice during the day these roads are virtually impassible and extremely dangerous to children. Bringing more traffic into the area is an accident waiting to happen. Pedestrians on Tonacliffe Road walking in the Rochdale direction aren't well catered for with footpaths. There's only very narrow pavements on the left-hand side, and no pavement at all in some parts. The resulting excess in vehicles will make it even more dangerous. As a parent I worry constantly about my children and the roads around here and that will only get worse. - I would also like to add that after heavy rainfall, Highgate Lane is like a river with all the excess water running down from the hills. We'll all be at risk of flooding if parts of the greenbelt is concreted over.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1469	George	Salt	-		Object	Whitworth is located in a valley, this in itself presents issues with the amount of space available. 7,500 people lived in Whitworth according to the data from the 2011 Census and this is a large amount of people if you look at the services and infrastructure in Whitworth. To start off with there is one GP surgery that has 7,248 people registered with them. Whitworth Medical Centre has 4 GPs which means that for one GP there are 1,812 people. There is not any more capacity available for more people to register with the practice. - - Schools are also busy especially with just one school for secondary education. With more people living in Whitworth that would mean a greater demand on schools and could result in some children living in Whitworth not going to school there. - - Going back to Whitworth being a valley this physical feature means that infrastructure being put in can be difficult. Whitworth has one road in and out and during peak hours this is a very busy road. Most new people would probably be using a car as their main mode of transport adding more pressure to Market Street and its tributary roads. Public transport is also very poor in Whitworth meaning that it is not really a viable alternative for any new people who would come to Whitworth. - - As shown with a few of these arguments Whitworth does not have the capacity to accommodate an extra 359 houses over the next 15 years. For example an average of 3 people per house would result in 1,077 more people living in Whitworth. It is not going to work.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1494	Richard	Woodhouse	-	SHLAA16001	Object	<p>I object to the building on this site for two primary reasons. Firstly that the "Tonacliffe" area already has more than enough residences. The roads, the parking, the traffic etc. are already maxed out. There is no infrastructure such as shops, play areas, buses, doctors, dentists etc. to serve the people already here, so any new dwellings will rely on cars as much as we do and add to the congestion. This is compounded by the school which increases these issues 3 times a day or more. Furthermore the quality of living here in relation to noise and views has already suffered enough with the housing that has already been put up. Secondly in developing the site access is limited to two roads. One is very awkward for a car let alone larger vehicles and the other is full of parked cars, kids playing, traffic relating to the school etc. As well as these two main points there are a lot of other reasons why this site is not a good idea that you acknowledge in your assessment such as the water issue, the difficulty involved given the hilly nature, the coal issue, electricity pylons, building on greenbelt etc. The last point and the impact on areas such as Healey Nature Reserve is in particular something that I'd like to emphasise. The village of Whiworth in general would struggle with more dwellings. There is only one road in and out which is already a nightmare at peak times, there is very little in the way of shops and facilities and services such as doctors, dentists and schools are already beyond capacity. These issues are felt even more in Tonacliffe because we are set back and up from the main road and village. As an example before joining the main road in the morning to spend 45 minutes traveling 3 miles towards Rochdale, we have to spend another 10/15 minutes traveling 400 yards to get to the main road because of the lack of access and the school.</p>		<p>I appreciate that people have to live somewhere and that houses have to be built but this site is truly a bad idea that can surely only look viable on paper.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1496	Ann	De Frond	-	SHLAA16001	Object	I object to the building on this site for two primary reasons. Firstly that the "Tonacliffe" area already has more than enough residences. The roads, the parking, the traffic etc. are already maxed out. There is no infrastructure such as shops, play areas, buses, doctors, dentists etc. to serve the people already here, so any new dwellings will rely on cars as much as we do and add to the congestion. This is compounded by the school which increases these issues 3 times a day or more. Furthermore the quality of living here in relation to noise and views has already suffered enough with the housing that has already been put up. Secondly in developing the site access is limited to two roads. One is very awkward for a car let alone larger vehicles and the other is full of parked cars,kids playing, traffic relating to the school etc. As well as these two main points there are a lot of other reasons why this site is not a good idea that you acknowledge in your assessment such as the water issue, the difficulty involved given the hilly nature, the coal issue, electricity pylons, building on greenbelt etc. The last point and the impact on areas such as Healey Nature Reserve is in particular something that I'd like to emphasise. The village of Whiworth in general would struggle with more dwellings. There is only one road in and out which is already a nightmare at peak times, there is very little in the way of shops and facilities and services such as doctors, dentists and schools are already beyond capacity. These issues are felt even more in Tonacliffe because we are set back and up from the main road and village. As an example before joining the main road in the morning to spend 45 minutes traveling 3 miles towards Rochdale, we have to spend another 10/15 minutes traveling 400 yards to get to the main road because of the lack of access and the school.	-	
1497	Wendy	Rose	-	Horsefield Ave	Object	The infrastructure of Whitworth cannot support or sustain further development. There is only one road in and out of Whitworth. Congestion is a serious problem now due to the volume of traffic. When there are roadworks the situation is bordering on dangerous as emergency vehicles are hindered. Further residential development would only compound this issue with higher levels of vehicles. - - Power cuts are a regular occurrence in this area, one can only assume this would get worse with the extent of the proposed developments - - Doctors surgeries are fully to capacity and cannot adequately serve the community at the moment. Waiting times for appointments is ludicrous. Schools are over subscribed. Parking around schools is dangerous and any increase in school children would seriously impact on this. - - All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - - Proposed land in some cases is not viable as parts are prone to flooding. Culverts running through a proposed sight would impact on flood defences in the area. - - - -	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1500	katherine	maclean	-	HS2.109 HS2.106	Object	I object to the proposed plans - wildlife all the greenbelt land is of great importance to our local wildlife of whitworth. at the back of us we regular see deer's and foxes. - - local amenities such as schools, dentist, doctors are already full and building more houses would have a negative impact on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - the road network is already shocking as its, we have one road in and out of whitworth, building more houses will only add to the strain. the roads around whitworth are also in poor condition which would only see this get worse.		-
1502	Danielle	Makin	-	HS2.102, HS2.103, HS2.104, HS2.105, HS2.106, HS2.107, HS2.108, HS2.109	Object	The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.		-
1503	edward	maclean	-		Object	I object to the proposed plans - wildlife all the greenbelt land is of great importance to our local wildlife of whitworth. at the back of us we regular see deer's and foxes. - - local amenities such as schools, dentist, doctors are already full and building more houses would have a negative impact on the living standards of the people of whitworth. - - the road network is already shocking as its, we have one road in and out of whitworth, building more houses will only add to the strain. the roads around whitworth are also in poor condition which would only see this get worse.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1504	Timothy	Makin	-		Object	<p>The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - - A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - - Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done. - - Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - - The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - - The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1505	Pat	Stewart	na		Object	<p>I object to all the listed sites in whitworth. - - HS2.102 - King Street, HS2.104 - Old Lane, HS2.108 - Sandbank Gardens, - HS2.105 - Albert Street, HS2.107 Fern Isle Close, HS2.106 - Moorland Cres, - HS2.109 - Horsefield Av - - 1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in</p>		Please can you inform me of how many people object to the whitworth sites.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - - Plus please note - - Human Rights Act - Responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, - In particular - Protocol 1, Article 1. - This states that "a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land." - Additionally, Article 8 - The Human Rights Act states that "a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life." - - In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1535	Susan	Neilson	N/A	HS2.106 Moorland Crescent and HS2.109 Horsefield Avenue	Object	<p>These two sites at Tonacliffe are unsuitable for housing. The geographical features of the landscape would make it very difficult to build on (as previous land surveys conducted here in the 70's and 90's have proved). Access to the proposed sites is also not suitable, as there is a dangerous bottleneck situation from the Moorland Crescent side and the second proposed access at High Peak Lane is partially owned by local residents, so would not be a viable option. - - The moorland is percolated by a system of springs and the culvert, which runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe site is already near besting point at times of heavy rain. There would be a serious risk of widespread flooding if this building goes ahead. - - The current infrastructure is totally inadequate for this proposed number of houses, as Tonacliffe Road, leading to the two designated access roads for the Tonacliffe site, is very narrow, currently often congested and in need of frequent repairs with the current level of traffic. At dropping off and collection time, the roads in the Tonacliffe area around Tonacliffe County Primary School are already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal . Parking around the area is already a concern for the school and an increase in traffic will only make it worse . Local residents regularly voice their concerns about this . Local amenities such as the schools, dentists, and doctors are already full and building more houses would have a negative effect on the living and health standards of the people of Whitworth . The water, electricity and gas services would also need major work and upgrades to accommodate this level of housing. There have been several incidents are linked to other new building developments, which have already being completed in Whitworth , at which have resulted in power cuts and problems with sewerage and water supply . The road network to and from Rochdale and Bacup was never intended to take the already large volume of traffic. It is frequently gridlocked. More houses would make it worse. - - The proposed site is in an area of Greenbelt Land, which is of great importance to preserve local wildlife in Whitworth . We have protected newts living in the pond and Pipistrelle bats nesting in the area. There are badgers, foxes, deer and hares living wild, alongside the sheep and horses that graze on the moors. In a recent government planning policy statement, it was stated that there needs to be 'a higher level of protection given to the most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitat and natural resources.' This needs to be factored In In order to maintain the environmental quality of the area . The proposed building would cause irreversible damage to the environment . - - -</p>		There would also be a detrimental effect both for the local wildlife and residents in terms of increased noise, pollution and related impact on the carbon footprint of the valley. Public footpaths and rights of way would be lost .The whole proposal across both sites at Tonacliffe could only negatively impact on both the character of the village and its environment and pollute what is currently an area of importance both to the conservation of protected species and wild, moorland beauty .

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1538	Mike	Burgess			Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
					unbearable strain on this network.	HS2.109	<p>accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
								<p>footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - DON'T FORGET EACH ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CAN PUT IN THEIR OWN OBJECTION FORM TO THE BUILDING WORK. Extract from the Governments Planning Policy Statement - Protection and Enhancement of the Environment 17. The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. Those with national and international designations should receive the highest level of protection. 18. The condition of our surroundings has a direct impact on the quality of life and the conservation and improvement of the natural and built environment brings social and economic benefit for local communities. Planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design, conservation and the provision of public space. 19. Plan policies and planning decisions should be based on: –up-to-date information on the environmental characteristics of the area; – the</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
								<p>potential impacts, positive as well as negative, on the environment of development proposals (whether direct, indirect, cumulative, long-term or short-term); and, – recognition of the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage. Planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, planning authorities and developers should consider possible mitigation measures. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. In line with the UK sustainable development strategy, environmental costs should fall on those who impose them – the “polluter pays” principle.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1545	Robert	Hesten		SHLAA16001	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam. Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework). Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions? Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS. There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village. Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed? In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area. Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF. Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1546	Sandra	Hesten		SHLAA16001	Object	<p>We have consulted many villagers living in Whitworth and their ideas form a large part of our objections to all the proposed new housing developments (as referenced on page I); particularly those sites (underlined on page I) encroaching on already limited public spaces which consume Greenfield and environmentally sensitive areas. Our view is supported by the National Government Policy Framework (NGPF) which states that planning should contribute to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>According to article 8 of the Human Rights Act, everyone has "the right to peaceful enjoyment" of their home and immediate surroundings. These planning proposals would interfere with that right.</p> <p>Public footpaths to surrounding countryside would be compromised. There is also research that suggests that being in, and having access to, a green landscape can improve mental wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>According to article 17 of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (GP PS) on Greenbelt conservation, "a high level of protection should be given to wild life habitats". Further house building would have a devastating impact on them, and the landscape as a whole. We believe they would represent a loss of residential amenities to the community.</p> <p>Greenbelt land is important in the protection of Whitworth wildlife. Cutting down the forest of Tonacliffe would represent an act of ecological vandalism. Deer sleep, birds sing and bats nest in these areas. Hares and foxes are frequently seen. Rare protected newts live in nearby ponds. In the coppice, surrounding Cowm Waterworks, there are owls, badgers and increasingly rare, English bluebells. Government Planning Policy is supposed to protect Greenbelt except for exceptional circumstances. What are these circumstances and how have they been justified by the planning committee?</p> <p>Various postcodes within Whitworth have been officially re-classified as within a flood plain e.g. Cowm Waterworks. Therefore, proposing further house building beneath Cowm Reservoir (a local beauty spot) would seem irrational. The dam wall (a public footpath) is now closed for safety checks until November to allow United Utilities to test the infill and stability of the dam.</p> <p>Many residents are very concerned about the implications e.g. a major flood risk. Any reinforcement would be costly. How often would these tests have to be performed in the future?</p> <p>Cowm Waterworks has a small underground storage reservoir within the site. Compromising that and the culvert running through the middle of the Tonacliffe site would increase the risk of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>flooding. With the unpredictability of climate change (e.g. more frequent flooding in the valley), should the council be protecting residents from it rather than creating further problems? Local drainage (water and sewage) cannot cope now in some areas. Should County, District and Town Councils together with United Utilities officially verify which of these proposed development sites are in potential flood areas before planning permission is granted? Further house building would expose a failure "to deliver sufficient community infrastructure and services to meet local needs" (a key principle of the National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>Such development would also cause further pollution (e.g. to air quality - more traffic on the roads) creating a greater carbon footprint for the valley and the next generation. Article 19 (from the GPPS), in line with UK Sustainable Development Strategy, states that "the environmental costs should fall on those who impose them"; will the council take this "polluter pays principle" into consideration before making any decisions?</p> <p>Geographically, in some of the proposed sites, the landscape makes building difficult. It would require radical and costly solutions. Where would the access roads for these developments be? If any small byroads are used, this would increase traffic, thereby increasing the risk of accidents to children (particularly near schools). Additionally, in winter such roads are often not salted or gritted making them a hazard for the disabled and the elderly resulting in more accidents and costs for the NHS.</p> <p>There is already inadequate infrastructure in transport where roads are gridlocked at peak times and in need of repair e.g. the already congested road leading to the reservoir and quarry (adjacent to Cwm Waterworks). With one main road in and one out, Whitworth is already a congested village.</p> <p>Public transport is very limited e.g. no train/tram services. How will the increased traffic be managed?</p> <p>In other services, there have been at least 4 outages this year in electricity in the Whitworth area.</p> <p>Water and gas would also need upgrading (representing further expenses on already overburdened service users). Present resources would fail to deliver the increased demand new residents would require, thereby failing to meet the criteria set out in NPPF.</p> <p>Currently, schools, doctors and the sole dental practice are all over overstretched and over subscribed. This depletion in resources would curtail the life chances of future generations. Further house building would further increase class numbers in schools and severely overload resources there. Frequently, waiting times for doctor's appointments are well over four weeks. Dental</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>practices have gone from three to one. There is no optometrist. Long queues are the norm at peak times at the chemist. Any extra patient loading would exacerbate already inadequate NHS provision.</p> <p>Local amenities are already perceived to be at breaking point. Any extra pressure would lead to a failure to meet future local community needs impeding the NPPF's strategy of improving "the health, social and cultural wellbeing" of all.</p> <p>Have surveys been undertaken on these sites and if so have the result been published prior to this consultation? How would all the problems described above be resolved? How long would it take?</p> <p>What would it cost? Who would pay for it? Has any planning been done on the extra infrastructure, services and resources required? Do the local council have a legal responsibility to ensure adequate provision of services for all its residents? Can Whitworth cope with an additional 25% to its population?</p> <p>In conclusion, the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should take account of "the different roles and character of different areas"; promote "the vitality of our main urban areas"; protect "the Green Belts around them"; recognise "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"; support "thriving rural communities within it."</p> <p>Shouldn't the council take heed of these Core Planning Principles and vote against the proposals?</p> <p>Please don't reduce our beautiful valley to a dormitory suburb.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1547	Karen	Ruane		SHLAA16001	Object	<p>I wish to object to the Emerging Local Plan Draft Local Plan (2019 to 2034) for Rossendale and the proposals for Whitworth. I would like to state my objections to the local plan specifically for the Whitworth Area, and in particular Site Ref HS2.106 and Site Ref HS2.1 09</p> <p>I am a resident of Meadow Head ave and have lived here since February 1978. I remember when these two areas were defined as Green Belt because of their unsuitability for development. (Inspector's Report September 1994 Gill. D and Sustainability Appraisal May 2017 {3.16.7})</p> <p>The objections raised then and their causes have not 'gone away and are just as valid now. In fact, there are more reasons for keeping the areas as Green Belt. As the problems expressed then, have multiplied rather than decreased. The increased congestion at Tonacliffe Road and Tonacliffe Way is now a nightmare for residents entering and leaving their homes and for parents dropping off their children at Tonacliffe School.</p> <p>Bus Services have decreased from Rochdale and Rossendale through Whitworth as part of a cost cutting exercise. Leaving the minor roads on to estates not serviced by public transport. Shift workers have to use their own cars or car sharing and the last resort, Taxis, because there are no Buses available.</p> <p>I am not a lone voice in expressing my concerns over the current infrastructure which is not adequate for our needs? This Emerging Local Plan (ELP) is going to increase our problems rather than relieve them. And while our MP Jake Berry and Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) may publicly argue about the figures for housing needs, their discussion does prove that it is a Government-led initiative RBC are chasing in this ELP rather than filling a Local need.</p> <p>The increase in pressure on our local resources, this ELP would produce is because of a Whitehall need not a Whitworth need.</p> <p>On the 14th September 2017 in parliament Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government publicly stated the government's commitment by saying. "Greenbelt is still protected."</p> <p>Our local MP then announced in the Rossendale Free Press on 22nd September 2017 "I'm delighted that after raising this issue at the highest levels that I've been able to get the Valley's housing figures reduced to protect more of our local green spaces. This is a victory for everyone here in Rossendale. "</p> <p>In presenting this Draft ELP Rossendale Borough Council are ignoring the wishes of our MP and the residents of Whitworth who seek to protect the Greenbelt not because we consider it our own back garden but because in the absence of any proper development of resources this ELP will increase the burden on an already overburdened infrastructure. As Jake Berry says. "These new homes should</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>continue to be prioritised on brownfield and former industrial sites rather than our beautiful countryside."</p> <p>I agree with the Sustainable Development Commission which states: "Sustainable Development starts with making better decisions on the issues that affect all of our lives, easy access to health care and leisure facilities, education for all ... at the nearest school, good public transport, roads and schools. It is about ensuring a strong, healthy, and just society, meeting the diverse needs of all residents those existing and potential future generations. The Schools, Tonaciiffe School, St Anselms School, St Bartholomew's school, St Michael and St John School and the one High School are almost at capacity now. The planning area of Whitworth will show a limited number of places remaining across schools in that planning area If local schools are unable to meet the demand of a new development there is the potential to have an adverse impact on the local community, with children having to travel greater distances to access a school place. (Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017) One GP Surgery, one dentist, one road in and out of Whitworth, schools oversubscribed, I feel this ELP does not show how Sustainable Development (SD) will be achieved. It does, however, show how Rossendale rate revenue will be increased. I believe as community members we have a duty to preserve our open spaces and not allow them to be removed from the Greenbelt to justify a Whitehall need, rather than the needs of Whitworth people for better and improved Services. Without improvement to the existing infrastructure in Whitworth, this Emerging Local Plan will increase problems not reduce them.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1684	Amanda	Calderbank			Object	<p>I am writing to you today to object about your future planning of houses around Tonacliffe Way and Horsefield Avenue.</p> <p>I have lived in this house with my husband for 24 years and we have raised our three children here.</p> <p>I am quite shocked and very upset that you are even thinking about building houses on this area of moor land you may not be aware of the wildlife that lives behind my home and you are going to destroy all of this.</p> <p>Firstly I would like to point out to you that the land behind my home is moor land. We are very lucky to back onto the moors and as such we get to see all the wildlife that live here we see family of Foxes to Badges, Deer with their young fawns Birds of prey, Rabbits, Birds and Bats.</p> <p>Yet again this year we have had the privilege of watching a Vixen with her fox cubs seeing these little cubs grow up with love and care of their mother watching these little cubs running around playing with each other and even explore their surrounding while we have been watching them they have stopped playing and then watch us as we watch them this Vixen has come back year after year to use the two same dens.</p> <p>Secondly the School here at Tonacliffe does not have the capacity for more houses as we already struggle with the amount of traffic that come up and down Tonacliffe Way. Please find attached photos that I have taken on a normal School day. These pictures are taken at 3.30 pm when Tonacliffe School closes. As you can see people have no regard for us residents who live here and on numerous occasions I have had my drive blocked by parents going to collect their children. Over the last few years this situation has got worse even when the community police come up nothing seems to get done. I have missed several appointments for my children and I due to parents being selfish and blocking the entrance to my drive and I have been unable to get out please feel free to come and take a look for yourselves it is utter madness on a daily basis and you want to make it ten times harder.</p> <p>Thirdly during the wintermonths the ground behind my home can get very water logged and there are patches of marsh land we even have water coming off the moors on a daily basis which then runs straight down Tonacliffe way. If you were to build houses behind my house I would no longer have a back garden but a pond!!!!</p> <p>If you were to build these houses where would all the children go to School as Tonacliffe Primary and Whitworth High School are already at the full capacity. Do you have plans to build New Primary and Secondary Schools to cater for all these children if so where are you going to put these buildings?</p> <p>My husband and I bought our house here because we fell in love with surrounding moor land. We have been very fortunate to have let our children grow up with wonderful memories of playing outside on the moors for hours on end making dens having picnics out on the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
						<p>rocks and under the trees. As a mother you always want the best for your children so letting them play outside where I could see them all the time was very comforting. I knew they were safe many of our extended families have come to our house over the years and said how lucky we are to have this on our door step I see lots of children from around the estate playing out on the moors are you really going to destroy all of this beauty just so you can make a profit.</p> <p>I also think that you should re think about putting houses on this land due to the mine shafts that are here. Is the ground safe if you start digging it up are you going to open up holes in ground.</p> <p>We have a dog who enjoys playing and going for walks outside on the moor we often see people who are dog walking ramble's horse riders enjoying the surrounding countryside where all the wildlife live there are flowers plants and trees here.</p> <p>Please stop and consider what damage you will cause if you do go ahead. Where will all the wildlife go? Our homes already feel like a prison at school time and it will be like running a gauntlet just going to work and carrying out our everyday lives.</p>		
1748	M C	Reed			Object	<p>Rossendale Borough Council's forward planning for potential new housing on the above site in particular does not seem to take in the fact that access would be extremely poor and would cause immense problems in an already congested area. Tonacliffe Road is always busy, particularly during the hours which accommodate commuting to and from work or school. Also it is badly maintained and is constantly plagued by water pipe burts.</p> <p>The proposed building land above is inhabited by wildlife and in the past has been proved unfit for building due to bad drainage. Also, our landscape would be ruined.</p> <p>The actual main road - market Street - is the only access into Rochdale or Bacup and the road itself is already extremely busy, hence the amount of "Yellow boxes" in an attempt to control traffic.</p> <p>Whitworth is a busy village with very few facilities as it lies on the cusp of Rossendale. We already have oversubscribed schools and medical services, surely with such stretched amenities do we require more housing in all the proposed areas?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.109	Further comment
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	TONACLIFFE, WHITWORTH - HS 2:106 and 109 – The sustainability of the sites is considered to be low and improvements to the pedestrian and cycle links would be required. There are ongoing concerns on Tonacliffe Road raised by the residents in relation to vehicle speeds and therefore mitigation measures to reduce vehicle speeds in accordance with the speed limit may be required. The sites could be deemed acceptable subject to a design which is in accordance with Manual for Streets which provides maximum permeability and loop roads for multiple vehicle access points off the adopted highway network, rather than extensions of cul-de-sacs.		
					Number of comments	HS2.109	137	
Reference		HS2.110		Irwell vale Mill				
739	Edward	Oldham			Support	I write on behalf of our client Edward Oldham who owns the above site as identified on the South West Policies Map within the Rossendale Draft Local Plan. My client fully supports the proposed allocation of the site for residential development. The site is 'deliverable'; it is available for development; it offers a suitable location for housing development; residential development on the site is viable and housing could be delivered on the site within five years. The factory has been vacant since December 2015. It has been actively marketed since that date. No firm interest or offers have been made for the site as a going concern. As such we do not consider that it is appropriate to continue to retain the land in employment use. As you are aware a planning application (ref. 2017/0290) for residential development has been submitted for land, within the proposed allocation, to the south of the river Ogden. This demonstrates the availability and deliverability of the site.		
950	Stuart	Thompson	None	SHLAA16278	Object	The site and volume of housing proposed will dramatically increase the burden on local site infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, road infrastructure. - - Lancashire County Council have already stated that the funding available to further develop these type of services are scheduled to be cut, not increased, in the coming years. This will lead to an unmanageable overload and therefore a deterioration in educational and health provision to the current population which would be significantly exacerbated should the population increase. - - A demonstration that funding will be available and all additional support services will be developed/improved from their current condition needs to be clearly stated by local, county and central governing bodies. - -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.110	Further comment
1367	Nicola	Hardman	-		Object	<p>I am writing to put forward my objections to the proposed property development in Helmshore. - - I will address each of the sites separately below however my overall concern which applies to all of the proposed development sites in Helmshore is the lack of services, infrastructure, and erosion of valuable green space. - - Look at an aerial picture of Helmshore 'village' in 2017. Can this once beautiful village really be classed as a village anymore? There is hardly any green space with housing having been allowed to be crammed into every available space and Helmshore is no longer distinguishing from Haslingden. - - You refer to the government white paper, encouraging higher density 'where appropriate'. How can the destruction of a small village be classed as appropriate? - - Does anyone in the council commute outside the valley for work? Particularly the m66? You are encouraging the move to the countryside (cheshire based property developers at the Loom development) yet it is not reasonably possible for anyone who values family life and their time to commute to and from Manchester anymore with this journey now taking approx 90 minutes each way and the roads unable to cope. - - You address the serious concerns about the m66 and the m60 which are virtually gridlocked but do not propose any solutions. This is merely an afterthought. How you can even consider the building of so many new homes 'encouraging higher density' without addressing the lack of infrastructure and the gridlock is negligent. The travel issue such as re-opening the railway should be the starting point. - - No mention is made in the report of building extra schools or how Helmshore will cope with an influx of local residents when schools are already over subscribed with some people resorting to pay for their children to attend primary school due to be offered unsatisfactory schools outside of the area they reside. Again this should be a starting point. - - The lack of green space in the urban area of Helmshore is particularly sad for future generations. Yes, Helmshore is surrounded by beautiful hills, but is this a reason to remove all the green space within the 'village' itself and turn this into a concrete jungle? - - To turn to the particular proposed developments; - - HS2 76 SNIG HOLE - - one of the more beautiful areas of Helmshore opposite the memorial park is at risk. See your policy HS5. This would have a clear impact on local character and appearance. - - Very close to one of the only green spaces where all the children in Helmshore are squished in the park to play. Development here is not safe. - - - HS2 710 IRWELL VALE MILL SITE - - this is an area that floods already - - Irwell vale has one road in and out without a proper footpath. Not safe for anyone on foot. - - another beauty spot being ruined. - - the affect on wildlife. - - I fail to see why any green belt should be released to meet the 'housing requirement'. Planning for future generations should require saving greenbelt, not amending urban boundaries as suits and developing other areas of brownfield or other less developed areas of rossendale. The ratio of what is being proposed in</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS2.110	Further comment
						Helmshore is grossly out of proportion with the size of the village. - - It's shameful that these developments are even being proposed and I assume that the council knew this given that the documented - Proposal does not have the confidence to clearly define the proposed building in 'Helmshore' in the contents and attempts to sneak these developments in under vague headings. Perhaps the council was aware of the upset anticipated from local residents. - This speaks volumes. Do you want your legacy to be ruining Helmshore for the future? -		
1439	Antony	Wild	-		Object	Any development at Irwell Vale will require the provision of a new access road. As a former resident, the current access past the sewage farm is dangerous because there is no footpath. The road is initially very narrow and scarcely allows two cars to pass. If this is a serious development, then road widening or alternative access routes (Hardsough Lane?!!) need implementing.		What happened to the Green Belt and using up Brown Field sites first (instead of sanctioning M&S and the myriad of other supermarkets)? - -
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities		Not Applicable	HS2.110 – Inner Vale Mill Site The site in question is located next to Rossendale Wastewater Treatment works. There is also pumping station located within the site and it may be more appropriate to consider the new location of development and reduction on future residential amenity in terms of being located close to an asset. We would ask any future developer(s) to contact us to explore options for addressing this as early as possible.		

Number of comments HS2.110

5

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES

Chapter 0: Delivering Sustainable Development

Reference SD1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

1473	K	Howieson	C/O Agent		Support	<p>3. DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES</p> <p>POLICY SD1 PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>3.1 This policy is in line with the Framework and supports sustainable development in accordance with the Local Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In addition, where policies are out of date or irrelevant the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise, taking into account any adverse impacts that would demonstrably outweigh the benefits or any specific policies in the Framework that indicate development should be restricted.</p> <p>3.2 This policy is supported as it is directly in line with the Framework.</p>		
------	---	----------	-----------	--	---------	---	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD1	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>The Draft Local Plan makes reference to the NPPF and that a core theme within the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It states that the Council will therefore proactively seek opportunities to meet the development aspirations and needs of Rossendale. The Local Plan also states that the document contains policies that follow an approach in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>The Policy recognises this, stating the following: ‘The Council will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area’</p> <p>Furthermore, the policy adds: ‘Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise’</p> <p>Key Point: The Council recognises the importance of Sustainable Development as identified within the NPPF and it will work proactively to ensure that such developments are delivered within the Borough.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD1	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the national Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The Council will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p> <p>Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise, taking into account whether:</p> <p>a) any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>b) specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</p> <p>RCT supports SD1 subject to amendment to definitions of sustainable development in 2011 Core Strategy and NPPF 2012, and prefers these: Resolution 42/187 of the United Nations General Assembly defined sustainable development as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The UK Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future set out five ‘guiding principles’ of sustainable development: living within the planet’s environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly. Not just a lot of low density “aspirational” housing”. Nor now demolished free grant money projects such as Blackburn’s Waves Leisure Pool that followed the 1981 riots.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD1	Further comment
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Not Applicable	<p>Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>6. CPRE Lancashire is pleased to note that when considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Environmental factors must be considered in balance with economic and social ones.</p> <p>7. The absence of a definition for sustainable development in the NPPF is a glaring omission, and we recommend that this deficiency could be rectified by the inclusion of one, in the local plan. We follow the Brundtland Commission, 1987 definition: "Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". It contains two key concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept of "needs", in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and • The idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and future needs." 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD1	Further comment	
1790	David	Trivett			Not Applicable	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the July 2017 Local Plan Written Statement (Regulation 18 Draft) and submit the following for consideration. Although the draft plan encompasses the entire borough I have limited my comments to the proposals I consider will affect our immediate locality in and around the Bacup and Stacksteads area.</p> <p>I have several areas of concern about the proposals within the draft but will focus on those I consider most important for the future.</p> <p>Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>I understand sustainable development means: Development that meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.</p> <p>With consideration to some recent planning decisions made by the council I have serious concerns about the statement on page 4 of the draft:</p> <p>“Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.” and page 5</p> <p>“approve development proposals that accord with the Local Plan without delay; and</p> <p>Where the Local Plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out-of-date, grant permission unless:</p> <p>any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>specific policies in the Framework indicate the development should be restricted.”</p> <p>My interpretation of the presumption in favour of sustainable development is; a small group of elected, lay person, representatives make decisions which will have a long reaching effect on future generations with regard to the local environment, finances and their future wellbeing.</p> <p>As with this exercise I appreciate planning notifications are issued and consultation events are organised. However, I believe a large proportion of the populace are too busy living their daily lives to take note of some of the proposals which could affect them; other than those highlighted in the media. Recent claims that some individuals were too scared to voice an opinion on the £2 million Bacup Town Heritage Initiative and comments that a majority of people are in favour of the first, now rejected, public realm initiative scheme are examples of the manner in which some major decisions are managed. If no objections are raised the presumption is then made in favour of the proposal. This concerns me.</p> <p>The fact that some individuals are not aware, are too busy to respond to what is happening around them, or consider there is no point in objecting because; it won't make any difference to the decision, frustrates me greatly. Hence my</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD1	Further comment
						responses to the Local Plan draft consultation.		
1809	Alex	Rowe	Natural England		Support	<p>Thank you for your consultation which was received by Natural England on 28 September 2017.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Delivering Sustainable Development</p> <p>We would like to see reference to The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006 that places a duty of every public authority, in exercising its functions, to have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those function, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.</p> <p>Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework's (NPPF) presumption in favour of sustainable development has been fully captured in the Draft Local Plan for Rossendale, which we support.</p>		

Number of comments SD1

6

Reference	SD2	Urban Boundary and Green Belt						
8	Lorraine Butler	-	Green Belt Parcel Ref 74	Object		<p>I object to the application of Land Parcel Ref 74 to be allocated as a "sub area with potential for release" as I strongly believe it should remain within the designated Greenbelt boundary as is currently defined. The vast part of the land that has been assigned for potential release is farm land that is currently used for agricultural purposes for the feeding of livestock and therefore releasing this land would have a significant impact on the openness of the green belt area and encourage urban sprawl. - - Releasing this Parcel of land would blur the lines between Greenbelt and urbanisation of the village of Whitworth and would allow the encroachment of developments on to the current Greenbelt, releasing this land will allow for further applications to made for further Greenbelt areas. - - Over the last two years there have been several planning applications made for a detached house to be built on the Northern part of the land that you have earmarked for potential release. However both the local authority and the Government Building Inspectorate have dismissed planning due to the fact that there is a clearly defined boundary that separates the urban area of the village and the current greenbelt. Releasing this land will mean that there is no longer a clearly defined boundary. - - The historical houses situated within the Greenbelt have been here for nearly 300 years and releasing this land would have a significant impact on the visual amenity and openness of the area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
93	Norman	Crook	-	SD2 Proposed urban area boundary at Blackwood Road Stacksteads	Object	Whilst the urban area boundary should include land to the north and south of Blackwood Road, Stacksteads to include housing allocation HS2.24, the boundary should be extended to include a wider enclave incorporating existing housing and to connect more logically to the main existing urban area. This will provide a more defensible long-term urban area boundary. - - (A Plan showing the suggested urban area boundary accompanies the original representation seeking the allocation of land at Blackwood Road in response to the 'Call for Sites')		No. - - If further information, clarification or explanation is required, please do not hesitate to contact the Agent.
432	Antony	Greenwood	-		Object	This land, which is currently designated as Green Belt is being proposed to be Countryside in the current emerging Local Plan consultation. I would like this land to be brought into the Urban Boundary. There is much development going on at New Hall Hey on the other side of the motorway and changes to the Urban Boundary currently being considered are only about 3 fields away. Letter received at Bacup Roadshow (14/09/2017): I would like this to be included in the new Urban Boundary please. Please see appendix for attachment.		-
477	Sadaqut	Amin			Not Applicable	Thank you for your email. After carefully viewing the Haslingden proposals it has led me to question what is exactly meant by the 'proposed urban boundary' and is there any chance you can send the original map with streets to view what changes are actually made. My general assumption is that when it states 'proposed urban boundary' it implies residential area but there seems to be some areas which are marked on the outskirts of such proposal so therefore could disadvantage some residents. My specific enquiry is in relation to the proposed urban boundary which runs through Rake Foot but fails to acknowledge the residential area on Rock Hall Road (see attached). As a resident of this area can you offer some insights about why this is and if these proposals are accepted what are the implications for any future building, planning etc... if it's in the outskirts of the urban boundary? I hope to hear from you soon. Thanks		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
527	John	Howat	N/A	Land at Marl Pits	Object	<p>Observations on Proposed Local Plan for Rossendale. - - Having viewed the 2017 proposed Local Plan for Rossendale and discussing it with a member of the Planning Department at a recent local consultation meeting on Thursday 7th September, I feel obliged to make the following objections and following observations. - - Access. - There appears no have been no consideration of the extra traffic that the proposed developments will generate. From a personal point of view I am particularly concerned by those schemes in Rawtenstall, some requiring extending the Urban Boundary into the countryside, that are contiguous with and likely to be accessed from Newchurch Road. Principally these are: - - Dark Lane Football Ground, HS2.82 (58 Houses). - St Peters Road, Newchurch, HS2.86 (9 Houses). - Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.53 (30 Houses). - Land east of Johnny Barn Farm, HS2.54 (105 Houses) - Higher Cloughfold, HS2.58 (7 Houses). - West of Dobbin Lane, HS2.54 (27Houses). - Land at Conway Road, HS2.57 (5 Houses). - Land between Newchurch Road & Bacup Road, HS2.54 (55 Houses). - Hurst Platt, HS 2.56 (8 Houses). - Peel Street, Clough Fold, HS 2.84 (8 Houses) - - In addition the plan shows a proposal that Urban Boundary behind Marl Pits be moved north to Balladen Clough and although no actual figure or HS reference is given, a figure of 55 houses has been quoted informally in the past. - - Permission has recently been granted for two houses outside the existing Urban Boundary, in a greenfield site, (2015/0308). Although it appears that there is no intention to move the boundary to accommodate them. - - Potentially therefore there are 369 new houses planned that will have their main access via Newchurch Road. Assuming that each household has two cars (738 cars) each making just one trip out and one trip back each day (1476 daily journeys) for 323 days a year (allowing for six weeks holidays) this will be a minimum of 476,748 new car journeys along all or part of Newchurch Road each year. In addition there will be journeys generated by visitors, deliveries and services such as refuse collection. Newchurch Road, downhill from Marl Pits to Rawtenstall, will become exceptionally busy; entrance and exit from Union Street already difficult, will become virtually impossible; an intolerable situation. - - As long as I can remember (30 years or more) there have been problems with access to and from Chapel Hill via the Union Street /Newchurch Road Junction. In 1993, at the public enquiry into objections to the then proposed District Local Plan, it was noted that Rossendale Borough Council considered that Union Street was unsuitable and there were "... severe highway problems in the area" and "... that no additional traffic at all should be allowed to aggravate the situation". The Inspector, Mr D. Gill, added a comment to his ruling on Urban Boundary changes in the area, "... that the present arrangement (for traffic) is certainly below standard". - - None-the-less, over subsequent years, RBC has sanctioned further developments in the area including the making of a rear entrance to Alder Grange School with access via Union Street, which at</p>		I have not commented on individual sites as it is the effect that the sum of these sites will have on the traffic on Newchurch Road that is my concern.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>peak periods has worsened the situation considerably, both for pedestrians using the narrow pavements and vehicles dropping off or collecting children. -</p> <p>There are real problems with access from Newchurch Road up Union Street onto Hurst Lane and onwards onto Chapel Hill. Union Street is a steep hill with residents parking which only allows one-way traffic the majority of the time. It is treacherous in winter conditions and at times only four-wheel drive vehicles can ascend; descent too can be extremely awkward when the road is icy. - -</p> <p>The exit from Union Street on to Newchurch Road has become increasingly difficult, as traffic has inexorably increased. There is limited visibility to the east and the road the west it is compromised by the bus stops on both sides and cars parked outside the convenience store. The latter obstruct the carriageway causing vehicles leaving Union Street and turning down Newchurch Road to travel some distance on the wrong side of the road, at times in the face of oncoming traffic. Cars entering from Newchurch Road are often blind to vehicles descending Union Street and this results in awkward maneuvering, with traffic on the main road impeded by cars waiting to ascend Union Street as a result. This is a particular problem for those cars entering Union Street from the east. - - - The single track available at the bottom end of Union Street as a result of residents' parking, can be blocked by vehicles which stop half way up to unload passengers or goods. In recent years large lorries connecting with the conversion of the redundant public house, The Old House at Home, to housing and the (apparently never-ending) construction of the eight new houses behind Hurst Platt have added to the chaos at the bottom of the street as they negotiate the tight junction between Green Street and Union Street (often in reverse) or on to Newchurch Road.</p> <p>Newchurch Road is increasingly busy and joining it from Union Street is often very difficult, especially if traffic is backed up from the pedestrian crossing and traffic lights at the Rams Head/St Mary's Way. Frequently one is reliant on a good-natured driver giving way. - - There is real concern amongst the residents in Waingate that Fire, Ambulances and other emergency vehicles would at times be unable to reach their destination expeditiously. - - There are no alternative routes onto Chapel Hill. The continuation of Hurst Lane from the top of Union Street down hill to Newchurch Road is little more than an alley, a very narrow single track with no pavements. It cannot be considered as an adequate substitute for Union Street except in the occasional emergency. Only cars can use it. Waingate Road is no longer suitable for vehicular traffic. - - It would appear from planning application 2015/0308 that Lancashire County Council do not see a problem with the traffic on Newchurch Road and Union Street and access to properties on Chapel Hill. It is clear that none of their officers have lived in the area and to my knowledge no one has spoken to the residents. If they had, I suspect they perhaps would hold a different view. It seems that in allocating the various areas along Newchurch Road for extra housing in the Local Plan, there has been neither</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----	-----------------

recognition of the problems of Union Street nor consideration as to how they may be alleviated. - - A traffic census was seen to be carried out a few years ago but as it was during half-term, when there was no school traffic, its value therefore must be in doubt and of course it did not take into account those changes that will ensue should the current Local District Plan come to fruition along Newchurch Road as proposed. Should, as was intimated during the consultation meeting I attended, a further study on traffic in Rawtenstall be commissioned, can I urge you to involve to the residents of Waingate, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent and Union Street as part of the study? - - Facilities. - Other than to permit a surfeit of supermarkets, RBC appears to have given no consideration to the infrastructure required to support any major increase of housing/population. General Practice surgeries are struggling with the current patient demand and attracting Doctors into existing practices to fill vacancies proves very difficult. Recruitment to new practices is impossible. Currently there are insufficient Medical graduates choosing General Practice as a career. There is also dearth of NHS Dental Surgeries and it may necessary to travel out of the Borough to register for NHS treatment. There appears to be no possibility of extending existing primary or secondary schools nor is there the finance to build new ones. - - Alternative Sites and Uses. - In general I object to the use of greenfield sites to accommodate additional housing. There appears to be no map or register of brownfield sites, which should be completely replaced by residential schemes before any consideration is given to extending the Urban Boundary to provide building land. There are several large redundant buildings which should be sympathetically converted to residential use as apartments as has been done elsewhere both in Rossendale and neighbouring towns and cities. Examples include the old cinema on Bacup Road, vacant and available for many years. It should be converted, with compulsory preservation of the external structure, to two floors of apartments and the ground floor used for residents' parking. Similarly, St John's Church, Crawshawbooth, recently on the market, would make a fine block of flats. The abandoned Kwiksave/Poundland store by the railway station should be demolished and the site made available for new housing. It is not needed for an out of town retail site. - - The plan to move the Urban Boundary at Marl Pits should be abandoned. The area is crossed by a well-used and much-loved rural footpath which would be lost if it was subsequently urbanised. In any case the land at the west end of the plot slopes steeply to the brook and is unsuitable for building. There is currently no vehicular access to the area unless the RBC is to allow it through the Marl Pits car park, which would be unacceptable. A possible alternative use for this land, maintaining its greenfield status, would be as a campsite for tourists, with hard standings for touring caravans and pitches for tents. A dedicated domestic block close to the leisure centre would be acceptable; access could be through the leisure centre car park. An administrative office could be

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						established in the leisure centre itself, or as part of the domestic block. This type of facility is sorely needed in Rossendale if, as the RBC professes, the tourist industry is to be promoted and developed. The campsite could be administered and promoted as part of the Leisure Centre. - - Suggested Action. - I am well aware of the pressure applied by Central Government to the RBC to provide affordable and new dwellings. However, now that the target has been reduced by approximately 50% to 2,100, I urge the Council to abandon any proposals for land outwith the Urban Boundary and concentrate development on redundant buildings, brownfield and other former industrial sites. - - 19th September 2017 -		
562	Phillip	Byrne	-	RCGL (UB) 11 - Lives and Landscapes July 2014	Object	There are material considerations that demonstrate this change to the urban boundary is counter-indicated. - 1. Grade 2 listed Church of St Mary and All Saints - This is a site of cultural value for which the setting must be maintained per Part (2) of section 16 and Part (1) of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The proposed change to the urban boundary would significantly affect the setting of this important, graded local building. - 2. Residential amenity - The effect of building high density housing in the proposed area would have an adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood and on the residential amenity of neighbours. Adjacent properties are substantial, detached properties with good spacing and ample grounds and these new houses would be very much out of place. - 3. Road Safety - Whilst accepting there will be a thorough and detailed Road Safety Audit, the fact is that more buildings equals more cars. Any development would adversely affect highway safety by creating conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular movements, given the poor provision of parking and pavements along the single-track road that is Goodshaw Lane. The lane is accessed by children on their way to and from Crawshawbooth Primary School, the attached recreational area and the outdoor classroom. Additionally, increased traffic will exacerbate current access problems for Goodshaw Lane, making it difficult for emergency services. - 4. Core Strategy Development Plan Document: The Way Forward (2011 - 2026) - This document states that housing will be focussed on Rawtenstall with no major development in Goodshaw and that the integrity of existing open spaces will be maintained. Further it states that walking and cycling improvements in Goodshaw will offer improved countryside access. Changing the urban boundary to facilitate additional development contravenes these commitments. - 5. Creation of Precedent - Moving this area of countryside within the urban boundary to allow a development will make it difficult to refuse similar developments on similar sites, as a precedent will have been created, irrevocably changing the overall character of the area.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
571	Andrew	Ellis	-	RCGL(UB)11 /SHLAA16196	Object	<p>The proposed urban boundary change will only encourage more building on the east of Goodshaw Lane which will increase traffic flow on a dangerous narrow partially steep and blind-cornered lane. The lane is used recreationally by lots of people (walking, cycling and horse riding) - as it is a refuge from Burnley road, scenic and a pleasant area to use. I don't feel that your assessment of its recreational value has been fully ascertained i.e. at weekends, especially during fine weather, it is a very popular walk, cycle and horse riding route. Many children (and parents) use the lane to walk to Crawshawbooth primary, again to avoid a busy road and enjoy the rural nature the valley. I can find no evidence that any assessment of the lane's use at these high use times has been conducted. The high level of traffic caused by other local attractions / services (Church and local children's nursery on Goodshaw Avenue) have a large impact at key times. Moving the urban boundary to ultimately facilitate house building (by landowners who do not live in the valley) would not only increase traffic but would massively reduce the quality of the natural environment for local people now and in the future, i.e. walking through a housing estate on a dangerously narrow road would be yet another way to erosion of the quality just to facilitate a larger population. Given the marginal gain in potential housing land and the impact on the natural environment and landscape, I would urge you to keep the urban boundary as it is and therefore discourage any further development along Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>The proposed urban boundary change set out in in the local plan part 2 (RCGL(UB)11 - Land south of Goodshw Chapel and opposite St Marys and All Saints had a sustainability appraisal. The new proposal document has further moved the urban boundary into more</p>		I do feel that you have have tried to make documents and information available to the public but the sheer scale of the proposal has meant that changes proposed to the urban boundary have become obscured and confusing.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
573	Jessica	Dougherty	None		Object	<p>I would like to oppose the proposal concerning Policy Ref: RCGL(UB)11/SHLAA16196; Site Location: Land south of Goodshaw Chapel and opposite St Mary's and All Saints for the following reasons: 1. Changing the urban boundary from its current position (centre of Goodshaw Lane) would mean increasing the likelihood of future development and housing. This will exacerbate further the significant access issues on this quiet and narrow lane. Certainly, the existing highway infrastructure is highly unsuitable to serve as a means of access to any further development proposals. 2. In addition, the local land form is such as to make residential development here, regardless of form or layout, overbearing and intrusive in character and allocation of this land would involve development on a visually prominent site, clearly visible from adjoining roads and footpaths. Goodshaw Lane is of significant recreational importance to the countryside, as a greenfield area which has several public rights of way. Families with young children, horse riders, walkers, cyclists and runners all frequent the lane as it an important and peaceful refuge from the increasingly busy Burnley Road. School children and walking buses from Goodshaw Primary are also frequent users. 3. Further, I strongly oppose the later changes proposed as it dramatically increases the extent of the boundary change immediately south of Hawthorn Farm Cottage from the previous proposed boundary change in prior to 2015 which only encompassed the paddock immediately adjacent to Goodshaw Lane on the east side. It is our understanding that this seemingly arbitrary extension of the original proposed urban boundary change had not been subject to a 'Sustainability Appraisal' at all – your previous ref: RCGL(UB)11. Additionally, this new proposal for the boundary change was actually made prior to the most recent site survey which has taken place, dated 7th June 2017. Reading this document, it appears to greatly underestimate and under play the impact of any development on the natural environment and biodiversity; on heritage assets (St Mary's and All Saints Church & Goodshaw Chapel) and its setting; the capability of sustainable development; and any adverse impact on local views and viewpoints. 4. While the original proposal for alteration of the urban boundary included land east of Goodshaw Lane that had been previously developed, this minimal housing development had been fully demolished and the land fully cleared from buildings of any kind since the 1960s. Since then the paddock in question has been returned to grazing. However, the further substantial shift in the proposed urban boundary in the most recent document (June 2017) would mean that even more land designated as valuable greenfield countryside and currently used for grazing and hay production would be potentially lost. This hay meadow does provide habitats for wildlife and its loss would likely result in deterioration of biodiversity, wildlife refuge and valuable feeding areas (including bats). The additional field in question has never been used as housing, and is currently</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>classed as countryside, which, in our view, dramatically weakens the case for moving the urban boundary across this area. 5. Additionally, due to the omission of this land from the original appraisal prior to 2015 (and subsequent arbitrary inclusion), as stated earlier, we feel that the validity of the consultation process has again been called into question as potential objectors may not be aware of this major shift in the proposed urban boundary in Goodshaw Ward and this has not been sufficiently been communicated. 6. We are also concerned as to the reasoning behind this substantial proposed erosion of countryside and its centring only in this specific location to the east of Goodshaw Lane and are genuinely confused as to why this should be the case when other such substantial shifts have not been proposed elsewhere along Goodshaw Lane south of St Mary's Church. In addition, I am concerned that this may create a worrying precedent which could potentially lead to further housing development in Goodshaw Ward. It is notable that the only proposals to move the urban boundary in the area have actually come from the landowners themselves who do not actually live in the valley. Clearly, any movement of the urban boundary to include their land would benefit them individually in terms of land price and potential development opportunities. However, I believe that the negative impact on the local community and the environment in the immediate and long term as outlined above should be the primary consideration in this case. If you require any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us. I look forward to your response in due course.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment	
596	P	Byrne			Land South of Goodshaw Chapel and opposite St Marys and All Saints Church	Object	Further to the publication of your draft local plan presentation thereof, I would like to formally put on record my objection to the following proposal contained therein: Land south of Goodshaw Chapel and opposite St Marys and All Saints Church This change proposes taking land from the countryside and bringing it into the urban boundary, to enable it to be developed in the future. There are a number of material considerations that illustrate the need for this change to be reconsidered and I strongly urge that you do based on the following: 1. Grade II Listed Church of St Mary and All Saints A church has stood on this site since 1542, with the current church being built in 1829. This church is a site of significant cultural value for which the setting must be maintained. The church currently enjoys a Grade II listing, per the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and confirmed by the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England. This listing ensures that the church is of special interest, warranting every effort to preserve it and its settings. Specifically, Part (1) of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states, "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses". The proposed change to the urban boundary to enable development would have the potential to significantly affect the setting of this important, graded local building. Further it would detrimentally affect the amenity value provided to those parishioners who use this church, which is now the sole remaining Church of England place of worship for the parish. 2. Residential amenity The stretch of Goodshaw Lane from St Mary and All Sainsts Church to Crawshawbooth primary school has a particular character, exemplified by the size and nature of the houses that have been built there. Over many years, particular care has been taken by the planning officer to ensure new houses, and modifications to old houses, are sympathetic with this character. The effect of building high-density housing in the proposed area would have an adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood and on the residential amenity of neighbours. Adjacent properties aer substantial, detached properties with good spacing and ample grounds and new, high-density houses would be very much out of place. 3. Road Safety Whilst accepting there will be a thorough and detailed road safety audit, an inescapable fact is that in this day and age, more buildings equals more cars.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>Twenty high-density houses may well result in as many as thirty additional motor vehicles and there will not be the space to park these cars. The resultant overspill would adversely affect highway safety by creating conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular movements. This would be further exacerbated by the poor provision of parking and pavements along the single-track road that is Goodshaw Lane.</p> <p>The lane is accessed by children on their way to and from Crawshawbooth Primary School, the attached recreational area and outdoor classroom. There are many footpaths accessed directly from Goodshaw Lane and walkers journey up and down the lane to get from one path to another. Horses with riders are a daily occurrence. Elderly people resident at Harvey Longworth Court regularly access the lane on foot. None of these will mix well with increased vehicular movements.</p> <p>Additionally, an increase in the amount of vehicles on or around this part of Goodshaw Lane will worsen the already critical problem of access for larger vehicles. Council service vehicles have problems accessing all areas of the land and, at certain times, emergency vehicles simply would not be able to get to where they need to go.</p> <p>4. Core Strategy Development Plan Document: The Way Forward (2011 - 2026) This document states that housing will be focused on Rawtenstall with no major development in Goodshaw and that the integrity of existing open spaces will be maintained. Further it states that Goodshaw and that the integrity of existing open spaces will be maintained. Further it states that walking and cycling improvements in Goodshaw will offer improved countryside access. Whilst the core strategy document will be replaced by the Local Plan once it is formally issued, we assume that these same commitments will be by inherent on the decisions made and direction taken by the planning office going forward. Changing the urban boundary to facilitate major, additional development contravenes these commitments. Brining countryside into the Urban Boundary opposite St Marys and All Saints Church would be the least sympathetic place to do so, if upholding the twin vision of maintaining the integrity of current open spaces and improving walking and cycling access to the countryside is a true aspiration of the Planning Officer.</p> <p>5. creation of Precedent A long-stated aspiration of the Planning Office is to maintain the Urban Boundary for Crawshawbooth as much as between the Burnley Road and Goodshaw Lane as is possible. The area to the east of Goodshaw Lane has always, with good reason, enjoyed protection from development. Many applications for development in that area have, in the past, been refused and potential developers have been told tht there is enough land elsewhere for development.</p> <p>This situation has bit changed and many sites within the Urban Boundary, but</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>not shown in the draft Local plan, could be identified as sites for development. The government's white paper in February this year called for local councils to focus on identifying and registering such sites and back this instruction by setting up a £1.2B fund to create upwards of 30,000 homes on brownfield land. Moving countryside within the urban boundary to allow development contravenes this government initiative.</p> <p>The action of eschewing government direction and opening up the countryside to new-build developments will have set a precedent and will make it difficult to refuse similar developments on similar sites in the future. The loss of swathes of countryside to the east of Goodshaw Lane is then, just a matter of time.</p> <p>In summary, bringing countryside south of Goodshaw Chapel and opposite St Marys and All Saints Church into the Urban Boundary contravenes both government initiatives and the council's own, stated position. It does so without making a material gain in terms of solving the overall housing problem being addressed by the council. However, what it does achieve is to set precedent and direction that will irrevocably change the nature of countryside in that area and will severely detract from the amenity value enjoyed by residents of and visitors to that neighbourhood. I implore you to reconsider this change to the Urban Boundary and encourage you to build upon the government's initiative and find the equivalent number of houses in the many pockets of brownfield land in and around the Goodshaw area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
598	David	Trick		Hutch Bank Farm, Flip Road, Haslingden	Object	<p>I am writing to seek your agreement to the realignment of the Western Urban Boundary line shown on the draft policies plan in the area known as Hutch Bank, Haslingden</p> <p>I have recently inherited Hutch Bank Farm, Flip Road in Haslingden. I am rather disappointed to see that the urban boundary line in this area remains the same as the previous local plan policies map. Presently the farm and surrounding area beyond St Crispins Way is an eye sore and contributes little to the town. I would like the opportunity to create a sense of place that is likely to be valued. There is definitely the potential to achieve a substantial development with good design.</p> <p>The area itself is strategically positioned for both walking and cycling into Haslingden and is easily accessible to the local highway network</p> <p>I have enclosed, on the next two emails, two sketches that show residential development on the site. By the very nature of the site and its close proximity to St Crispin Way it does seem suitable for small starter homes. To create a sense of place a nature tree screening could be managed and developed along the eastern boundary line as shown. With views above the tree line and across the valley it could potentially be an exciting development.</p> <p>The local infrastructure to service the site is within easy reach and would not adversely affect the highway network</p> <p>Furthermore with good design there is the potential to unlock land to the south that is presently considered as left over space contributing nothing to the local economy.</p> <p>Presently the site falls under countryside in the policies plan. This does nothing to help enhance the region that is sadly lacking nor does it provide an opportunity to change the area for the better</p> <p>Online questionnaire received 25/09/2017: Refer to email under Hutch Bank Farm, Potential Development Proposals</p> <p>Please see attachments in appendix</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
610	Joyce	Haworth			Object	<p>I have attended this church for more than 60 years and, as number of cars on our roads has grown beyond anything that could have been anticipated, I have seen traffic on the road outside the church increase and the amount of parking space decrease. To allow the building of houses on this piece of land would have the most devastating effect on our church, which has embraced the congregation of St John's in Crawshawbooth since its closure, as well as the area in general.</p> <p>Parking spaces on a Sunday are at a premium and members of the congregation, many of whom are elderly, are faced with having to park some distance away. In addition, the church facilitates many weddings, baptisms, funerals and social events which bring with them a marked increase in cars and people.</p> <p>Goodshaw Lane is very narrow with several 'blind' bends. There are no adequate pavements and scant street lighting. The road is used by young families walking to the nearby primary school and nursery, horse riders, walkers and customers going to the Kennels.</p> <p>The area already has a large amount of houses - council and private, as well as a large sheltered housing complex - and the demands which would be made on services (doctors, dentists, school etc) - in the area would be stretched to its limits.</p> <p>The area and its people deserve to have some open spaces and a safe environment, and this development would contribute nothing to either.</p>		
677	Phil	Ramsden	Lindon Park Development s Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt - - It is acknowledged and supported that all new development in the borough should take place within the Urban Boundaries, which are defined on the Policies Map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area. - - However, it is imperative that the Council fully undertakes a detailed assessment of sites outside of the defined urban boundary to ensure that all sites with potential or which have a historic planning permission are included within the boundary. Sites that fall within the latter category can have the effect of reducing the overall amount of greenfield land that will need to be allocated for development. - - This is the case with regard to a site off Lindon Park Road, Ewood Bridge, Haslingden which benefits from a historic but implemented and still extant planning permission. The emerging Local Plan proposes the site to be included within a wider zone of Green Belt when it should be allocated for housing development, by reference to its planning history. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
749	Fred	Barlow		Green belt land in Helmshore	Object	<p>It has come to my notice that more GREEN BELT land is to be considered for building on in Helmshore, land off FREE LANE. This land is now allotments. Allotments are part of the amenities of a community and should be kept as such.</p> <p>Haslingden and Helmshore have been walked on enough by Rossendale council planning, our kids still have no swimming pool!</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to these proposals, this land needs to be kept as GREEN BELT.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
756	John	Simpson	-		Object	<p>Objection to proposed changes to the Green Belt, Urban Boundary & Countryside as shown on the South West map in relation to land parcels 30 & 31. - - NPPF paragraph 79 states that 'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.' One of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt is 'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.' (NPPF Para 80 – number 3). - - The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Helmshore are contrary to these aims for the following reasons: - - In the assessment criteria for Purpose 3 (NPPF Green Belt Purposes – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment) a Moderate rating is where a 'parcel of land contains the characteristics of countryside, has limited urbanising development, & is relatively open.' - - The current Green Belt boundary is clearly defined by Helmshore Road & Free Lane. In 'The Green Belt Review' document para 3.19 in terms of permanence 'it is recognised that there are benefits in using features which are clearly defined & which also play a physical and/or visual role in separating town and countryside to act as Green Belt boundaries.' - - There are no such strong physical features to define the proposed new Green Belt boundaries & therefore there is nothing to prevent incremental encroachment into the Green Belt in the future. - - By moving the boundary away from the roads, & so allowing the potential for development/urbanisation on the land released, the Green Belt would lose the essential characteristic of openness it currently has in this area of Helmshore. - - Land Parcel 30 - In the proposed changes to the Green Belt, Urban Boundary and Countryside document Land Parcel 30's notes on Purpose 3 state that 'there is a sense of encroachment with the parcel as a result of a cluster of residential properties, facilities of Sunnybank Social Club and a children's play area' so that 'the north of the parcel has a somewhat weakened rural character.' - - This assessment does not take into account the length of time the properties etc have been situated here, nor the fact that they have not been classed as 'encroachment' in previous Local Plan reviews, where they have been included within the Green Belt boundary. - - Sunnybank Social Club and Helmshore Memorial Park (which includes the playground) have both been in their locations for over 100 years. Likewise the residential properties are mainly a farmhouse and cottage which have been on site for over 300 years, with associated farm buildings having been converted or re-built on the original building's footprint. In this respect there has been no recent 'encroachment'. Other buildings/structures associated with equestrian use are recognised as accepted use in rural areas (Rossendale Borough Council's Core Policy LT5). - - The Review of the Green Belt considers that the Potential Degree of Harm caused by the removal of this area from the Green Belt to be Medium. However, this parcel is adjoining a</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>large area of land where the Degree of Harm is considered High. If this parcel were to be removed the threat to the Green Belt would be increased. - - NPPF Para 81 states that 'once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively ... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity.' Therefore this parcel of land should remain within the Green Belt, not only for its own value, but also to protect this whole section of Green Belt and the adjoining Biological Heritage Site (BHS). - - Draft Local Plan - There are various policies in the draft Local Plan which strongly support the case of the Green Belt boundary not being moved in this part of Helmshore: - - Policy ENV4: Landscape Character and Quality - 'In order to protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape, development proposals should: - •Retain and, where possible, enhance key views' - - 'The Borough's landscape is significant in terms of its local identity ... and general contribution to quality of life and it is essential that it is protected.' - - Whilst the council are proposing the above policy for new builds, the same protection should be applied to existing properties. Visitors often comment that views from the properties at Tor View Farm are considered some of the best in Rossendale. Indeed the views were considered a selling point when one of the properties was recently up for sale. - - Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks - 'Ecological networks should be conserved, enhanced and expanded.' - - NPPF Para109 also states that 'the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: - •Recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; - •Minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.' - - This parcel of land forms part of the ecological network in Helmshore, allowing linkages between the different areas of landscape and biodiversity. If these linkages are broken this would leave wildlife vulnerable as a result of the loss of habitat, pressure on remaining habitat etc. The serious decline in various species of British wildlife is well documented and by releasing even small parcels of land for development further pressure is placed on the remaining habitats and the populations these can realistically support. - - Policy ENV6: Green Infrastructure - 'Schemes which would result in a net loss of green infrastructure on-site will only be permitted if: - • The proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on amenity, surface water - run-off, nature conservation or the integrity of the green infrastructure network. - - Green Infrastructure refers to the network of Rossendale's multi-functional green spaces, corridors and waterways ("blue infrastructure"), which provide multiple social, environmental benefits, and enhance quality of life. It has an important role in providing habitats and migratory routes for many plants and animals.' - - NPPF Para 114 also states that ' Local planning</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>authorities should: - •Set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.' - - The above policies (local and national) support my previous comments about loss of habitat and maintaining links and ecological corridors. In addition the reference that green infrastructure should 'enhance quality of life' is particularly relevant as the removal of this land from Green Belt and the protection from development which that status currently provides would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life enjoyed not only by the current residents in the properties at Tor View Farm, but also those at Snig Hole and in the immediate surrounding area, visitors to Helmsshore Memorial Park, and those using the Public Right of Way and National Cycle Route. - - Land Parcel 31 - Many of the points raised in relation to Land Parcel 30 are also relevant to Parcel 31. For brevity I won't repeat them but these should be recorded as part of my objection. - - However I would repeat the point about the proposed new Green Belt boundary not having a permanent physical feature to provide a strong boundary. - - Part of the adjacent Biological Heritage Site falls outside the proposed Green Belt boundary which could make this section vulnerable from development and fragmentation. - - Given all of the above the Green Belt boundary in this part of Helmsshore should remain where it is currently to prevent inappropriate and unnecessary development, to protect ecological networks and biodiversity in the area and safeguard the integrity of Green Belt beyond the Local Plan period. - -</p>		
791	Graham	Shuttleworth	-	Between HS2.56 and HS2.58	Object	<p>This appears to be a cynical land grab, proposing to take historic farmland, with seemingly little consideration for the impacts of a number of matters. - - Flood defence. This is a vulnerable area, that is prone to flooding and is a key soakaway site for the locality. - - Traffic. This area regularly suffers due to the large volumes of users using the leisure facilities at Marl Pits. The thought of adding to this high density, high use area seems at best ill-conceived. - - Leisure and Health. The field to the west of Marl Pits Leisure Centre is superbly seen by a range of people of ages for horse riding, running, dog walking and cycling. To remove this community facility would surely be detrimental to the forward thinking health and well-being of the borough. - - Nature and Environment. I have witnessed a huge diversity of wildlife in this field already this year, including amphibians, bats, owls, badgers, foxes and deer. Woodpeckers returned and nests this year, amongst a host of wild birds and wild flowers that inhabit at this field throughout the four seasons. - - It is an essential community asset, for so many reasons and the long standing, green field use sets a clear precedent that should be respected and retained. - - There are many brown field areas that must be looked at for redevelopment and this is where the council must focus.</p>		<p>The green space is the very asset that makes Rawtenstall and the Roseendale valley such a valued and enviable asset for locals, visitors and investors alike. Please do not seek to needlessly damage and erode that which makes the borough so special and unique, instead we should be looking at ways in which we can improve and enhance our natural environment and protected green belt.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
792	Lisa	Struthers	-		Object	I would like to object the movement of the current urban boundary to the proposed new boundary. - Having only lived in the area a short time I have seen excessive traffic due to events at Marl Pits Sports Center and parking which has been quite frankly dangerous on Newchurch Road during such events. I believe that the movement of the boundary will in the future, increase congestion/traffic, as it is possible that properties would be built on that land. - I also believe that the loss of local wildlife would be devastating to the local habitat and the surrounding countryside, along with the recreational ground for walkers, runners and cyclists.		I have also been lead to believe that the existing boundary was put in place to protect historical farmland and the wonderful surrounding countryside.
794	Dale	Norman	-	HS2.56	Object	I am writing in objection to the proposal to alter the urban boundary between Mark Pits and Waingate Close just off Newchurch Rd. The area in question is currently a scenic piece of countryside which Rossendale should be proud of. It is used by walkers, runners, old and young and brings great pleasure to all who use it - having the countryside right on our doorstep. Please note I say countryside as that is exactly what this land is and most definitely not "urban land" It is a habitat for all kinds of wildlife from bats and birds of prey to rodents and fauna and gives access and pleasure to people who may not usually seek out such environments. - The main concern and thus objection to this proposal which is ultimately a crafty way of opening this land up for development is the congestion this will cause all around the surrounding area. Newchurch Rd at the opening to Mark Pits is absolute chaos most evenings and weekends whenever there is something on. To even think about developing land with access through a busy car park is ludicrous and shows the lack of thought. The traffic on Newchurch Rd at rush hour is at standstill and this would just add to that. Before any further houses are built in Rawtenstall I would suggest someone look at easing the chaos around Rawtenstall centre, at the junction near the Market, on Burnley Rd and on Bacup Rd as surely a priority should be to resolve these issues before adding to it? The infrastructure needs vast improvement - the state of the roads all through Rawtenstall are worn out and covered with potholes. - Rossendale is a unique, gorgeous place to live, however I fear that the things which make it just that are the same things that are are being sacrificed to fill the back pockets of large corporate developers. -		I have lived in Rossendale all my life and am excited about all the development going on in and around Rawtenstall.....the new bars and restaurants and the new bus station, however for all this to work the problems of congestion needs to be rectified. Adding more and more houses and thus vehicles into this before it is resolved will cause gridlock almost constantly. - These proposals need to be thought about very carefully and the consequences of them to the surrounding areas.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
802	Dean and Diana	Hebden	-	HS2.56	Object	<p>The alteration of this boundary will change the field adjoining Marl Pits to Waingate Village, from a very pleasant field to a potential site for housing development, which we feel would be detrimental to the area. Access to this site would lead to congestion as the road is already busy with traffic to and from the Leisure centre, Rugby and Football pitches, Athletic club, regular events at Marl Pits Sports pitches eg. Cancer Research Relay for Life, Cross Country events, weekend and evening football and rugby matches and it is also access for the Rossendale golf range and a developing new garden centre, the impact of which is yet unknown as this will be opened in the new year. This could cause potential problems and will increase traffic flow along Newchurch Road into Rawtenstall centre, which is already very busy. - There is currently a boundary which is marked by original walling stones which we believe are over 200 years old and these should be preserved as they are becoming more and more rare and are part of the heritage of the area. - The field is currently used by many local people who walk along there as a pleasant route to and from Waingate to Marl Pits and the school children use it as access to Alder Grange as a short cut to and from school. It is also used by dog walkers as it is one of the areas where dogs can safely be let off the lead. It is also part of the Rossendale Round the Hills walk and the Rossendale athletic club and schools often use it as part of their cross country training routes and the popular annual Rossendale Triathlon event uses the field for their running race. - The field is often extremely wet and boggy, hence the origin of the name, marl pits. "Marl or marlstone is a calcium carbonate or lime-rich mud or mudstone which contains variable amounts of clays and silt. The dominant carbonate mineral in most marls is calcite, but other carbonate minerals such as aragonite, dolomite, and siderite may be present". (Ref: Wikipedia) This helps it to retain water and would make it very difficult to build on and may cause future problems with the potential to flood and there were indeed problems when building the Marl Pits houses which have thankfully stood now for almost 20 years without issue (as far as we know) but it is rumoured that a large piece of heavy plant machinery which was lost in the marl during building process! - This field is also habitat to an abundance of wildlife and the benefit to us humans is huge and more evidence is emerging about how important these green spaces are to health and well being. We have seen foxes, deer and many species of birds, flora and fauna and we ask that the boundary is not changed from countryside to urban land which would jeopardise the ecosystem of the field.</p>		<p>We ask that all future developments have regard for current residents and know from personal experience, the sadness that loss of open spaces can have on physical and mental health. As these spaces are eroded and opportunities to roam become lessened, the ease of access to open fields becomes more and more difficult. It is true that we have hills to walk on, but not everyone is able to access them and this relatively gently undulating field is often used by people who may not have the option to climb the steep hills which surround Rossendale. This particular field enables many people to exercise gently and take their dog out and to give it a much needed run around without endangering farm animals. - Please also consider the height of new houses as the 3 storey blocks take away peoples light and privacy and can soon dominate the area and look out of place with the older properties and spoil everyone's view. - We have tried to find out why there is a 5 bar gate appeared at one end of the field (adjacent to the car park at Marl Pits). This would allow vehicular access and as far as we are aware this a footpath access only so would ask for clarification on this matter (I have submitted a request for this information to LCC but have heard nothing yet). - Many thanks for your consideration on this matter.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
804	David	Booth		HS2.56	Object	This proposal is a nonsense, and is doomed before it even begins,, Access , Parking things that are already a problem in Marl Pits area, and would only be worse should this development be allowed! - This area is constantly used for recreation, walkers, cycling, running and children going to school, and last but not least the Wildlife would all so suffer, Bats and Birdlife which all have established habitats in this area, and not forgetting the protected Badger life which is very well established. - In conclusion this field is countryside and has been for years! and NOT urban, this proposal should not get the green light, it is not only impractical , and as always PEOPLE yes PEOPLE have not been given a thought it seems. - I, m sorry but thats how I feel and I suspect I, m not alone and before i finish has anybody thought about the infrastructure drainage ect ect. - Regards D. Booth		-
806	Peter	Hargreaves	-	Marl Pits area	Object	I don't want extension of the local plan around Marl Pits extended. Reasons are :- - Concerns about parking / traffic, - - Disturbance of local wildlife such as Bats, Birds of prey, Badgers and Foxes etc. The field behind Marl Pits is countryside not urban land. So it should not be designated urban land but still countryside.		-
813	Janet	Hollinson	-	Haslingden and Rising Bridge area	Object	We have on several occasions complained about parking on Rising Bridge Road to no avail. The impact of more units on Rising Bridge Road will be devastating. The Council has no regard for residents. Their employees park illegally everyday on a yellow line with no penalties ever being given. They have no respect for the residents. Building more units on Rising Bridge Road will only increase the problem. We are also concerned about more units being put on the A56. Why build more when there are plenty of empty units, We have only lived here 3 years and the increase in traffic is incredible. It is becoming apparent that only when a fatal accident happens will Rossendale Council consider doing something.		-
825	Claire	Smith	-	SHLAA16196 Land South of Hawthorn Farm and to the east of Goodshaw Lane	Object	Road Safety : More houses will mean more cars on this narrow lane. Goodshaw Lane is used daily by around 40 parents & children walking to Crawshawbooth Primary school & home. The majority of this lane is single track with no pavements. The lane is already very busy and is especially congested & parking a problem when any services are held at St Mary's & All Saints church including funerals. The lane also provides access to countryside & recreational land for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Elderly people resident at Harvey Longworth Court regularly access the lane on foot. None of these will mix well with increased vehicular movements. - - Emergency access: Emergency service vehicles have a difficult task trying to negotiate both Goodshaw avenue & Goodshaw Lane without the prospect of more traffic - - Flooding: Goodshaw Lane suffers from surface water flooding and any extra building and reduction in run off would increase this problem.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
828	Nicholas	Smith	-	SHLAA16196	Object	Road Safety : More houses will mean more cars on this narrow lane. Goodshaw Lane is used daily by around 40 parents & children walking to Crawshawbooth Primary school & home. The majority of this lane is single track with no pavements. The lane is already very busy and is especially congested & parking a problem when any services are held at St Mary's & All Saints church including funerals. The lane also provides access to countryside & recreational land for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Elderly people resident at Harvey Longworth Court regularly access the lane on foot. None of these will mix well with increased vehicular movements. - - Emergency access: Emergency service vehicles have a difficult task trying to negotiate both Goodshaw avenue & Goodshaw Lane without the prospect of more traffic - - Flooding: Goodshaw Lane suffers from surface water flooding and any extra building and reduction in run off would increase this problem. - -		-
854	Pauline	Smith	-	Proposed housing site, field behind Marl Pits and Waingate Village	Object	Access to the site and parking issues - There is already congestion caused by Marl Pits Sports Centre at the entrance and around Newchurch Road as well as parking issues in the area caused by the sports centre, If further development was allowed in the area it would make this even worse. - There would be a loss of area used for recreation, walking, cycling and running. It would also mean that local wildlife would lose their habitat. There are bats and birds of prey who hunt on the field, it is countryside NOT urban land. - There is also concern with regard to drainage and flooding from the stream at the bottom of the field, which has occurred in the past.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
948	David	Ashworth	-	Urban boundary, Lomas Lane, Rawtenstall, BB4	Object	<p>In 2014, I sent X a detailed submission, including a sketch map, concerning the urban boundary adjacent to Balladen hamlet. I will send a hard copy of both this email and that from 2014 to you under separate cover. - Essentially, I made the case for the boundary to be amended to exclude the anomalous finger of land along Lomas lane which included Bess Nook cottages and Plane Tree House. This peninsula of land inside the boundary was included some years ago despite the absence of any rationale or evidence in support. I understand that the Rossendale Civic Trust has also raised this issue with the planning authority. - - I was assured that my submission would be considered under the Local Plan review but I can find no reference to it within the consultation feedback documentation. I suppose I may have missed it in the mass of paperwork but, just in case, I wish to formally request that specific reference to and justification for its inclusion in the boundary is explicit in the Plan if it is proposed to retain its inclusion inside the Urban Boundary. - Obviously, I would prefer common sense to prevail and for the land in question to return to its previous status outside the Urban Boundary. I understand that one of the purposes of the Review is to "tidy up" the Boundary by including or excluding land in order for the Boundary to make sense in both planning and geographic terms. My extremely minor proposal seems to conform to these aspirations and I therefore hope you will amend your proposals accordingly.</p> <p>Copy of email dated 17.04.2014 Hello X. Thank you for your very full reply to my email. Firstly, yes, I would like to be included on the list of consultees for the next stage of the boundary revision process please. Secondly I would like to propose an amendment to the current urban boundary insofar as it affects Balladen hamlet. As I previously explained, I cannot find any reason/justification in the records why Bess Nook cottages and Plane Tree House were included in the urban boundary. I can only imagine that the reason for this extraordinary "finger" extending out from the coherent boundary, is that, at some time, someone decided that: either all properties to the west of Lomas Lane should be included in the urban boundary or; that all properties to the north/north east of Balladen Brook should be included. Neither of these explanations stands up to serious scrutiny. If the former was applied, Horncliffe Mount Farm and Sheffield Gate Cottage would have to be included. If the latter reflects the rationale, all the properties in Balladen hamlet, with the exception of Oak Villa, Horncliffe Mount Farm and Sheffield Gate Cottage would have to be included I Bess Nook Cottages and Plane Tree House have always been not only at the gateway to the hamlet but very much part of it. Both date back to the early</p>		No thank you - other than to express great sympathy for the Council in its efforts to produce a Plan which satisfies the requirements of government, business and the electorate. All this in the face of draconian budget cuts and consequent staff reductions. GOOD LUCK!!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>19th century. Their membership of the Balladen (countryside) hamlet is further and, in my view, convincingly reinforced by the local topography. Balladen Brook flows down behind Plane Tree House and Bess Nook and, after it has passed them, flows in a northwesterly direction down along the rear of Redwood Drive which forms the edge of the current urban boundary. This "edge" is in fact a very steep escarpment which, importantly, runs, increasingly steeply, from Lower Clowes in a southeasterly direction towards Balladen before swinging eastwards, behind (to the south of) the Cherry Crescent cui de sac, until it meets Lomas Lane north of Bess Nook. The Brook itself flows in a deep ravine which broadens just to the north of Bess Nook where another water course, previously dammed to make a (now redundant) lodge, joins it. This steeply descending water course is bounded to the north by the escarpment to which I refer above.</p> <p>The import of all this is that, between the cui de sac of Cherry Crescent and Bess Nook there is a huge, natural divide - not just a road or a hedge but a steep gulley/ravine which effectively separates Balladen hamlet from its nearest urban neighbours and, one could argue, creates its unique identity. The current "extended finger" of urban boundary into the countryside at Balladen hamlet makes no sense in terms of coherence, planning, history, topography or simple logic. It is, in short, an aberration. However, thankfully, it is one which can be simply corrected by making the urban boundary coterminous with the southern boundary of the Redwood Drive/Cherry Crescent housing estate. I enclose a map (rather amateurish I'm afraid) which I hope illustrates the points I am making.</p> <p>I hope that these comments are helpful to you in your review of the urban boundary and that you will agree with my analysis and proposal. Would you please be kind enough to acknowledge receipt of this email? Thank you.</p> <p>Please see appendix for sketch.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1042	John	Lord	LANXESS Urethanes UK Ltd		Object	<p>Proposed Urban Boundary - - The proposed Urban Boundary includes land within the companies' ownership immediately adjacent to its single access road. This line is drawn too tightly and significantly restricts the development potential of allocation EMP2.35, and unallocated land south of the companies' access road between EMP2.35 and Rising Bridge Lane. - Further, the boundary as drawn fails to take account of the continuation of the urban area to the east of Rising Bridge Road at EMP2.38. - - We propose that a minor amendment be made to the Urban Boundary, for the urban area to include the area immediately to the west of Rising Bridge Road between the companies' access road and Roundhill Lane. The attached plan shows the area of land referred to. - - Proposed Green Belt - - The proposed Green Belt boundary extension includes land within the companies' ownership immediately adjacent to and south of its existing access road. Inclusion of this land within the Green Belt would significantly restrict the potential development of area EMP2.35 and the unallocated land between EMP2.35 and Rising Bridge Lane. - - We believe that the contribution of this area of land to Green Belt principles is very limited and that the impact on achievement of objectives of the Green Belt will be unaffected by this change. - - We propose that a minor amendment be made to the Green Belt boundary for it to exclude the area immediately to the west of Rising Bridge Road between the companies' access road and Roundhill Lane. The attached plan shows the area referred to. -</p> <p>Please see the plan in appendix.</p>		I would like to upload a plan referencing the companies' proposed changes to Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt, but can see no capability to do so. - I should be grateful for the opportunity to do so for this to form part of your consideration.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1061	Rachael	Rogers	-	HS2.50; HS2.52; HS2.49; HS2.47; HS2.51 and	Object	<p>The propped extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will further exacerbate traffic issues within the valley. - - In the first instance Goodshaw Lane is a single track road in beautiful surroundings which is currently used extensively by cyclists and walkers thus promoting a healthier lifestyle. The extra traffic already on the lane caused by the extensions at Willows, Wags and Whiskers is problematic when walking children to the primary school which backs into the lane - children have to squash against the sides as the cars rush past (There is little paved area). This is a concern for the safety of both children and cyclists not to mention a potential reduction in the number of people selecting to walk - when as one of the most unhealthy areas of the country we are seeking to promote healthier lifestyles. - - Secondly Burnley Road will also struggle to accommodate the extra traffic. The traffic on a morning queuing to get through Rawtenstall enroute to Manchester currently can extend as far as Reeds Holme. This will only become worse with the extra houses and subsequent vehicles. - - The propped extra houses in the HS2 sites quoted above will also need to be accommodated by the local Primary School. This year alone many local children were unable to access a place at Crawshawbooth School unless they had a sibling already attending. This results in children having to travel further to schools with the associated extra cars in the road. The only option would be to extend the school for which there is no facility. An extension would require a double form entry ensuring that the school lost its identity as a village school. In addition to this there have already been a number of 'near misses' involving children and cars around the school increasing numbers will only make the situation worse. - - Changing the urban boundary in the site near the Old Baptist Chapel and Hawthorn Farm will alter the whole setting for the Chapel (a protected English Heritage site). The Chapel is the oldest Baptist church in the country and enjoys visitors from across the world. This is a 'jewel' of Rossendale which should be preserved and protected in its natural setting.</p>		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1093	Guy	Thomas	-	Proposed changes to green belt, urban boundary & countryside - Regulation 18	Object	<p>There are a number of reasons why this proposal to move the urban boundary should be rejected.</p> <p>1. Road Safety - Goodshaw Lane is a single track lane that has no pavements, limited parking and contains a number of blind bends. The lane is accessed by children on their way to and from Crawshawbooth Primary School, the attached recreational area and the outdoor classroom. There are also many footpaths accessed directly from Goodshaw Lane and walker's journey up and down the lane to get from one path to another. Horses with riders are a daily occurrence. Elderly people resident at Harvey Longworth Court regularly access the lane on foot.</p> <p>2. The building of any houses would significantly increase the number of vehicles accessing the lane and almost certainly lead to overspill parking. This would adversely affect the safety of all users of the lane and create significant conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicle drivers.</p> <p>3. An increase in the amount of vehicles and on road parking on or around this part of Goodshaw Lane would also worsen the already critical problem of access for larger vehicles. Council service vehicles already have problems accessing all areas of the lane and, at certain times, emergency vehicles would simply not be able to attend an incident.</p> <p>4. Grade II listed Church of St Mary and All Saints - The proposed change to the urban boundary to enable development would significantly affect the setting of this important, graded local building. It would also have a detrimental impact upon those parishioners who use this church, which is now the sole remaining Church of England place of worship for the parish.</p> <p>5. Impact upon biodiversity - The area under review includes a bat roost which would be totally destroyed in the event of any development. All bat species along with their breeding sites and resting places are, as I am sure you are aware, fully protected by law.</p> <p>6. The local hay meadow to the east of Goodshaw Lane, which has never been used for housing and is part of the countryside, would also be destroyed in the event of any development.</p> <p>7. Core Strategy Development Plan Document: The Way Forward (2011 - 2026) - This document states that housing will be focussed on Rawtenstall with no major development in Goodshaw and that the integrity of existing open spaces will be maintained. It also states that walking and cycling improvements in Goodshaw will offer improved countryside access. Whilst the core strategy document will be replaced by the Local Plan once it is formally issued, we assume that these same commitments will be taken up by the Planning Office going forward. Changing the urban boundary to facilitate major, additional development contravenes these commitments.</p> <p>8. Bringing countryside into the Urban Boundary opposite St Marys and All Saints Church would be the least sympathetic place to do so if upholding the twin vision of maintaining the integrity of current open spaces and improving walking and cycling access to the countryside remains a true aspiration of the Planning Office.</p> <p>9. Creation of Precedent - The area to the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						east of Goodshaw Lane has always, with good reason, enjoyed protection from development and many such applications have been refused with potential developers being told that there is enough land elsewhere for development. This situation has not changed and many sites within the current Urban Boundary, but not shown in the draft local plan, could be identified as appropriate sites. - Any opening up of the countryside to the east of Goodshaw Lane to new-build developments would set a precedent and make it difficult to refuse similar developments on similar sites in the future. The ongoing loss of countryside is then inevitable.		
1108	Margaret	Bretherton	-		to alter the existing urban boundary in respect of the field behind Marl Pits and Waingate Close	Object		
						With regard to the proposal to alter the existing urban boundary in respect of the field behind Marl Pits and Waingate Close. I would strongly like to register my objection to this proposal for several reasons:- - ENVIRONMENT - We would be losing an area well used for recreation - walking, cycling, running etc. all my family enjoy this area. - I believe that the urban boundary was originally set where it is to protect this area of historical farmland and countryside and to move it in readiness for development would be absolutely preposterous. The field is countryside and NOT urban land. - ACCESS AND PARKING ISSUES - There is enough congestion already caused by the Sports Centre entrance and around Newchurch Road - DRAINAGE - I remember previous flooding issues on the field. - - I trust you will take the above issues into consideration and leave the field as it was intended. - Thank you - Margaret Bretherton		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1149	EMMA	SMURTHWAIT - E			Object	<p>The proposed movement of the urban boundary is unsafe. To go ahead with this proposal would put local children at considerable risk and in my opinion the council would be wholly responsible if a child was injured which is almost inevitable. Goodshaw Lane is already extremely congested at school times. It would be unsafe to allow more traffic through this narrow lane which in many places is single track. To increase traffic on the lane would make it unsafe out of school hours too as children use the lane for cycling and walking in preference to the already dangerous Burnley Road. As a school governor I think this proposal is putting the heart of our community at risk. - - There has not been proper consultations with local people. I first found out about it this weekend. The consultation period needs to be longer so that proper public opinion can be sought.</p> <p>Email received 09/10/2017: I am writing with grave concerns about the proposal to change the urban boundary on Goodshaw Lane. This lane is already very congested at times as it is a single lane in many areas. It becomes particularly congested at school pick up and drop off and it's incredible that a child has not been injured with the current traffic. As a school governor at Crawshawbooth Primary school I believe this plan will put our local children in jeopardy and I am certain there will be an incident with increased throughput of traffic on the lane. Parents choose to drop their children off on Goodshaw Lane as it is safer currently than Burnley Road, but this will change. Goodshaw Lane is not suitable for further increase in traffic as residents already use the lane for parking. It is frankly a dangerous idea to build more houses. In addition the entry to Crawshawbooth Primary is at maximum and therefore any additional residents will probably have to travel to get to school In addition the lane is an area of natural beauty so even outside school hours children use the lane with their families to cycle and walk. It is not unusual to encounter families on the lane and additional traffic will put them at risk too. Horse riders also frequent the lane instead of using Burnley Road. We should keep the countryside as it is and not make Goodshaw Lane a major thoroughfare which it could not be without significant investment. Happy to discuss further. I also have a petition that has been signed by many.</p>		Yes. I will put them in writing

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1154	Glyn	Smurthwaite	-		Alteration of urban boundary goodshaw lane crawshawbooth reg 18 draft 2019-2034	Object There is a wealth of Brown field land in rossendale that should be prioritised for development before green field sites. - Goodshaw lane is narrow and single track and is already heavily used with traffic. - On a normal school day the road is blocked at drop off and pick up times at crawshawbooth primary school. - The vehicular access to the proposed expansion of urban boundary is all single track. - This would snarl up the area and create chaos.Necessary emergency vehicular access would be a challenge. - The local primary school is at CAPPED numbers and is not allowed by the LEA to accept more children. Any children living in the proposed area will therefore need bussing elsewhere -this would create further transport danger. - The likely traffic volume increase would create a real risk in terms of traffic accidents, restricted emergency access and service access such as post office, him collection add would be hugely compromise		Do not allow this dangerous (due to traffic/transport dangers) proposal to pass
1157	Debbie	Horrocks	Whitworth Action & Greenbelt Group	Whitworth	Whitworth	Object I think it's ludicrous to even think about this.I have several objections.One is traffic,I travel 3miles to work daily,for this I have to allow 40/45mins due to sheer volume of traffic.If there are temporary traffic lights need add at least another 15mins & this is happening too frequently.I know people who won't look at buying houses in this area due to this ongoing problem of getting in & out what is ludicrously now called a "village". Trying to get a doctors appointment is an absolute joke it is usual to be told 2/3 weeks,on numerous occasions I have had to go to the walk in centre to been seen by a doctor.Is this right?Schools are struggling with accommodating pupils already & with their budgets already having been decreased a huge amount how will this work? - Flooding has been a problem over recent years probably due to building,old/inefficient drainage & the lack of maintenance.How will your proposals help?There is also the animals habitat to think of here.We have been blessed with various different animals over the years that people enjoy,they would certainly diminish.If this plan was to go ahead I for one will be out of Whitworth.		No to cross to mention them right now
1171	Mark	Collier	-			Object Objections to developing moorland that is classified as green belt.		-
1189	PAUL	CARROLL	-		GREEN BELT CHANGES ROUND EDENFIELD	Object KEEP OUR VILLAGE A GREEN VILLAGE...		-
1192	CHLOE	CARROLL	-			Object KEEP EDENFIELD A VILLAGE AND NOT A CRIME SPOT. OVERLOADED WITH HOUSES ALREADY...		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1200	Simon	Butler	-	Parcel Ref 74 - Hallfold	Object	<p>I note from your recent consultation documentation that you are reviewing green belt land within the Rossendale area. Please accept this communication as my formal appeal against the release of Parcel Ref 74. Your consultation documentation is dated as of 23 November 2016 and has been compiled by XX and XX. For clarification there are two pieces of sub area which have been identified for potential release; one of these parcels of land has already been subject to two planning applications which have been rejected at both a local planning authority level and by the Governments Inspectorate appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and I have attached some of their comments below which counter argue the mitigating points put forward in your report. The Parcel of land should be removed from the consultation process as it is clearly within Green Belt, has a clearly definable boundary and significantly contributes to the openness of the Countryside. Whilst I appreciate the local authority trying to address some of the housing issues within the area the amount of land would only be able to support one dwelling which would have no significant impact on the housing plan but would have a detrimental affect on the openness of the Green Belt. Within your consultation report you have listed Parcel Ref 74 as "High" with regard to the degree of harm to the area in releasing this land. The report has also listed the plot as Strong with regards to Points 1a, 1b, 3. These three Points refer to: 1a which is to check the unrestricted spread of large built up areas, - 1b to identify if the Parcel protects open land from the potential for urban sprawl to occur, - 3 to assist in the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment. The Parcel has no contribution to point 2 which is to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another and Point 4 is listed as Moderate, point 4 is to preserve the setting of special character of historic towns. - - They have also listed a number of potential mitigation points to be considered with regards to these plots. This mitigation includes: - - 1) Development within the sub area should be restricted to appropriate and attractive small scale of low density building - 2)New properties should be a maximum of two storeys to minimise the negative impact on the openness of the adjacent Green Belt land and view from the wider landscape. - 3) The dry stone walls that bound the sub area should be rebuilt and enhanced. - 4) A framework of boundary planting should be developed to soften the appearance of any new development and reduce the negative effect of the openness on the neighbouring Green Belt land. - - Both Government Inspectorates have considered all mitigation and believe that development within this area is harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The last Government Inspectorates decision was delivered in May 2017 which is significantly later than your consultation document and therefore more up to date with its considerations. The second Parcel of land identified in Parcel Ref 74 is currently farmland owned by Lower Fold Head farm and is completely</p>		To object the release of Parcel Ref 74 as per the Rossendale Greenbelt review

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>separated from the Parcel of land that has had previous planning applications submitted. The dry stone walls that your report refers to are part of the farm landscape and I do not see how agricultural land can be identified as anything other than Green Belt Land. Farmers should be encouraged and supported to maintain their Green Belt land and therefore this land should be removed from the consultation process. The government's inspectorates have both communicated that the land identified in Parcel Ref 74 has clearly definable boundaries that separate it from the urbanisation of Whitworth Village, by allowing this allocated sub area to be built upon you do not have any clearly definable boundaries and therefore are not protecting the openness of the Green Belt. Future developments will then follow as you will have allowed urbanisation sprawl into a clearly defined Green Belt area and on this basis I object to your proposals. Below are some of the comments made by the Building Inspectorate. -XXX BSc (Hons) DipTPMRTPI - site visit 10 April 2017 - Decision date 3 May 2017 - The Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm identified is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The harm by reason of inappropriateness and the adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt are clearly not outweighed by the other considerations outlined above. The grounds presented in support of the development have been considered but together they do not outweigh the harm the scheme would cause. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development have not been demonstrated. - - The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 23 of the Rossendale Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document – The Way Forward 2011 (CS) which aims to ensure that new development maintains the relationship between urban areas and the countryside. Furthermore, the proposal fails to represent one of the types of developments considered acceptable within the countryside as detailed within Policy 21 of the CS. - - In spreading a relatively substantial domestic building over a greater area of the site, the proposal would conflict with two of the Green Belt's five purposes. Those being the protection of unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment to a greater extent than the existing development on the site. Consequently, the overall openness of the Green Belt would be eroded and the openness of the Green Belt would be significantly harmed. Accordingly, the proposal would not fall within the exceptions set out in paragraph 89 and for the purposes of the Framework, would be inappropriate development. - - The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Whilst the concept of openness includes the absence of buildings and development, it is a broader concept than just visibility, and levels of domestic activity can affect</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>openness. - - It is acknowledged that some landscaping is proposed. However, this is limited in scale and would not adequately soften the appearance of the proposal. In addition, the removal of part of the escarpment and introduction of a driveway and space for car parking would result in a significant amount of hardstanding, which would be an incongruous, urbanising feature in a rural setting. - - XXX BSc (Hons) MSC MRTPI - site visit 8 August 2016 - Decision date 9 September 2016 - - The presence of a steeply sloped landscaped escarpment across the frontage of the site provides a visual break that marks the point where the character of the south western side of Hall Street changes to countryside. A small group of well-established dwellings to the west of the site and buildings located further to the south are separated from the development within the urban boundary by the appeal site and a public footpath. As a consequence, they are characterised as lying within the countryside beyond the urban boundary rather than forming part of a village. For these reasons, I would not describe the appeal site as being located within a village, notwithstanding that it adjoins the urban boundary and is relatively close to local facilities. Accordingly, the proposal would not therefore represent limited infilling in a village. - - A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, as set out in paragraph 79 of the Framework, is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, with openness being identified as one of the essential characteristics of the Green Belt. There is no definition of openness in the Framework but, in the Green Belt context, it is generally held to refer to freedom from, or the absence of, development. As this part of the Green Belt comprises a site with existing buildings in an elevated and screened position relative to Hall Street to the south west, with surrounding buildings to the west and others nearby to the south, it is clearly less open than the surrounding countryside further to the north, west and south. However, the Framework makes no distinction between the importance of openness in different parts of the Green Belt, and therefore the key determinant relating to the impact on openness is whether the proposal would materially increase the amount of built development on the site. - - The siting of the dwelling and detached garage would include a much larger footprint of built development within the site than the existing buildings to be removed and those which have been removed. Furthermore, the modest single storey buildings would be replaced by a more substantial two storey dwelling of a greater height, scale, bulk and massing, together with the addition of hard surfaces associated with the proposed new access and driveway. Consequently, the dwelling and detached garage would result in a significant increase in the amount of built development and hardstanding within the site and in a different position on the site than the existing/previous buildings. As a consequence, the proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would result in significant harm in this respect. - - When viewed from the south west</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>frontage of the site onto Hall Street, the prominence of the development would be lessened by the elevated position of the site, reducing land levels within the site to the west and south, the presence of the landscaped escarpment and the set back position of the buildings. However, the development would remain visible from public vantage points on Hall Street to the north and west, the New Road bridleway, a public footpath adjoining the south eastern boundary of the site and from surrounding dwellings in similarly elevated positions, from which the site would appear less open. Although some views of the development could be filtered by additional screening introduced by proposed landscaping, this in itself would have a detrimental effect on the existing openness of the site. Furthermore, the presence and scale of taller buildings in the immediate setting does not justify a harmful loss of openness within the site. - - As the site lies in open countryside rather than comprising part of a village, the proposal would also lead to encroachment of development into the countryside in conflict with one of the purposes of the Green Belt set out in paragraph 80 of the Framework. - - I conclude that the development would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the buildings it would replace and would impact on the Green Belt purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Accordingly the proposal would comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt in conflict with the Framework. - - The design of the dwelling, garage and enclosures would respect the diverse style of property types evident in the local area and suitable landscaping could be incorporated. However, the presence of built development of increased footprint, height, bulk and massing, when compared to the existing modest buildings, would have a negative impact on views from public vantage points on Hall Street to the north and west, the New Road bridleway, a public footpath adjoining the south eastern boundary of the site and from surrounding dwellings in similarly elevated positions. The additional screening offered by proposed landscaping would not mitigate the resultant change of the site to an urban character and appearance, including the removal of a small section of the existing escarpment, the introduction of an extensive driveway and the potential addition of domestic paraphernalia within the site. The presence of nearby dwellings does not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the site in this respect. As a consequence, the proposal would erode the contribution that the existing site makes to the setting of the countryside around the village. - - I therefore conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 23 of the CS in so far as it seeks to ensure that development maintains the relationship between the urban areas and the countryside. The development also does not comprise one of the types of development that Policy 21 of the CS permits in the countryside. These policies are consistent with the Framework. - - I find that</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						the other considerations in this case do not clearly outweigh the substantial weight to be given to the totality of harm to the Green Belt and other harm arising from the proposed development. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed. -		
1208	James	Hebb	-	Land To The North Of HS2.73	Support	I write regarding the Green Belt land situated off Eden Street / Eden Lane in Edenfield which is directly in front of my house . Although Green Belt land there have been several unsuccessful attempts to build on this land over the years which I have objected to. - - I support the planners view that this land should remain as Green Belt and agree with them that Eden Street / Eden Lane form a long established and suitable boundary to the urban development. - - Although in principal I do not believe that any Green Belt land should be given up for housing I do think that if Edenfield is to have more homes then a larger development as proposed between Market Street and the Edenfield By-Pass with all the associated infrastructure would be preferable. - -		No.
1233	Susan	Hebb	-	land to the north of HS2.73	Support	I write regarding Greenbelt land situated off Eden St./ Eden Lane which is directly in front of my house. Although the land is in the Greenbelt there have been several attempts to build on the land over the years which I have objected to. I therefore SUPPORT the planners view that this land SHOULD REMAIN as GREENBELT and agree with them that Eden Street /Eden Lane forms a long established and suitable boundary to the urban development. - - With regard to greenbelt land in general I do not think it should be built on. In relation to other greenbelt sites in Edenfield, I feel it is imperative that we preserve the smaller sites as these provide pockets of green space that help to prevent an urban sprawl. So given the current government thinking and rather aggressive housing policy if it is inevitable that some greenbelt is given over to be built on, I would rather one larger site be built on in order to reduce disruption and address infrastructure requirements thoroughly and in one concentrated site.		no

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1247	Angela	Rhodes	-	parcel 74	Object	X - Hallfold - Whitworth - OL12 8XL - Parcel 74 Rossendale green belt survey. - I wish to raise the following concerns with regards to parcel 74 listed in you Green Belt survey as land identified as potential release & development from the Rossendale green belt. - 90% + of parcel 74 is farmed by us at Lower fold head Farm and has been agricultural farm land used in animal husbandry (production of milk & rearing of pedigree cattle) for over 200 + years. For the past 40 of those years us, the Rhodes family who purchased the farm outright. - All our farm has a holding number, registered with the Welsh Black Cattle society , is Defra registered, in a single payment scheme and natural England stewardship registered as land to be managed and protected. This includes such tasks as protection of ancient dry-stone walls, water courses / culverts and the growth and nurturing of natural grasslands as habitats for local species and wild life. We have colonies of many species from deer / bees / foxes / badgers and bats who rely on our farmland including all within parcel 74, as food and shelter indeed this is all recorded with DEFRA & Natural England status. - My cows graze this ground every day and have done for the past 40 years. - As stated we farm over 90% of parcel 74 and in the not too distant future it will pass to our daughter who is currently planning her career around agriculture and animal husbandry within our farm. - I firmly believe there is substantial evidence of conspiracy to remove this ground, in order for a well-connected local business man / come builder to build a large detached house within 0.3 (the only part of parcel 74 we DON'T farm or own) - As recent as May 2017 his planning application was once more refused by the secretary of state inspector the main point for the dismissal of the appeal being that the land in question sits clearly within a defined existing green belt boundary. She also proceeded to find that there is presently a very well placed urban boundary to the current green belt within Hallfold. - Another point made in the inspector's report in May 2017 was the very poor access to the land generally in which any access necessitates passage via very narrow step lane Hallfold is one of only 3 identified hamlets with Whitworth. There are no properties adjacent to parcel 74 north, west and east boundaries that are less than 200 years old. - Access to all or any of parcel 74 must be also made via the single-track road of Hallfold, past the already crumbling un adopted single track road to the west of St Barthomews Primary school. Within term time this is already as bottle neck with the necessity of local police officers patrolling and providing traffic calming measures to reduce the high risk of a road traffic accident. - The inspectorate concluded that any part the local area with parcel 74 to be built on would impact negatively on the hamlets perinate openness . - The only right of way to over 85 % of parcel 74 is by my own private road to my property (no point being over 7 feet wide) the other 15 % to the north east being a very poorly maintained bridleway (at no point over 8 feet wide), I therefore fail to see this parcel being of ANY developmental use or even	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>consideration for removal of green belt status for this parcel of land. - The land with parcel 74 is a very visible piece of land from almost every angle of the Whitworth valley, any development would be clearly visible and an impact on the openness of the village / Hamlet. - All the ground in Paracel 74 is on a steep gradient of over 30% and all would considerable structural engineering to be classed as suitable for building of any type. - All the ground in parcel 74 is also run off over ground and underground via culverts to surface and local spring water, indeed none of the ground within parcel 74 has mains supply within 500 M all water supplies are via spring water. - It is my understanding that the local plan concerns itself with affordable, sustainable housing for the local community. The effectiveness of such being housing in groups of 10 houses to make any dint into the current housing crisis. Parcel 74 it appears is about 1 large 4 bedroomed detached property. - Any building of sustainable housing would remove the privacy of at least 16 existing houses that back onto my open farmland within parcel 74. as previously stated all of these cottages being well over 100 years old. - I appreciate that everywhere needs more sustainable housing however parcel 74 is not a plot that you COULD build sustainable housing. it is and will remain for 90% agricultural farm land. We, as owners and farmers have no desire to see this parcel removed out of greenbelt status and should Rossendale council proceed to do so I feel gives clear evidence to gross misconduct and questionable practice in the decision making of the planning officers involved in this process . - My final point of consideration is the photograph on the front page of your Rossendale green belt survey. - A truly beautiful photograph depicting green, lush countryside. I have no doubt that your department consulted professionals to provide an image that depicts permanence of openness the very essence of greenbelt. That picture was in fact taken (without any consent I may add) within my meadow to the front of my home and actually includes that very land you wish to remove out of greenbelt! No one particularly local and national press will fail to see some irony in that. - I am currently discussing this matter with other greenbelt protection agencies and the NFU as to actions options. - I wish therefore given my beliefs and findings regards parcel 74 of land to engage in a face to face meeting with an officer from your department to discuss my concerns and thoughts further. - I may be contacted at any time on X and my landline is X where if no answer a message may be recorded. - - Yours Sincerely - Mrs A Rhodes -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1250	jeffrey	rhodes	-	parcel 74	Object	<p>- X - Hallfold - Whitworth - OL12 8XL - Parcel 74 Rossendale green belt survey. - I wish to raise the following concerns with regards to parcel 74 listed in you Green Belt survey as land identified as potential release & development from the Rossendale green belt. - 90% + of parcel 74 is farmed by us at Lower fold head Farm and has been agricultural farm land used in animal husbandry (production of milk & rearing of pedigree cattle) for over 200 + years. For the past 40 of those years us, the Rhodes family who purchased the farm outright. - All our farm has a holding number, registered with the Welsh Black Cattle society , is Defra registered, in a single payment scheme and natural England stewardship registered as land to be managed and protected. This includes such tasks as protection of ancient dry-stone walls, water courses / culverts and the growth and nurturing of natural grasslands as habitats for local species and wild life. We have colonies of many species from deer / bees / foxes / badgers and bats who rely on our farmland including all within parcel 74, as food and shelter indeed this is all recorded with DEFRA & Natural England status. - My cows graze this ground every day and have done for the past 40 years. - As stated we farm over 90% of parcel 74 and in the not too distant future it will pass to our daughter who is currently planning her career around agriculture and animal husbandry within our farm. - I firmly believe there is substantial evidence of conspiracy to remove this ground, in order for a well-connected local business man / come builder to build a large detached house within 0.3 (the only part of parcel 74 we DON'T farm or own) - As recent as May 2017 his planning application was once more refused by the secretary of state inspector the main point for the dismissal of the appeal being that the land in question sits clearly within a defined existing green belt boundary. She also proceeded to find that there is presently a very well placed urban boundary to the current green belt within Hallfold. - Another point made in the inspector's report in May 2017 was the very poor access to the land generally in which any access necessitates passage via very narrow step lane Hallfold is one of only 3 identified hamlets with Whitworth. There are no properties adjacent to parcel 74 north, west and east boundaries that are less than 200 years old. - Access to all or any of parcel 74 must be also made via the single-track road of Hallfold, past the already crumbling un adopted single track road to the west of St Barthomews Primary school. Within term time this is already as bottle neck with the necessity of local police officers patrolling and providing traffic calming measures to reduce the high risk of a road traffic accident. - The inspectorate concluded that any part the local area with parcel 74 to be built on would impact negatively on the hamlets perinate openness . - The only right of way to over 85 % of parcel 74 is by my own private road to my property (no point being over 7 feet wide) the other 15 % to the north east being a very poorly maintained bridleway (at no point over 8 feet wide), I therefore fail to see this parcel being of ANY developmental use or even</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>consideration for removal of green belt status for this parcel of land. - The land with parcel 74 is a very visible piece of land from almost every angle of the Whitworth valley, any development would be clearly visible and an impact on the openness of the village / Hamlet. - All the ground in Paracel 74 is on a steep gradient of over 30% and all would considerable structural engineering to be classed as suitable for building of any type. - All the ground in parcel 74 is also run off over ground and underground via culverts to surface and local spring water, indeed none of the ground within parcel 74 has mains supply within 500 M all water supplies are via spring water. - It is my understanding that the local plan concerns itself with affordable, sustainable housing for the local community. The effectiveness of such being housing in groups of 10 houses to make any dint into the current housing crisis. Parcel 74 it appears is about 1 large 4 bedroomed detached property. - Any building of sustainable housing would remove the privacy of at least 16 existing houses that back onto my open farmland within parcel 74. as previously stated all of these cottages being well over 100 years old. - I appreciate that everywhere needs more sustainable housing however parcel 74 is not a plot that you COULD build sustainable housing. it is and will remain for 90% agricultural farm land. We, as owners and farmers have no desire to see this parcel removed out of greenbelt status and should Rossendale council proceed to do so I feel gives clear evidence to gross misconduct and questionable practice in the decision making of the planning officers involved in this process . - My final point of consideration is the photograph on the front page of your Rossendale green belt survey. - A truly beautiful photograph depicting green, lush countryside. I have no doubt that your department consulted professionals to provide an image that depicts permanence of openness the very essence of greenbelt. That picture was in fact taken (without any consent I may add) within my meadow to the front of my home and actually includes that very land you wish to remove out of greenbelt! No one particularly local and national press will fail to see some irony in that. - I am currently discussing this matter with other greenbelt protection agencies and the NFU as to actions options. - I wish therefore given my beliefs and findings regards parcel 74 of land to engage in a face to face meeting with an officer from your department to discuss my concerns and thoughts further. - I may be contacted at any time on X and my landline is X where if no answer a message may be recorded.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1253	sarah	rhodes	-	parcel 74	Object	- X - Hallfold - Whitworth - OL12 8XL - - - Parcel 74 Rossendale green belt survey. - I wish to raise the following concerns with regards to parcel 74 listed in you Green Belt survey as land identified as potential release & development from the Rossendale green belt. - 90% + of parcel 74 is farmed by us at Lower fold head Farm and has been agricultural farm land used in animal husbandry (production of milk & rearing of pedigree cattle) for over 200 + years. For the past 40 of those years us, the Rhodes family who purchased the farm outright. - All our farm has a holding number, registered with the Welsh Black Cattle society, is Defra registered, in a single payment scheme and natural England stewardship registered as land to be managed and protected. This includes such tasks as protection of ancient dry-stone walls, water courses / culverts and the growth and nurturing of natural grasslands as habitats for local species and wild life. We have colonies of many species from deer / bees / foxes / badgers and bats who rely on our farmland including all within parcel 74, as food and shelter indeed this is all recorded with DEFRA & Natural England status. - My family's cows graze this ground every day and have done for the past 40 years. - As stated we farm over 90% of parcel 74 and in the not too distant future it will pass to me, Sarah Rose Rhodes, I am very involved and farm actively this piece of greenbelt presently and manage the farm day to day with my parents help. I find the suggestion of removing this land from within greenbelt disturbing as every week there are clear identified concerns around the issue of young people entering and embracing British agriculture and farming. This is what I wish to do and passionately believe that my family's farm continues and develops further. The threat of removing parcel 74 mostly containing my family's farm from the protection of green belt I feel is disturbing and deeply distressing. Removal from the green belt of parcel 74 makes no sense whats so ever . - Access to all or any of parcel 74 must be also made via the single-track road of Hallfold, past the already crumbling un adopted single track road to the west of St Barthomews Primary school. Within term time this is already as bottle neck with the necessity of local police officers patrolling and providing traffic calming measures to reduce the high risk of a road traffic accident. - The inspectorate concluded that any part the local area with parcel 74 to be built on would impact negatively on the hamlets perinate openness. - The only right of way to over 85 % of parcel 74 is by my own private road to my property (no point being over 7 feet wide) the other 15 % to the north east being a very poorly maintained bridleway (at no point over 8 feet wide), I therefore fail to see this parcel being of ANY developmental use or even consideration for removal of green belt status for this parcel of land. - The land with parcel 74 is a very visible piece of land from almost every angle of the Whitworth valley, any development would be clearly visible and an impact on the openness of the village / Hamlet. - All the ground in Paracel 74 is on a steep gradient of over 30% and all would considerable	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>structural engineering to be classed as suitable for building of any type. - All the ground in parcel 74 is also run off over ground and underground via culverts to surface and local spring water, indeed none of the ground within parcel 74 has mains supply within 500 M all water supplies are via spring water. - It is my understanding that the local plan concerns itself with affordable, sustainable housing for the local community. The effectiveness of such being housing in groups of 10 houses to make any dint into the current housing crisis. Parcel 74 it appears is about 1 large 4 bedroomed detached property. - Any building of sustainable housing would remove the privacy of at least 16 existing houses that back onto my open farmland within parcel 74. as previously stated all of these cottages being well over 100 years old. - I appreciate that everywhere needs more sustainable housing however parcel 74 is not a plot that you COULD build sustainable housing. it is and will remain for 90% agricultural farm land. We, as owners and farmers have no desire to see this parcel removed out of greenbelt status and should Rossendale council proceed to do so I feel gives clear evidence to gross misconduct and questionable practice in the decision making of the planning officers involved in this process . - My final point of consideration is the photograph on the front page of your Rossendale green belt survey. - A truly beautiful photograph depicting green, lush countryside. I have no doubt that your department consulted professionals to provide an image that depicts permanence of openness the very essence of greenbelt. That picture was in fact taken (without any consent I may add) within my meadow to the front of my home and actually includes that very land you wish to remove out of greenbelt! No one particularly local and national press will fail to see some irony in that. - I am currently discussing this matter with other greenbelt protection agencies and the NFU as to actions options. - I wish therefore given my beliefs and findings regards parcel 74 of land to engage in a face to face meeting with an officer from your department to discuss my concerns and thoughts further. - I may be contacted at any time on X and my landline is X where if no answer a message may be recorded. -</p>		
1281	Suzanne	Rhodes	-		Object	<p>We feel it is important to raise our objection to the proposed change in the urban boundary that affects the field behind Marl Pits and Waingate Close. - Changing the status of this area will make it vulnerable to future development that would result in a loss of a beautiful piece of countryside and the flora and fauna that thrive there.The field is well used by many sections of the residents of Rossendale,walkers,riders,runners,cyclists and birdwatchers and would be sadly missed if it was developed. - Further development in this area can only add to the chaos and congestion that occurs around the entrance to the sports centre. Parking,already an issue will become more of a problem around the same area. - The land behind Waingate Close has drainage and flooding problems,these will only be increased if this land is developed.</p>		Not at this time

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment	
1300	Helen	Thornton	-		Field behind marl pits and waingate close	Object	We object to the change in the urban boundary to allow housing on this field. - - Environmental - field and area prone to flooding. Our garden is like a bog most of the year. More housing would increase surface water run off and increase risk of flooding. - - Traffic - serious road accidents have happened close to the junction of marl pits and Newchurch road. Traffic is very heavy on Newchurch and travels too fast making it very difficult to turn onto Newchurch road at peak times. - - Land use - we regularly use the area for recreation and this would be lost.		DO NOT BUILD ON THIS COUNTRYSIDE AND EXACERBATE FLOODING AND HEAVY TRAFFIC WHILST REMOVING RECREATIONAL COUNTRYSIDE SPACE.
1339	Robert	Longworth	n/a	SHLAA16196		Object	Dear Sirs, - - The plan to develop on the land East of Goodshaw Lane, Crawshawbooth is of concern to us. We are opposed to this for a number of reasons, as set out below. - - We are concerned that an increase in volume of residents and traffic will bring about a deterioration of the neighbourhood and impact negatively on village life. We feel this development would take away from the natural beauty of Goodshaw Lane and the surrounding areas, which attracted us to the area in the first place. - - Of equal concern is the sheer volume of cars already parked on the lane. Drivers frequently drive at unsafe speeds down Goodshaw lane which is used throughout the week by vulnerable people such as the children attending school and the elderly attending Church. - - I would like to bring to your attention in the last fortnight drivers have been asked by the Police to move their vehicles off Albert Road for emergency vehicle access. This request is of course understandable; however, the capacity of Goodshaw Lane has already been reached. Pulling out from Albert Road onto the main road is an utter danger with parked traffic blocking visibility in both directions. - - Traffic in the centre of the village is a hazard with visitors frequently parking on double yellow lines, at present. Increased development will only lead to further congestion and present a risk to the safety of residents in Crawshawbooth. The village simply does not have the capacity for more residents. - - Kindest Regards,		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1353	G	Coleman	-		Object	I object to the proposed urban boundary change at the rear of Waingate Close, Springside, Rawtenstall, for the following reasons: - An extension of the current urban boundary would include a field that extends from Marl Pits Sports Centre to Waingate Village. It is much more likely that this area, which is currently countryside, would be used for housing in the future. There is no vehicular access to the site through Marl Pits, which is already congested at peak times. - Access to any future housing development through Marl Pits would dramatically increase traffic at its already busy junction with Newchurch Road. - Marl Pits Sports Centre is popular since its re-development and extra traffic, despite any restrictions placed upon it, would heighten the chances of accidents in a pedestrianised area. - It would be prudent to consider the possibility of a terrorist-related vehicle attack provided by a through-road via Marl Pits, Rossendale's premier sports facility: an area popular with schoolchildren and families. - Access from Waingate Road would involve an awkwardly-angled junction with Newchurch Road which increases the risk of accidents due to bad road visibility. - At current traffic levels there are queues at peak times past this junction from the market traffic lights. - Access via Waingate Village would be along a private road used by children attending local schools as a safer alternative to Newchurch Road.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1361	David	Clarke	-		No site allocation number given by RBC. Amending the urban boundary on land between Marl Pits Leisure Centre and Waingate Village (area known as Springside)	Object Firstly I would object that this proposal has not been properly hi-lighted or explained in the plan. It has not been given an allocation number and people consulting the plan will not be aware of the proposal as it has not been listed or properly explained. - I would also object that the land proposed to be included in the urban boundary is in no way urban. This is open countryside with a stream running through it. The urban boundary was originally set next to the stone flag wall at the top of the field to protect this area of countryside and the boundary needs to stay where it is. - The field is next to a busy sports complex. During events at the centre traffic and parking is at saturation point. There have been numerous accidents and serious accidents in the vicinity and site entrance and there is no current vehicular access to the field which could not be undertaken safely. - This is an area of natural beauty and is used by dozens of runners, cyclists and walkers every day. It is used as an extension of the sports centre and is used by the Rossendale Harriers to train as well as being recently used for the borough's triathlon and as the final stage for the Colour Run this year. The land also forms part of the historic walk around the Waingate Village site. Planning policy as per NPPF 2012 should fundamentally seek to improve an area and not worsen it. - This is an area of countryside used by an abundance of wildlife including birds of prey, bats and amphibians. If it were earmarked for development by entering the urban boundary these animals would be at risk of extinction in the local area. - The site is also liable to flooding and significant ground swell and I believe a watercourse runs through it. The area is rich in clay and has a large stream at the bottom. This is Balladen Clough which is known to flood throughout its course. Should development ever be allowed on the land this could have a detrimental effect of the areas surface run off and ground soak and could lead to localised flooding. - There have been previous attempts to allocate the land for development which have failed. Losing a piece of countryside which is used for leisure and rich in wildlife could never be undone and a decision to amend the urban boundary to incorporate this area would be against the council's own planning policies.		Whilst I understand the pressure the council is under to allocate areas for housing this needs to be held against what is right for the borough. This is an area of nature and the beginning and end of many walks and borough events. I am unsure why the decision was made in the plan to move the urban boundary in this area when it would be so against a policy to utilise brownfield sites first and improve areas rather than devastate them. I hope the correct decision is made as if this site were to be lost it cannot ever be replaced and is currently a real asset for Rossendale as it is seen and used by a great many residents and visitors due to its location and beauty.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1364	Bernice	Eavis	-	No site allocation number given by RBC. Amending the urban boundary on land between Marl Pits Leisure Centre and Waingate Village (area known as Springside)	Object	I strongly object to the changing of the urban boundary concerning the field between Marl Pits sports complex and Waingate Village. This field is rightly countryside and should remain as such. The field is presently and frequently used for walking, cycling, running and other organised sporting events. There is much wildlife which lives in and uses our field including bats, deer, birds, butterflies and amphibians. It is a field of historical and natural beauty, flagstones run through the field as a path and these have been here for many generations and should always remain so. It is imperative to seek to protect this historical feature and not instead alter the land classification which could see it erased as would be probable if any future development were to occur.		No
1368	Racheal	Clarke	-	No site allocation number given by RBC. Amending the urban boundary on land between Marl Pits Leisure Centre and Waingate Village (area known as Springside)	Object	I object to the proposed change of the urban boundary concerning the field between Marl Pits sports complex and Waingate Village. - This field is not just a piece of spare land which at present has no use and is thus suitable for change or development. This field is already very much alive. It isn't unused or spare, indeed, far from it, it is absolutely vital to many, a part of some people's everyday lives. This field has a very hectic, busy life. Everyday, all day, it has many, many visitors and it is used and loved by both humans and animals of all ages and species. Is has already developed itself, by its very own structure and terrain, so that it is of immense importance and necessity to all those who spend any time in it. - Walkers walk through it, often the same walkers, everyday, all day, it's their 'place' to go for a walk. They may not manage far but it's a lovely walk, a flat walk away from the main road and it takes in some real natural, historical landmarks and beauty. Did you know that we have some gorgeous flagstones on the ground, they form a footpath which has been there for over 100 years. We can watch Balladen Brook cascade down through the hillside and in Spring we watch the lambs gamboling and jumping up and around in the field next door. Amazing. Beautiful. We want that to stay don't we? If we lose the urban boundary we could lose this footpath and these wonderful sights of nature. - Runners run through it. Everyday, all day they run. The Rossendale Harriers, The Rossendale Traithalon, The Colour Run and every single person who wants to run through a field and not on the road or track runs through it. They don't want to lose it. - - PLEASE SEE NEXT PAGE		Animals live in our field. The field is their home. They source their food here and they build their homes here. Small mammals, garden birds, large birds, birds of prey, frogs, hedgehogs, deer and our bats. We have bats. Fantastic. Our bats swoop over the field on a warm summer's evening, searching out their food. The owls hoot to each other. It's amazing. Our children have listened and learnt so much from it. Our animals need that field to live. They don't want to lose it. - - Cyclists cycle through our field. Children play in it. Dogs run in it. School children commute through it. They all use it, need it, love it. - - This field is alive. It is used, loved and needed by so many that without it left to remain as the countryside it rightly is, a devastation on many levels would occur. - - Don't change something for the wrong reasons. Don't make something worse. The future use of this field is and should always be determined by its past and present. - - Thank you.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1369	John	Jefferson	-	No site allocation number given by RBC. Amending the urban boundary on land between Marl Pits Leisure Centre and Waingate Village (area known as Springside)	Object	I object to the proposed change to the urban boundary concerning the field between Marl Pits sports complex and Waingate Village. - - This field should remain as countryside because - - 1. It is widely and frequently used by walkers, runners, cyclists and children for a wide variety of recreational purposes. The loss of this field as countryside could see this important area transformed into something ie housing which would prevent these people continuing their healthy lifestyles. - - 2. This field is full of a great variety of wildlife. On a daily basis I see many wild birds including birds of prey such as sparrow hawks and owls. I also see small mammals and frogs and hedgehogs sometimes also visit my garden from the field. We are very lucky to also have bats in the field and on a few occasions, the deer have been sighted early morning. The loss of this field as countryside into something urban would potentially lead to the destruction of these animals habitats. - - 3. This field is historically important due to its location next to the historic Waingate Village. The field has its own historical features which need protecting such as beautiful flagstones on the footpath and along the boundary. The urban boundary was originally set to protect this field and it should remain as so.		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1371	Daniela	Ripa	-		Object	<p>"The Regulation 18 consultation is flawed in that it proposes release of land from the Green Belt without justification and for no identified purpose. The consultation in this respect misleads members of the public and consultees and conflicts with both the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant case law. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that land may only be released from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances and case law (IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] and Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014]) has established that the production of a local plan is in itself not sufficient justification for land to be released (paragraph 2.25 of the Green Belt Review). - - Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] clearly established that a plan-maker may err in law if it fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. The Draft Local Plan (2019-2034) proposes the release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm, Whitworth (Figure 1) but does not clearly identify the intentions with regards to this released land (illustrated by the Key for the Policies Map 2017 at Figure 2, which does not define what this land will be designated as) and this is a clear failure to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. There may be other such instances in the Draft Local Plan. - - As a planner, I am able to deduce from this that the land may become 'Countryside' or 'Safeguarded Land', but even I am unclear whether the release is for one of these purposes or another purpose altogether and thus what the justification and exceptional circumstance for the release may be. I have therefore been prejudiced by this as I am unable to comment fully on the proposals as they are unclear. I am not able to come to a conclusion with regards to whether the Green Belt release can be justified in accordance with case law and meets the exceptional circumstance test in the National Planning Policy Framework. - - If it is unclear and has caused prejudice to me, it will not be clear to members of the public or statutory consultees. The fact that the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm is not proposed to be allocated for any intended purpose is unlawful for it fails to satisfy the exceptional circumstance test necessary for the release to be permitted in any event. This element of the plan conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and presents a significant risk of challenge should the plan be progressed as proposed. - - The only potential means by which the failure in the Regulation 18 Consultation can be remedied are: - 1. The omission of the proposed release of land at Lower Fold Head Farm from the Green Belt from the Publication/Submission Version of the Local Plan. - 2. A revision to the Policies Map to ensure all land proposed to be released from the Green Belt is appropriately allocated for whatever purpose it is intended to be released for, otherwise there can be no justification to release the land from the Green Belt. Any such revision would necessitate a new Regulation 18</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>Consultation. - - In addition to the comments above, I object to the release of the above on the following grounds: - 1. Paragraph 4.6 of the Green Belt Review identifies that it 'only considers the relative performance of the Green Belt; it does not consider the exceptional circumstances required to demonstrate the need for Green Belt release, or the range of other constraints that may inhibit sustainable development e.g. ecological, archaeological, infrastructure, social and economic constraints.' - 2. Notwithstanding that the failure to allocate the land for any purpose does not meet the exceptional circumstance test and is contrary to established legal principles, no assessment of site constraints or justification for the release of the land has been undertaken by the Council. - 3. No landscape assessment has been undertaken for this proposed release. - 4. Development on this land as suggested by the Green Belt Review document (page 52) would result in a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and would significantly encroach into the countryside. - 5. There is no realistic prospect of the land coming forward to meet unmet development needs in future as there is no feasible means of access to the land. Hall Fold is single vehicle width and due to the topography and character of the area, I can see no feasible means by which the carriageway could be brought to adoptable standards to facilitate access for development purposes. The development of the land would not meet Lancashire County Council's highways requirements or those of the Lancashire Fire Authority. Access and accessibility has not been considered. - 6. There is a clearly defined boundary to the Green Belt at this point – the eastern boundary is formed by a dry stone wall that is a retaining wall of significant height in parts (in excess of 2 metres in height). - 7. The proposed boundary of the Green Belt would result in an irregular and angular boundary that would harm the openness of the remaining Green Belt and present a significant encroachment into the countryside. - 8. It would lead to pressure for development in future that would compromise the farm holding of Lower Fold Head Farm. - 9. It would be harmful to the Rossendale Way. - 10. The parcel performs strongly against purpose 1a and 1b, performs strongly against purpose 3 moderately against purpose 4. Development within the parcel would not form a coherent extension to the current settlement edge and would introduce an element of sprawl. The parcel is open pastoral land and displays strong characteristics of the open countryside and has a relatively intact rural character. Releasing the identified sub-area would have a substantial negative effect on the integrity of the Green Belt and would result in a high degree of harm that, given the elevated nature of the land (standing some 3 metres higher than Wallbank Lane) could not be mitigated by 'planting' as suggested in the Green Belt Review. - 11. Paragraph 5.4 page 55 of the Green Belt Review states 'It is important to note that the conclusions reached in this study, do not state that the parcels identified should be released from the Green Belt; as the consideration of further constraints by</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>the Council will be required to ensure that any development is sustainable. It is also recommended that any identified land parcels are considered as part of the wider work undertaken by the Council to identify key housing and employment sites and land and tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as part of a robust approach to develop the future development strategy for Rossendale.' There is no document that demonstrates the Council has considered any such constraints. - "</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1401	Thomas	McATeer	-	Parcel 74	Object	<p>Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] clearly established that a plan- maker may err in law if it fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. The Draft Local Plan (2019-2034) proposes the release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm, Whitworth but does not clearly identify the intentions with regards to this released land (illustrated by the Key for the Policies Map 2017, which does not define what this land will be designated as) and this is a clear failure to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. There may be other such instances in the Draft Local Plan. - I have therefore been prejudiced by this as I am unable to comment fully on the proposals as they are unclear. I am not able to come to a conclusion in respect of this as the map is unclear and I do not know why the land is proposed to be released from the Green Belt. - The fact that the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm is not proposed to be allocated for any intended purpose is unlawful for it fails to satisfy the exceptional circumstance test necessary for the release to be permitted in any event. This element of the plan conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and presents a significant risk of challenge should the plan be progressed as proposed. - The only potential means by which the failure in the Regulation 18 Consultation can be remedied are: - 1. The omission of the proposed release of land at Lower Fold Head Farm from the Green Belt from the Publication/Submission Version of the Local Plan. - 2. A revision to the Policies Map to ensure all land proposed to be released from the Green Belt is appropriately allocated for whatever purpose it is intended to be released for, otherwise there can be no justification to release the land from the Green Belt. Any such revision would necessitate a new Regulation 18 Consultation. - In addition to the comments above, I object to the release of release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm on the following grounds: - 1. Paragraph 4.6 of the Green Belt Review identifies that it 'only considers the relative performance of the Green Belt; it does not consider the exceptional circumstances required to demonstrate the need for Green Belt release, or the range of other constraints that may inhibit sustainable development e.g. ecological, archaeological, infrastructure, social and economic constraints.' - 2. Notwithstanding that the failure to allocate the land for any purpose does not meet the exceptional circumstance test and is contrary to established legal principles, no assessment of site constraints or justification for the release of the land has been undertaken by the Council. - 3. No landscape assessment has been undertaken for this proposed release. - 4. Development on this land as suggested by the Green Belt Review document (page 52) would result in a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and would significantly encroach into the countryside. - 5. There is no realistic prospect of the land coming forward to meet unmet development needs in future as there is no feasible means of access to the land. Hall Fold is</p>		<p>to remove any of the parcel 74 out of greenbelt protection will leave me no alternative than to conclude that one persons desire to build on land adjacent to Lower fold head farm , top of Hallfold on 0.3% of an acre has been a result of underhandedness and illegal practices within the authority . - Over 98% of this entire parcel is farmed by the Rhodes family who have no desire and any development plans for this parcel of land , the only rational answer to your departments pursuit to remove it is for Mr Bowers personal gain and planning consent to be granted where it currently has been refused (twice at local level & twice national level) due to its greenbelt status of the plot of land he wishes to build 1 large house on .</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>single vehicle width and due to the topography and character of the area, I can see no feasible means by which the carriageway could be brought to adoptable standards to facilitate access for development purposes. The development of the land would not meet Lancashire County Council's highways requirements or those of the Lancashire Fire Authority. Access and accessibility has not been considered. - 6. There is a clearly defined boundary to the Green Belt at this point – the eastern boundary is formed by a dry stone wall that is a retaining wall of significant height in parts (in excess of 2 metres in height). - 7. The proposed boundary of the Green Belt would result in an irregular and angular boundary that would harm the openness of the remaining Green Belt and present a significant encroachment into the countryside. - 8. It would lead to pressure for development in future that would compromise the farm holding of Lower Fold Head Farm. - 9. It would be harmful to the Rossendale Way. - 10. The parcel performs strongly against purpose 1a and 1b, performs strongly against purpose 3 moderately against purpose 4. Development within the parcel would not form a coherent extension to the current settlement edge and would introduce an element of sprawl. The parcel is open pastoral land and displays strong characteristics of the open countryside and has a relatively intact rural character. Releasing the identified sub-area would have a substantial negative effect on the integrity of the Green Belt and would result in a high degree of harm that, given the elevated nature of the land (standing some 3 metres higher than Wallbank Lane) could not be mitigated by 'planting' as suggested in the Green Belt Review. - 11. Paragraph 5.4 page 55 of the Green Belt Review states 'It is important to note that the conclusions reached in this study, do not state that the parcels identified should be released from the Green Belt; as the consideration of further constraints by the Council will be required to ensure that any development is sustainable. It is also recommended that any identified land parcels are considered as part of the wider work undertaken by the Council to identify key housing and employment sites and land and tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as part of a robust approach to develop the future development strategy for Rossendale.' There is no document that demonstrates the Council has considered any such constraints. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1404	benjamin	evans	-	parcel 74 OL12 8XL	Object	<p>Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] clearly established that a plan- maker may err in law if it fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. The Draft Local Plan (2019-2034) proposes the release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm, Whitworth but does not clearly identify the intentions with regards to this released land (illustrated by the Key for the Policies Map 2017, which does not define what this land will be designated as) and this is a clear failure to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. There may be other such instances in the Draft Local Plan. - I have therefore been prejudiced by this as I am unable to comment fully on the proposals as they are unclear. I am not able to come to a conclusion in respect of this as the map is unclear and I do not know why the land is proposed to be released from the Green Belt. - The fact that the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm is not proposed to be allocated for any intended purpose is unlawful for it fails to satisfy the exceptional circumstance test necessary for the release to be permitted in any event. This element of the plan conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and presents a significant risk of challenge should the plan be progressed as proposed. - The only potential means by which the failure in the Regulation 18 Consultation can be remedied are: - 1. The omission of the proposed release of land at Lower Fold Head Farm from the Green Belt from the Publication/Submission Version of the Local Plan. - 2. A revision to the Policies Map to ensure all land proposed to be released from the Green Belt is appropriately allocated for whatever purpose it is intended to be released for, otherwise there can be no justification to release the land from the Green Belt. Any such revision would necessitate a new Regulation 18 Consultation. - In addition to the comments above, I object to the release of release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm on the following grounds: - 1. Paragraph 4.6 of the Green Belt Review identifies that it 'only considers the relative performance of the Green Belt; it does not consider the exceptional circumstances required to demonstrate the need for Green Belt release, or the range of other constraints that may inhibit sustainable development e.g. ecological, archaeological, infrastructure, social and economic constraints.' - 2. Notwithstanding that the failure to allocate the land for any purpose does not meet the exceptional circumstance test and is contrary to established legal principles, no assessment of site constraints or justification for the release of the land has been undertaken by the Council. - 3. No landscape assessment has been undertaken for this proposed release. - 4. Development on this land as suggested by the Green Belt Review document (page 52) would result in a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and would significantly encroach into the countryside. - 5. There is no realistic prospect of the land coming forward to meet unmet development needs in future as there is no feasible means of access to the land. Hall Fold is</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>single vehicle width and due to the topography and character of the area, I can see no feasible means by which the carriageway could be brought to adoptable standards to facilitate access for development purposes. The development of the land would not meet Lancashire County Council's highways requirements or those of the Lancashire Fire Authority. Access and accessibility has not been considered. - 6. There is a clearly defined boundary to the Green Belt at this point – the eastern boundary is formed by a dry stone wall that is a retaining wall of significant height in parts (in excess of 2 metres in height). - 7. The proposed boundary of the Green Belt would result in an irregular and angular boundary that would harm the openness of the remaining Green Belt and present a significant encroachment into the countryside. - 8. It would lead to pressure for development in future that would compromise the farm holding of Lower Fold Head Farm. - 9. It would be harmful to the Rossendale Way. - 10. The parcel performs strongly against purpose 1a and 1b, performs strongly against purpose 3 moderately against purpose 4. Development within the parcel would not form a coherent extension to the current settlement edge and would introduce an element of sprawl. The parcel is open pastoral land and displays strong characteristics of the open countryside and has a relatively intact rural character. Releasing the identified sub-area would have a substantial negative effect on the integrity of the Green Belt and would result in a high degree of harm that, given the elevated nature of the land (standing some 3 metres higher than Wallbank Lane) could not be mitigated by 'planting' as suggested in the Green Belt Review. - 11. Paragraph 5.4 page 55 of the Green Belt Review states 'It is important to note that the conclusions reached in this study, do not state that the parcels identified should be released from the Green Belt; as the consideration of further constraints by the Council will be required to ensure that any development is sustainable. It is also recommended that any identified land parcels are considered as part of the wider work undertaken by the Council to identify key housing and employment sites and land and tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as part of a robust approach to develop the future development strategy for Rossendale.' There is no document that demonstrates the Council has considered any such constraints. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1411	June	Bowker	-	reference :not known	Object	<p>Movement of existing boundary will mean any future planning proposals would be more likely to succeed. and it is obvious that enabling future development of the site would be the only reason to move the boundary. - - Any housing development would significantly increase traffic onto Newchurch Road, especially at peak times. This is already a congested road. Access from where I live .Waingate Close, onto Newchurch Road , is already very difficult, due to badly parked cars and frequent heavy traffic. Accidents have also occurred in the past when vehicles have accessed Newchurch Road from roads nearer the Marl Pitts Sports Centre access. There is, therefore at this moment in time, no suitable access point to the land in question. Access from any other part of the area around the field being prohibited by countryside and by the nearby listed building, Waingate Farm, - The Manor. - - There is also the problem of flooding. The land (adjacent field) between our boundary , and the field in question are very prone to water saturation, and any development would by its very nature. i.e. concrete on land, no doubt increase this problem. The ground being able at the moment to absorb the heavy rain we experience in Rossendale. - - In spite of assessments suggesting that as a largely flat area, development of the field would not have an adverse impact on local views and viewpoints for a considerable number of nearby residents, there would definitely be an increased problem of noise. The topography of the area means it acts as a kind of amphitheatre with loud sounds already heard often from places such as the rugby club grounds, the golfing range and the Alder Grange School playing fields. Pollution too from extra cars and homes would also pose a problem. Finally the land is at present an area with easy access from the town and very much appreciated for its open countryside by many groups of people. It is a natural habitat for birds, bats, insects,small mammals and badgers. I would urge in light of all the points listed above, and with special regard to the very real problem of access that a development of the land would bring, that the Urban Boundary is not moved from its current position.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1421	VALERIE	BENNETT			Object	The areas that are being considered for change of policy ie Green Belt and the areas in consideration for new housing. I am objecting on the grounds primarily that the infra structure of this small town just couldnt sustain the increase in volume of cars that would be caused by more new builds - primarily Whitworth is one road running through the town- the current volume of traffic is already more than enough to cause travel disruptions and when the snow arrives and inclement weather this can cause major issues even now - so if the plans to increase the volume of housing within the town go ahead - then the traffic will become a major headache for existing and new residents to the area. The Green Belt areas should remain as they are - that being areas for people to visit and enjoy - to remove the habitat of many wild animals and flora is not acceptable Whilst I appreciate that new builds are needed to keep economies alive and for them to thrive - they should be built on existing sites that are residential areas within the current Local Plan and new sites shouldnt not be placed at the detriment of Green Belt Land.		I Hope you do take into account the feelings of the people that do live in this town - as it is important we do protect our heritage and that consideration is given to what must be protected for future generations and balance that out with what is needed within the Borough and where the new builds are best placed to be so as to keep a balance for everyone within the Borough - please dont destroy this community and cause animosity please reconsider where the new builds are best to be built
1432	Steve	Gough	For: Thrum Hall Methodist Church	Regulation 18 Draft - Rossendale Local Plan (2019-2034)	Object	I strongly object to the reclassification of Greenbelt land in and around Whitworth. If any new building developments occur they should be limited to Brownfield sites. When Greenbelt land is sacrificed it is lost forever and should only be used if it is unavoidable. I would though, question whether it is appropriate to consider any new developments, particularly large-scale estates. Whitworth is a small town with limited amenities. One dental surgery, one Doctor's surgery and the few schools are all oversubscribed. There is only one children's playground. There is no permanent police presence and currently there is a lot of concern of residents that Whitworth is too low a priority for police response to the point where they are undependable. Some residents are even considering the formation of forming their own street patrols. No matter how much new building we see in Whitworth we have NEVER seen any corresponding development of infrastructure or amenities. There remains one road in and out of the town. Traffic congestion on this road during rush-hour has increased substantially over recent years and already reaches gridlock at times. When any road works take place, even minor works, the resulting increase in congestion make travelling to and from the town unreasonably difficult and appointments all the more hard to be on time for. - - There must come a time when it is inappropriate and counterproductive to further develop a town beyond the limitations of its infrastructure. I consider Whitworth should be so considered.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1433	Albertina	Ripa	-		Object	<p>Without prejudice to the site specific comments below, insufficient land is proposed to be allocated for housing in both Haslingden and Rawtenstall, the most readily accessible areas in the Rossendale Borough with good motorway and public transport links to Manchester, Lancashire and the wider Greater Manchester area. The allocation of land for employment in Haslingden and the promotion of employment opportunities should go hand in hand with the allocation of land for residential development and the creation of new homes in the Borough's two most accessible areas, Haslingden and Rawtenstall. The under provision of land for residential development in Haslingden and Rawtenstall leads to a resultant overprovision of land for residential development in other areas, namely Whitworth and Edenfield. Whitworth has significant accessibility constraints due to the fact it is linear in character - the Council's Adopted Core Strategy (2011, page 37) identifies this as a constraint ('.....with the main road a single carriageway so improvements are limited...'). Although it is part of Rossendale, the closest town is Rochdale to the south. There are only two routes to Rochdale from Whitworth: the A671, which leads to the junction of Whitworth Road with John Street, St Mary's Gate and Yorkshire Street - a signalised junction known as 'Townhead'; and the B6377, which leads to the junction of Falinge Road and Sheriff Street (a roundabout). At peak times and predominately during the morning (AM) peak, these junctions operate over capacity, with significant queuing of in excess of 20 minutes to pass through these junctions. Of particular concern is the roundabout, which from my observations appears to exceed absolute capacity in the AM peak. There is an added complication in respect of highway infrastructure as both of these junctions are in Rochdale and appropriate mitigation would therefore require input from Rochdale Borough Council. - In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies a need for health and education facilities in Whitworth (the single local doctors surgery has over 900 patients registered and Whitworth primary school has very limited capacity), but no land is proposed to be allocated for health purposes and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan proposes education 'improvements will be dealt with on a case by case basis'. Edenfield is a village and its character would be irreversibly damaged should land be allocated for 500 homes in 2019-2034. Whilst I support the allocation of land for residential development in Edenfield in principle, the scale of the expansion proposed is excessive and should be reduced as it would result in significant harm to the social dimension of sustainable development. The Regulation 18 consultation is flawed in that it proposes release of land from the Green Belt without justification and for no identified purpose. The consultation in this respect misleads members of the public and consultees and conflicts with both the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant case law. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that land may only be released from the Green Belt in exceptional</p>		<p>The withdrawn Draft Site Allocations document proposed the allocation of land currently used as playing fields for development in Whitworth. Playing fields provide a valuable resource for communities, making a significant contribution to the social dimension of sustainable development and the health and wellbeing of local communities. I welcome the omission of these proposals from the Draft Local Plan (2019-2034).</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>circumstances and case law (IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] and Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014]) has established that the production of a local plan is in itself not sufficient justification for land to be released (Paragraph 2.25 of the Green Belt Review Report lists the five relevant legal principles). - - Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] clearly established that a plan- maker may err in law if it fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. The Draft Local Plan (2019-2034) proposes the release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm, Whitworth but does not clearly identify the intentions with regards to this released land (illustrated by the Key for the Policies Map 2017, which does not define what this land will be designated as) and this is a clear failure to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. There may be other such instances in the Draft Local Plan. - - I have therefore been prejudiced by this as I am unable to comment fully on the proposals as they are unclear. I am not able to come to a conclusion in respect of this as the map is unclear and I do not know why the land is proposed to be released from the Green Belt. The fact that the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm is not proposed to be allocated for any intended purpose is unlawful for it fails to satisfy the exceptional circumstance test necessary for the release to be permitted in any event. This element of the plan conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and presents a significant risk of challenge should the plan be progressed as proposed. The only potential means by which the failure in the Regulation 18 Consultation can be remedied are: - 1. The omission of the proposed release of land at Lower Fold Head Farm from the Green Belt from the Publication/Submission Version of the Local Plan. - 2. A revision to the Policies Map to ensure all land proposed to be released from the Green Belt is appropriately allocated for whatever purpose it is intended to be released for, otherwise there can be no justification to release the land from the Green Belt. Any such revision would necessitate a new Regulation 18 Consultation. In addition to the comments above, I object to the release of release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm on the following grounds: - 1. Paragraph 4.6 of the Green Belt Review identifies that it 'only considers the relative performance of the Green Belt; it does not consider the exceptional circumstances required to demonstrate the need for Green Belt release, or the range of other constraints that may inhibit sustainable development e.g. ecological, archaeological, infrastructure, social and economic constraints.' - 2. Notwithstanding that the failure to allocate the land for any purpose does not meet the exceptional circumstance test and is contrary to established legal principles, no assessment of site constraints or justification for the release of the land has been undertaken by the Council. - 3. No landscape assessment has been undertaken for this proposed release. - 4. Development on this land as suggested by the Green Belt</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>Review document (page 52) would result in a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and would significantly encroach into the countryside. - 5. There is no realistic prospect of the land coming forward to meet unmet development needs in future as there is no feasible means of access to the land. Hall Fold is single vehicle width and due to the topography and character of the area, I can see no feasible means by which the carriageway could be brought to adoptable standards to facilitate access for development purposes. The development of the land would not meet Lancashire County Council's highways requirements or those of the Lancashire Fire Authority. Access and accessibility has not been considered. - 6. There is a clearly defined boundary to the Green Belt at this point – the eastern boundary is formed by a dry stone wall that is a retaining wall of significant height in parts (in excess of 2 metres in height). - 7. The proposed boundary of the Green Belt would result in an irregular and angular boundary that would harm the openness of the remaining Green Belt and present a significant encroachment into the countryside. - 8. It would lead to pressure for development in future that would compromise the farm holding of Lower Fold Head Farm. - 9. It would be harmful to the Rossendale Way. - 10. The parcel performs strongly against purpose 1a and 1b, performs strongly against purpose 3 moderately against purpose 4. Development within the parcel would not form a coherent extension to the current settlement edge and would introduce an element of sprawl. The parcel is open pastoral land and displays strong characteristics of the open countryside and has a relatively intact rural character. Releasing the identified sub-area would have a substantial negative effect on the integrity of the Green Belt and would result in a high degree of harm that, given the elevated nature of the land (standing some 3 metres higher than Wallbank Lane) could not be mitigated by 'planting' as suggested in the Green Belt Review. - 11. Paragraph 5.4 page 55 of the Green Belt Review states 'It is important to note that the conclusions reached in this study, do not state that the parcels identified should be released from the Green Belt; as the consideration of further constraints by the Council will be required to ensure that any development is sustainable. It is also recommended that any identified land parcels are considered as part of the wider work undertaken by the Council to identify key housing and employment sites and land and tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as part of a robust approach to develop the future development strategy for Rossendale.' There is no document that demonstrates the Council has considered any such constraints. - 12. Development of the land would have a significant detrimental impact on outlook from my property.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1435	Angelo	Ripa	-		Object	<p>I have previously commented on the Local Plan and these are my further comments. Insufficient land is proposed to be allocated for housing in both Haslingden and Rawtenstall, the most readily accessible areas in the Rossendale Borough with good motorway and public transport links to Manchester, Lancashire and the wider Greater Manchester area. The allocation of land for employment in Haslingden and the promotion of employment opportunities should go hand in hand with the allocation of land for residential development and the creation of new homes in the Borough's two most accessible areas, Haslingden and Rawtenstall. -The under provision of land for residential development in Haslingden and Rawtenstall leads to a resultant overprovision of land for residential development in other areas, namely Whitworth and Edenfield. -Whitworth has significant accessibility constraints due to the fact it is linear in character - the Council's Adopted Core Strategy (2011, page 37) identifies this as a constraint ('.....with the main road a single carriageway so improvements are limited...'). Although it is part of Rossendale, the closest town is Rochdale to the south. There are only two routes to Rochdale from Whitworth: the A671, which leads to the junction of Whitworth Road with John Street, St Mary's Gate and Yorkshire Street - a signalised junction known as 'Townhead'; and the B6377, which leads to the junction of Falinge Road and Sheriff Street (a roundabout). At peak times and predominately during the morning (AM) peak, these junctions operate over capacity, with significant queuing of in excess of 20 minutes to pass through these junctions. Of particular concern is the roundabout, which from my observations appears to exceed absolute capacity in the AM peak. There is an added complication in respect of highway infrastructure as both of these junctions are in Rochdale and appropriate mitigation would therefore require input from Rochdale Borough Council. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies a need for health and education facilities in Whitworth (the single local doctors surgery has over 900 patients registered and Whitworth primary school has very limited capacity), but no land is proposed to be allocated for health purposes and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan proposes education 'improvements will be dealt with on a case by case basis'.</p> <p>Edenfield is a village and its character would be irreversibly damaged should land be allocated for 500 homes in 2019-2034. Whilst I support the allocation of land for residential development in Edenfield in principle, the scale of the expansion proposed is excessive and should be reduced as it would result in significant harm to the social dimension of sustainable development. The Regulation 18 consultation is flawed in that it proposes release of land from the Green Belt without justification and for no identified purpose. The consultation in this respect misleads members of the public and consultees and conflicts with both the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant case law. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that land may only</p>		<p>The withdrawn Draft Site Allocations document proposed the allocation of land currently used as playing fields for development in Whitworth. Playing fields provide a valuable resource for communities, making a significant contribution to the social dimension of sustainable development and the health and wellbeing of local communities. I welcome the omission of these proposals from the Draft Local Plan (2019-2034).</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>be released from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances and case law (IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] and Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014]) has established that the production of a local plan is in itself not sufficient justification for land to be released (Paragraph 2.25 of the Green Belt Review Report lists the five relevant legal principles). - - Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] clearly established that a plan- maker may err in law if it fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. The Draft Local Plan (2019-2034) proposes the release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm, Whitworth but does not clearly identify the intentions with regards to this released land (illustrated by the Key for the Policies Map 2017, which does not define what this land will be designated as) and this is a clear failure to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. There may be other such instances in the Draft Local Plan. - - I have therefore been prejudiced by this as I am unable to comment fully on the proposals as they are unclear. I am not able to come to a conclusion in respect of this as the map is unclear and I do not know why the land is proposed to be released from the Green Belt. - - The fact that the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm is not proposed to be allocated for any intended purpose is unlawful for it fails to satisfy the exceptional circumstance test necessary for the release to be permitted in any event. This element of the plan conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and presents a significant risk of challenge should the plan be progressed as proposed. - - The only potential means by which the failure in the Regulation 18 Consultation can be remedied are: - 1. The omission of the proposed release of land at Lower Fold Head Farm from the Green Belt from the Publication/Submission Version of the Local Plan. - 2. A revision to the Policies Map to ensure all land proposed to be released from the Green Belt is appropriately allocated for whatever purpose it is intended to be released for, otherwise there can be no justification to release the land from the Green Belt. Any such revision would necessitate a new Regulation 18 Consultation. - - In addition to the comments above, I object to the release of release of land from the Green Belt at Lower Fold Head Farm on the following grounds: - 1. Paragraph 4.6 of the Green Belt Review identifies that it 'only considers the relative performance of the Green Belt; it does not consider the exceptional circumstances required to demonstrate the need for Green Belt release, or the range of other constraints that may inhibit sustainable development e.g. ecological, archaeological, infrastructure, social and economic constraints.' - 2. Notwithstanding that the failure to allocate the land for any purpose does not meet the exceptional circumstance test and is contrary to established legal principles, no assessment of site constraints or justification for the release of the land has been undertaken by the Council. - 3. No landscape assessment has been undertaken for this proposed</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>release. - 4. Development on this land as suggested by the Green Belt Review document (page 52) would result in a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and would significantly encroach into the countryside. - 5. There is no realistic prospect of the land coming forward to meet unmet development needs in future as there is no feasible means of access to the land. Hall Fold is single vehicle width and due to the topography and character of the area, I can see no feasible means by which the carriageway could be brought to adoptable standards to facilitate access for development purposes. The development of the land would not meet Lancashire County Council's highways requirements or those of the Lancashire Fire Authority. Access and accessibility has not been considered. - 6. There is a clearly defined boundary to the Green Belt at this point – the eastern boundary is formed by a dry stone wall that is a retaining wall of significant height in parts (in excess of 2 metres in height). - 7. The proposed boundary of the Green Belt would result in an irregular and angular boundary that would harm the openness of the remaining Green Belt and present a significant encroachment into the countryside. - 8. It would lead to pressure for development in future that would compromise the farm holding of Lower Fold Head Farm. - 9. It would be harmful to the Rossendale Way. - 10. The parcel performs strongly against purpose 1a and 1b, performs strongly against purpose 3 moderately against purpose 4. Development within the parcel would not form a coherent extension to the current settlement edge and would introduce an element of sprawl. The parcel is open pastoral land and displays strong characteristics of the open countryside and has a relatively intact rural character. Releasing the identified sub-area would have a substantial negative effect on the integrity of the Green Belt and would result in a high degree of harm that, given the elevated nature of the land (standing some 3 metres higher than Wallbank Lane) could not be mitigated by 'planting' as suggested in the Green Belt Review. - 11. Paragraph 5.4 page 55 of the Green Belt Review states 'It is important to note that the conclusions reached in this study, do not state that the parcels identified should be released from the Green Belt; as the consideration of further constraints by the Council will be required to ensure that any development is sustainable. It is also recommended that any identified land parcels are considered as part of the wider work undertaken by the Council to identify key housing and employment sites and land and tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as part of a robust approach to develop the future development strategy for Rossendale.' There is no document that demonstrates the Council has considered any such constraints. - 12. Development of the land would have a significant detrimental impact on outlook from my property and the adjacent bungalow. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1437	Joanne	Finn	-		Object	I would like to object to the proposed redrawing of the urban Boundary to include the land at Oakenhead Wood(HS2.64) and to the rear of 173 to 187 Haslingden Old Road(hs2.66) , behind St James the Less School, Rawtenstall wishing it to remain as existing as I object to development of housing in these areas a outlined separately.		I'm not sure that this is the right place to put it but I'd also like to comment on the Consultation process for this and plans etc including Lives and Landscapes .Whilst I'm sure you will comply with the legal minimum requirements Most people I spoke to didn't know about the Consultation we only found about because a neighbour knew there was a proposal for the field but didn't know the process. We've found out about things retrospectively in the past. People generally feel this is deliberate to minimise likelihood of objections. I'd expect it to be better advertised, including more often in the local paper and on the front page on your website. Even knowing of it's existence you have to hunt to find it on the website.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED	LAND AT ACRE AVENUE, STACKSTEADS	Support	<p>WE SUPPORT THE INCLUSION OF THIS SITE WITHIN THE URBAN AREA BOUNDARY. PLEASE SEE SUBMITTED REPRESENTATION FOR DETAILS. ACRE AVENUE, STACKSTEADS</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. This consultation is the first public consultation stage in the production of the Local Plan (Regulation 18) and includes the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement) and its accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Hourigan Connolly is instructed by B and E Boys Limited to submit and provide comment on the above site in support of its inclusion within the urban area. We have previously submitted representations in response to consultation relating to the Local Plan Part 2 in 2015 and subsequently the 'Call for Sites' exercise relating to the preparation of the new Local Plan in 2016.</p> <p>Along with this letter, we have also submitted an electronic consultation form via the Council's website and this letter should be read in conjunction with the submitted form. A site plan is also enclosed for information.</p> <p>Submissions</p> <p>We note that within the draft Local Plan land at Acre Avenue, Stacksteads is not proposed to be allocated for a particular use, however it is proposed to be included within the Urban Area.</p> <p>Our client supports the inclusion of the site within the Urban Area as is indicated on the draft Policies Map. The site is entirely appropriate for inclusion within the urban boundary given the distinction between it and land further to east which is more open in nature, providing a suitable boundary to the open countryside.</p> <p>We reserve the right to provide further supporting statements and evidence during the preparation of the Plan process and ask that we continue to be informed as the Local Plan progresses.</p> <p>Please see plan in appendix.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1473	K	Howieson	C/O Agent		Object	<p>Please see submitted Representation Document</p> <p>Email received 09/10/2017:</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. The Council are asking for comments on the Draft Local Plan which will replace the Core Strategy once it is adopted. 1.2 The Draft Local Plan document has been informed by a series of evidence base documents, and previous consultations undertaken on proposed changes to the Urban Boundary and the Green Belt. 1.3 The evidence base comprises the following documents: • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) - Stages 1 & 2 and Site Assessments 2017 • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2017 • Employment Land Review 2017 • Green Belt Review 2016 • Environmental Network Study 2017 • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment 2016 • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study 2017 • Playing Pitch Strategy 2016 (previously published) • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) 2016 • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing 2017 • Landscape Study 2015 (previously published) • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published).</p> <p>1.4 Rossendale's Local Plan will designate land and buildings for future uses to meet the Borough's needs and set out what developments should look like and how they should fit in with their surroundings.</p> <p>1.5 Sites have been proposed for development (such as housing or employment sites), for environmental protection and for recreation uses on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation areas and an extension to an existing Conservation area are being considered.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the Draft Local Plan in relation to land opposite 1019 Burnley Road in Loveclough, Rossendale. Currently the site is designated as being located beyond the Urban Boundary within the open countryside. On behalf of our client, we seek to promote a change to the Urban Boundary to include the subject site.</p> <p>1.7 This Statement will demonstrate that a change to the Urban Boundary to include the subject site would accord with the criteria set out by the Council as part of their consultation for the Review of existing Green Belt and Urban Boundary in 2012 / 2013 (no update to this appears to be available as part of the 2017 consultation).</p> <p>1.8 The location of the site is shown below, at Figure 1.1. Figure 1.1 Site Location & Context (NB. Red line is for indicative purposes only).</p> <p>1.9 The site itself has been previously developed and includes nine existing garages, which are currently used for storage purposes, with two being used</p>		Please see submitted Representation Document

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>as workshops for local builders. These are accessed via an existing track which is in private ownership but is a public right of way. Abutting the site to the east is an allotment and further garage which is under separate ownership. The to the south is greenfield land, beyond which is existing residential development.</p> <p>Figure 1.2 Existing garages within the site, viewed from Burnley Road</p> <p>1.10 The site is bordered to the north by recreational sports fields (Loveclough Sports Field), to the east by Burnley Road with residential uses beyond and to the south by further existing residential uses.</p> <p>1.11 Land to the north west of the site benefits from a recent planning permission for a large allotment development², which was approved by the Council's Planning Committee on 10 December 2013 and is under construction. This development is known as Badgercote Allotments and is on land owned by the Council. Also to the west is the settlement of Goodshaw Fold.</p> <p>1.12 The site is within walking distance of a number of settlements including Goodshaw, Crawshawbooth and Dunnockshaw, which provide a variety of services, and the topography of the area is conducive to walking, with good, well-surfaced and street-lit footways on both sides of all the roads in the area. There are a number of facilities within a 5km cycling distance of the site, including primary, secondary and further education facilities, convenience and large-format foodstores, accessible via traffic-free routes.</p> <p>1.13 The site has previously been subject to an appeal against the Council's decision to refuse full planning permission on 05 February 2015 for the erection of 15no. detached dwellings including formation of access from Burnley Road and landscaping³. The appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate, primarily on the grounds of landscape impact on 4th February 2016.</p> <p>1.14 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.15 The starting point for consideration of the Draft Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>1.16 On behalf of Mr X we strongly recommend that the Council redraw the Urban Boundary so that it includes the area of land subject to this Representation.</p> <p>1.17 Needless to say we will wish to participate in the Examination in Public and attend the relevant hearings and will make further representations at the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>Regulation 19 Submission stage.</p> <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Development Strategy.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The Rossendale Borough Council Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and will guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain's demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development. These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”. <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests: Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168). HOUSING</p> <p>2.21 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.22 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.25 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.26 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE</p> <p>2.28 The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>2.29 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Submission, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms): Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.30 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306): WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply</p> <p>2.31 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that: HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED?</p> <p>To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.32 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.33 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.34 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.35 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>POLICY SD2 URBAN BOUNDARY AND GREEN BELT</p> <p>3.3 This policy seeks to restrict new development to within the Urban Boundary, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area.</p> <p>3.4 The principle of this policy is supported; however, the proposed extent of the Urban Boundary is not. We consider that there is scope within the Borough to further revise the line of the Urban Boundary to accommodate the level of growth required to ensure the Borough's growth is sustainable and meets the aspirations of the Council moving forward.</p> <p>SUGGESTED MODIFICATION</p> <p>3.5 The Council should change the Urban Boundary to include the subject site within this boundary line to further deliver a sustainable level of growth. To change the Urban Boundary at this location would be sound and would not harm the objectives of the Local Plan and would accord with the Council's criteria set out in the Review of the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>3.6 The detailed proposed amendment to the Urban Boundary is shown in the following Chapter.</p> <p>4. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE URBAN BOUNDARY</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>4.1 Previous consultations by the Council on the Review of the Green Belt and Urban Boundary has resulted in a number of proposed changes to the Urban</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>Boundary line as shown on the draft Proposals Maps4. The Council used a number of criteria to assess whether a change to the Urban Boundary would accord with the purpose of the Urban Boundary to clearly define and differentiate between designated settlements, Countryside and Green Belt.</p> <p>4.2 The subject site is situated within the Ward of Goodshaw in Loveclough. Loveclough is a village located between Burnley and Rawtenstall with quick and direct access by public transport to both towns via Burnley Road (A682). The bus shelters opposite the site are served by the X43 'Witch Way' bus service which provides an express service into Manchester City Centre.</p> <p>4.3 Appendix 1 contains an extract from the Goodshaw Ward Proposals Map where the location of the subject site has been indicated with an arrow. Currently the site is located directly adjacent to the Urban Boundary. In the second extract, we have indicated how the Urban Boundary should be changed to include the site. The amendment to the delineation of the boundary line is minor.</p> <p>4.4 By assessing the inclusion of the site within the Urban Boundary against the Council's criteria (as listed above), we reach the following conclusions:</p> <p>1 The Urban Boundary will be amended to correct any cartographic errors, anomalies and inconsistencies where:</p> <p>(a) Boundaries are inaccurately drawn, or The current Urban Boundary in this location is some 20 years out of date, representing the old field boundaries in this locality.</p> <p>(b) Do not follow strong, robust and permanent boundaries, on the ground, or The boundary should include the subject site which would be bounded by a clearly defined boundary line associated with the allotment development immediately adjacent to the west. The new boundary would be well established, permanent and robust.</p> <p>(c) Areas of land no longer read as part of the wider built up area, or N/A</p> <p>(d) Areas of land clearly read as part of the wider built up area. This site reads as part of the built up area along Burnley Road, where there is residential development on both sides of the main road. This relationship has been strengthened following the development of the approved allotments to the immediate west of the site.</p> <p>2 To meet the Borough's future development and community needs, additional land will be considered for inclusion within the Urban Boundary where</p> <p>(a) It is capable of being developed sustainably and integrated into the existing built-up area, and Yes. The site is sustainably located and is already integrated into the existing built-up area.</p> <p>b) It would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment unless it is capable of full mitigation, and Yes. There would be no adverse effect.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>(c) It would not result in the amalgamation of settlements or adversely affect the character of the settlement; and Yes. There would be no amalgamation of settlements or adverse effect on the character of the settlement.</p> <p>(d) It would not adversely affect heritage assets or their setting, and N/A</p> <p>(e) It is capable of being developed without a significant adverse impact on local views and viewpoints, including where appropriate the use of appropriate mitigation measures. Yes. Development could be achieved without significant impact.</p> <p>3 Open land on the edge of existing settlements will be excluded from the Urban Boundary where it has existing recreational or community value (e.g. playing fields, allotments, playgrounds etc) to ensure it remains undeveloped The site is not used for recreational purposes.</p> <p>4.5 The subject site is sustainably located and any future development, would represent sustainable development, which the Framework establishes a presumption in favour of.</p> <p>4.6 The Framework also encourages Local Planning Authorities to positively seek opportunities to meet the objectively assessed development needs of their area unless, inter alia, any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>4.7 With this in mind, we would recommend that the draft Proposals Map for Goodshaw Ward be revised to take account of a change to the Urban Boundary so that the site on land opposite 1019 Burnley Road, Loveclough is included within the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>4.8 We reserve the right to add to make further submissions to the Council during the Local Plan preparation period.</p> <p>5. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>5.1 The Council should amend the Urban Boundary to include the subject site within this boundary line to further deliver a sustainable level of growth and to properly reflect the lie of the land. To amend the Urban Boundary at this location would be sound and would not harm the objectives of the Local Plan and would accord with the Council's criteria set out in the Review of the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>Please see appendix for figures</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1478	N/A	N/A	Winfields Holdings Ltd and Winfield's Ltd		Support	Winfields support the extension of the urban boundary at Acre to include the brownfield land that forms the northern part of the site upon which its existing business operates. The site is enclosed and not readily discernible from the surrounding area. Indeed, the land to be excluded from the Green Belt is directly comparable to other land already included within the existing urban area, and not readily visible from beyond it. - - As recognised by Officers, this land does not perform any Green Belt function and is a clear continuation of the existing urban area, being distinct and separate from the countryside beyond (as confirmed by your site assessment from June of this year). It does not therefore perform the purposes identified by paragraph 80 of the NPPF, as confirmed by the independent reviews undertaken during 2014 and November 2016. The exclusion from the Green Belt would, however, assist the existing business by recognising its status, which provides further assurances with respect to its programme of consolidation and renewal of the business within the Haslingden area.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1479	N	TEAGUE	SEE AGENT DETAILS		Object	<p>THE SITE SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE GREEN BELT AND INCLUDED WITHIN THE URBAN BOUNDARY. PLEASE SEE SUBMITTED REPRESENTATION FOR FULL DETAILS.</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>BRIEF 1.1 Hourigan Connolly is instructed by Mr N Teague in respect of his land interests at Elm Street, Edenfield. 1.2 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. Following the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in November 2011, RBC commenced work on its Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. However, this document was halted in favour of the preparation of a full new Local Plan which has now been issued for consultation from Monday 24 July to Monday 9 October 2017. This edition of the Local Plan comprises the Regulation 18 consultation document which sets out the Council's preferred approach to future housing, employment and leisure uses over the Plan period. Once adopted the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy (2011).</p> <p>1.3 Within the draft Local Plan, sites have been proposed for development (for housing or employment use), for environmental protection and for recreation uses, as identified on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation Areas, along with an extension to an existing Conservation Area, are being considered. 1.4 Documents included in the Draft Local Plan Consultation are the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement), the accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 1.5 The evidence base which supports the Local Plan comprises the following documents: • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017). • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017). • Employment Land Review (2017). • Green Belt Review (2016). • Environmental Network Study (2017). • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (2016). • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study (2017). • Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) (previously published). • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2016). • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing (2017). • Landscape Study (2015) (previously published). • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published). • Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites (2017). 1.6 In addition to the above documents, the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, although not strictly evidence, has informed the development of the draft policies.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.7 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the emerging</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>Local Plan in relation to land at Elm Street, Edenfield. The site falls outside of the urban boundary and is designated at Green Belt, and this Representation sets out why the Council should consider amending the urban boundary in this location order to promote sustainable development.</p> <p>SCOPE</p> <p>1.8 In preparing these submissions we have reviewed the documents mentioned above as well as other documents forming the evidence base that underpins the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>1.9 This representation is structured as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative and Policy Context. • The Site. • Green Belt Review. • Proposed Extended Employment Allocation. • Conclusions. <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Local Plan document.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The RBC Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain’s demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people and that Local Planning Authorities should plan for the release of land for development.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development. These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”. <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168).</p> <p>GREEN BELT</p> <p>2.21 In respect of Green Belt Paragraph 80 of the Framework lists the five national purposes of the Green Belt as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; • To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and, • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>2.22 Paragraph 83 goes on to state that Local Planning Authorities (LPA's) with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 84 states when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 85 sets out that when defining new Green Belt boundaries LPA's should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development; • not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open; • where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; • make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development; • satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and <p>2.25 define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.</p> <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.26 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>HOUSING</p> <p>2.28 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.29 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.30 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.31 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.32 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE – LAUNCHED 6 MARCH 2014</p> <p>2.33 On 28 August 2013 the government launched its draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The draft NPPG was subject to consultation for 6 weeks and was launched on 6 March in its final form. The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.34 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Report, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms): “Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.35 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306): “WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply.”</p> <p>2.36 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 of the section titled ‘Local Plans’ (Reference ID 12-008-</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>20140306) that: “HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED? To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.”</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.37 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.38 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.39 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.40 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>3. THE SITE</p> <p>SITE LOCATION</p> <p>3.1 The site’s general location is identified below in Figure 3.1. Figure 3.1 – Land at Elm Street, Edenfield– not to scale.</p> <p>3.2 The site lies to the south of Elm Street, with properties along Rochdale Road forming the south western boundary and the line of a former hedgerow forming the eastern boundary. This parcel of land forms part of a much larger parcel which is also within the ownership of our client – this wider parcel is bounded by Gincroft Lane, Michael Wife Lane and Plunge Road.</p> <p>3.3 As is evident from the aerial image above, land at Elm Street has a close</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>physical relationship with the existing built up part of the settlement, and the parcel provides an opportunity for rounding off the urban area.</p> <p>SITE DESCRIPTION</p> <p>3.4 The site extends comprises vacant greenfield land currently located within the Green Belt. Adjacent to the site, to the north east, there is a barn which has recently been converted to 2 No. apartments. This is also within the ownership of Mr N Teague and is outlined in red below.</p> <p>Figure 3.2 – Land at Elm Street, Edenfield.</p> <p>SURROUNDING AREA</p> <p>3.5 The subject site is located on the edge of the settlement of Edenfield. The site is approximately 1 mile to the north of Ramsbottom and 2.5 miles south of Rawtenstall. The village is mainly residential in nature and it has seen recent growth as a commuter settlement serving Greater Manchester and Lancashire.</p> <p>3.6 The village centre is located along Market Street (approximately 150 metres from the site) where a range of local services and facilities can be found, including a baker, butcher, pharmacy, post office newsagent and takeaway.</p> <p>3.7 The centre of Edenfield lies at the intersection of the A676 providing links to Bolton, the A680 providing links to Accrington and Rochdale and the A56 to Rawtenstall and Bury. The M66 motorway terminates at Edenfield where it becomes the A56 dual carriageway known as the Edenfield Bypass.</p> <p>3.8 This unremarkable site has a close physical relationship with the existing settlement (being surrounded by development to the north, south and west), and it does not relate to the wider countryside which dominates the landscape further to the east and north. Furthermore, the site is relatively flat compared to other parts of the village and the Borough more widely.</p> <p>FLOOD RISK</p> <p>3.9 According to the Flood Map for Planning provided by the Environment Agency, the site lies within Flood Zone 1. Only those areas which lie adjacent to the course of Dearden Clough Brook further to the south are identified as being in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Figure 3.2 – Extract from Flood Map for Planning</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p> <p>3.10 The Council commissioned a Landscape Character Assessment in 2015. The document separates areas of the Borough into various landscape character types, with reference to those identified in the Lancashire Landscape Strategy. The subject site which is located on the edge of the urban area of Edenfield falls into an area identified as ‘Settled Valley’. The area is not identified as one which is of particular value.</p> <p>Figure 3.3 – Extract from Landscape Character Areas Plan</p> <p>3.11 The Landscape Character Assessment goes on to assess specific sites in relation to their development potential, although land at Elm Street is not</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>considered in detail in this regard.</p> <p>PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY</p> <p>3.12 Footpath number 14-3-FP164 runs in close proximity to the site to the south. The wider land which is in the ownership of our client is bounded by further footpaths as shown within Figure 3.4.</p> <p>Figure 3.4 Extract of Lancashire County Council's PROW Mapping</p> <p>AGRICULTURAL LAND QUALITY</p> <p>3.13 According to the agricultural land quality database, land in this area is considered to be of poor or very poor value. This is identified in Figure 3.5 below.</p> <p>Figure 3.5 Extract of Natural England's Agricultural Land Classification Mapping</p> <p>ECOLOGY</p> <p>3.14 The site is not a statutory Ecological or Heritage asset neither is it within 1 km of a National Nature Reserve, Ramsar Site, Site of Special Scientific Interest or Special Protected Area.</p> <p>SUMMARY</p> <p>3.15 In summary, none of the statutory or other designations identified would preclude development of the site.</p> <p>4. GREEN BELT REVIEW</p> <p>4.1 As part of the evidence base to inform the emerging Local Plan, a Green Belt Review was carried out by LUC with the final report being published in November 2016. The purpose of the review was to carry out an independent and comprehensive assessment of Green Belt within the Borough to inform the preparation of the new Local Plan. One of the key aims of the review was to provide clear conclusions on the relative performance of Green Belt which will enable Rossendale Borough Council to consider whether there are 'exceptional circumstances' (as per Paragraph 83 of the Framework) to justify altering Green Belt boundaries through the Local Plan process to meet development needs.</p> <p>4.2 As previously identified, the Framework sets out five purposes of the Green Belt as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; • To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and, • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>4.3 In common with other studies we have reviewed the LUC Green Belt Assessment firstly establishes Green Belt parcels – in this instance there are 80 parcels included within five broad areas of Green Belt. In that respect the subject site falls within Parcel 47, as identified below.</p> <p>Figure 4.1 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) Green Belt Parcels around Edenfield</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>4.4 Parcels were formed through the identification of land that contains the same or very similar land uses or character bounded by recognisable features. These features are described as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural features i.e. substantial watercourses; and • Manmade features i.e. motorways A and B roads, railways. <p>4.5 Less prominent features such as walls, woodland, hedges, tree lines, streams and ditches were also considered where other more permanent boundaries were not present.</p> <p>4.6 Two types of parcel were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas adjacent to built up areas (relatively small parcels); and • Broad areas of Green Belt that may be more remote from settlement. <p>4.7 The boundary of Parcel 47 is identified in further detail in Figure 4.2 below. Figure 4.2 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) identifying Parcel 47</p> <p>4.8 An assessment has then been made by LUC as to the ratings of the Green Belt parcels in Rossendale against the first four objectives of including land within the Green Belt as set out in Paragraph 80 of the Framework. Figure 4.3 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) – Overall Assessment Table Figure 4.4 Extract from Green Belt Review (2016) – Parcel Ratings</p> <p>4.9 It can be seen in Figure 4.3 that the Council’s Green Belt Assessment for Parcel 47 concluded that the parcel has a ‘strong’ role in relation to Purpose 1a and Purpose 1b, a ‘weak’ role in relation to Purpose 2, a ‘moderate’ contribution in relation to Purpose 3 and a ‘weak’ contribution in relation to Purpose 4. Purpose 5 is not detailed within the table given that all sites have been considered as equal in this regard.</p> <p>4.10 We have considered the Council’s Green Belt Review and the analysis of the subject site below.</p> <p>PARCEL 47</p> <p>4.11 The assessment for Parcel 47 states that it lies adjacent to Edenfield and it lies between Edenfield and Rawtenstall.</p> <p>4.12 In our view Parcel 47 is far too broad a study area which has led to skewed conclusions being reached by LUC. In our opinion there is a clear distinction between the western most part of Parcel 47 to that in the east. In that respect we comment on the conclusions reached by LUC below.</p> <p>PURPOSE1A - DOES THE PARCEL EXHIBIT EVIDENCE OF EXISTING URBAN SPRAWL AND CONSEQUENT LOSS OF OPENNESS?</p> <p>4.13 As identified within the assessment of the subject site, the land lies on the edge of Edenfield which forms part of the large built up area of Ramsbottom/Bury. The assessment considers that there are few urbanising features within the parcel and that there is a strong sense of openness. This may be the case for the eastern part of the parcel, however, the area to the west has a strong relationship with the existing urban area and the sense of openness is limited. Parts of the parcel are distinctly different in character and this means the assessment is flawed.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>4.14 The western side of the parcel offers a sensible opportunity to round off the settlement and would not constitute unrestricted sprawl of the built up area.</p> <p>4.15 Result: No contribution.</p> <p>1B - DOES THE PARCEL PROTECT OPEN LAND FROM THE POTENTIAL FOR URBAN SPRAWL TO OCCUR?</p> <p>4.16 Land on the western side of the parcel makes a Weak Contribution to protecting land from the potential for urban sprawl. Containment can be achieved using existing building lines and former field boundaries.</p> <p>4.17 Result: Weak contribution.</p> <p>PURPOSE 2: TO PREVENT NEIGHBOURING TOWNS MERGING INTO ONE ANOTHER</p> <p>4.18 The assessment identifies that although this parcel lies between Edenfield and Rawtenstall, the settlements are 2km apart and so this parcel has a weak role in terms of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.</p> <p>4.19 Again, the varying nature of land included within Parcel 47 makes it difficult to make a fair assessment and we consider that land on the western side of the parcel would have no contribution to this purpose.</p> <p>4.20 Result: No contribution.</p> <p>PURPOSE 3: TO ASSIST IN SAFEGUARDING THE COUNTRYSIDE FROM ENCROACHMENT</p> <p>4.21 It is stated within the assessment of Parcel 47 that properties along Plunge Road already give a sense of encroachment in this area.</p> <p>4.22 In our view, existing buildings along Plunge Road, and others to the north along Boundary Edge and Gincroft Lane mark out the limits of the existing urban area. The western part of Parcel 47 does not go beyond these limits and therefore inclusion of some of this land within the urban area would not constitute encroachment. There is no basis for the Council considering that this site has a moderate role in this regard.</p> <p>4.23 Result: No contribution.</p> <p>PURPOSE 4: TO PRESERVE THE SETTING & SPECIAL CHARACTER OF HISTORIC TOWNS</p> <p>4.24 The assessment of Parcel 47 considers its relationship with the historic settlement of Ramsbottom. However, it is concluded that the effects of development within this parcel on the character of the historic settlement are likely to be limited. We therefore agree with the conclusion that the site is rated as 'weak' in this regard.</p> <p>4.25 Result: Weak.</p> <p>PURPOSE 5: TO ASSIST IN URBAN REGENERATION BY ENCOURAGING THE RECYCLING OF DERELICT & OTHER URBAN LAND</p> <p>4.26 It is noted that in line with the methodology all sites have been considered as having an equal contribution to this purpose, though it is not</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>stated what this is.</p> <p>4.27 Result: Equal contribution.</p> <p>OVERALL ASSESSMENT</p> <p>4.28 We consider the assessment which has been carried out for the subject site, which comprises part of the land included within Parcel 47 to be flawed as it overestimates the value of the Green Belt in this location. This is largely due to the fact that the parcel is too large and varied in nature for a fair assessment to be made.</p> <p>4.29 We advocate that our client's land, particularly that to the west, makes a very weak to no contribution to four of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt and the remaining purpose 5 cannot be used for assessment purposes as all of the sites in the Borough are given equal weighting.</p> <p>4.30 In line with the Council's methodology the overall assessment for our client's site should therefore be weak.</p> <p>4.31 We consider the subject site as an appropriate site for release from the Green Belt as it is adjacent to the settlement boundary and has existing development on 3 sides. The site would form a logical extension to Edenfield in this location.</p> <p>4.32 We reserve the right to make further representations in support of the release of the subject site from the Green Belt.</p> <p>5. REPRESENTATIONS</p> <p>5.1 In light of the assessment included within this report, we consider that land at Elm Street, Edenfield should be considered for release from the Green Belt.</p> <p>5.2 Figure 5.1 shows the current Green Belt designation which covers the site in the emerging Local Plan Proposals Map. The extent of the urban boundary of Edenfield is marked with a red line.</p> <p>Figure 5.1 Extract from Local Plan Proposals Map identifying urban boundary</p> <p>5.3 It is clear that the area which lies immediately behind properties on Rochdale Road is enclosed on three sides and, as set out in Section 4 of this report, has a very limited role in terms of the five purposes of the Green Belt as identified in the Framework.</p> <p>5.4 The nature of the existing urban boundary in this location means that this part of the Green Belt provides an opportunity for rounding off the settlement without causing encroachment into the surrounding Green Belt which is more open in nature. In a Borough such as Rossendale which has a significant amount of smaller settlements and a large amount of countryside, it is imperative that sustainable sites on the edge of existing urban areas are fully considered in terms of their ability to meet the Borough's development needs where appropriate. Rossendale is further limited due to its topography and the subject site lies in a relatively flat part of the Borough.</p> <p>5.5 Edenfield is a sustainable settlement and the subject site is within 150m of local services along the high street. The village has good road links to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>Ramsbottom, Rawtenstall and beyond. Access to the site is achievable via Elm Street.</p> <p>5.6 The site is entirely appropriate for inclusion within the urban boundary of Edenfield. Indeed, part of the wider Green Belt parcel may have a future role in delivering sustainable development beyond the emerging Local Plan period.</p> <p>PROPOSED MODIFICATION</p> <p>5.7 The Council is respectfully requested to modify the proposed urban boundary of Edenfield to include land to the rear of properties along Rochdale Road as shown below.</p> <p>Figure 5.2 Proposed Amendment to Green Belt Boundary</p> <p>5.8 The extension of the urban boundary in this location is considered entirely appropriate having regard for the site's limited Green Belt function and the fact that it is bounded by the urban area on three sides.</p> <p>5.9 We contend that this would properly reflect the provisions of Paragraph 83 of the Framework which sets out that amendments to Green Belt boundaries can only be made in exceptional circumstances and through the local plan process. In addition, the amendment to the Green Belt boundary in this instance would be fully in accordance with Paragraph 84 of the Framework which sets out that such amendments should only be made to facilitate sustainable development patterns.</p> <p>6. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>6.1 The starting point for consideration of the Council's Local Plan is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the Framework that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>6.2 The Framework is clear at Paragraph 83 that Green Belt boundaries can be amended in exceptional circumstances, through the local plan process. Paragraph 84 further states that this can only be done in order to facilitate sustainable development.</p> <p>6.3 It has been highlighted in this Representation that land at Elm Street does not meet the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in Paragraph 80. As a result, and in order to provide for sustainable development over the plan period, the land should be included within the urban boundary of Edenfield and subsequently it should be removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Please see appendix for figures</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1485	Mark	Nelson	.		Object	<p>See attached representations</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. The Council are asking for comments on the Draft Local Plan which will replace the Core Strategy once it is adopted. 1.2 The Draft Local Plan document has been informed by a series of evidence base documents, and previous consultations undertaken on proposed changes to the Urban Boundary and the Green Belt1. 1.3 The evidence base comprises the following documents: • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) - Stages 1 & 2 and Site Assessments 2017 • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2017 • Employment Land Review 2017 • Green Belt Review 2016 • Environmental Network Study 2017 • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment 2016 • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study 2017 • Playing Pitch Strategy 2016 (previously published) • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) 2016 • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing 2017 • Landscape Study 2015 (previously published) • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published).</p> <p>1.4 Rossendale's Local Plan will designate land and buildings for future uses to meet the Borough's needs and set out what developments should look like and how they should fit in with their surroundings.</p> <p>1 Consultation was undertaken on the Green Belt & Urban Boundary Review between October – December 2012, January 2013 and December 2014, with further comments accepted by the Council during 2015 and 2016 to inform the previous Local Plan Part 2 consultation, which was late withdrawn.</p> <p>1.5 Sites have been proposed for development (such as housing or employment sites), for environmental protection and for recreation uses on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation areas and an extension to an existing Conservation area are being considered.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the Draft Local Plan in relation to land at Leabrook Nurseries, Burnley Road, Rossendale. Currently the site is designated as being located beyond the Urban Boundary within the open countryside. On behalf of our client, we seek to promote a change to the Urban Boundary to include the subject site.</p> <p>1.7 This Statement will demonstrate that a change to the Urban Boundary to include the subject site would accord with the criteria set out by the Council as part of their consultation for the Review of existing Green Belt and Urban Boundary in 2012 / 2013 (no update to this appears to be available as part of the 2017 consultation).</p> <p>1.8 The location of the site is shown below, at Figure 1.1.</p>		N/A

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>Figure 1.1 Site Location & Context.</p> <p>1.9 The site itself previously developed and includes the garden centre and associated structures, areas of hardstanding for display and sale of goods and parking areas. These are accessed via an existing bridge from Burnley Road, which also serves the adjacent commercial premises to the south. The site is generally flat though it does slope from west to east in its western part.</p> <p>Figure 1.2 The site, viewed from Burnley Road</p> <p>1.10 The site is bordered to the north by an established belt of trees, lining a farm access road. To the east lie terraced residential properties, whilst to the south lie commercial premises in a mix of uses compatible with this residential location. To the west, the site is bounded by an established belt of mature trees beyond which lies a farmstead converted to residential use.</p> <p>1.11 The site is within walking distance of a number of shops and services, and the topography of the area is conducive to walking, with good, well-surfaced and street-lit footways on both sides of all the roads in the area. There are a number of facilities within a 5km cycling distance of the site, including primary, secondary and further education facilities, convenience and large-format foodstores, accessible via traffic-free routes. The site also lies on an established bus route with regular facilities calling the bus stops immediately adjacent to the site.</p> <p>1.12 It is beyond question that the site is sustainably located.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.13 The starting point for consideration of the Draft Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>1.14 On behalf of Mr M Nelson we strongly recommend that the Council redraw the Urban Boundary so that it includes the area of land subject to this Representation to properly reflect the up-to-date position on the ground.</p> <p>1.15 Needless to say, we will wish to participate in the Examination in Public and attend the relevant hearings and will make further representations at the Regulation 19 Submission stage.</p> <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Development Strategy.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The Rossendale Borough Council Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council’s such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and will guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain’s demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development. These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”. <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168). HOUSING</p> <p>2.21 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.22 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.25 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.26 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development; • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE</p> <p>2.28 The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.29 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Submission, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms): Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>2.30 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306): WHAT CONSTITUTES A 'DELIVERABLE SITE' IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply</p> <p>2.31 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that: HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED?</p> <p>To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.</p> <p>3. DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES</p> <p>POLICY SD1 PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>3.1 This policy is in line with the Framework and supports sustainable development in accordance with the Local Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In addition, where policies are out of date or irrelevant the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise, taking into account any adverse impacts that would demonstrably outweigh the benefits or any specific policies in the Framework that indicate development should be restricted.</p> <p>3.2 This policy is supported as it is directly in line with the Framework.</p> <p>POLICY SD2 URBAN BOUNDARY AND GREEN BELT</p> <p>3.3 This policy seeks to restrict new development to within the Urban Boundary, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>area.</p> <p>3.4 The principle of this policy is supported; however, the proposed extent of the Urban Boundary is not. We consider that there is scope within the Borough to further revise the line of the Urban Boundary to accommodate the level of growth required to ensure the Borough's growth is sustainable and meets the aspirations of the Council moving forward.</p> <p>SUGGESTED MODIFICATION</p> <p>3.5 The Council should change the Urban Boundary to include the subject site within this boundary line to further deliver a sustainable level of growth. To change the Urban Boundary at this location would be sound and would not harm the objectives of the Local Plan and would accord with the Council's criteria set out in the Review of the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>3.6 The detailed proposed amendment to the Urban Boundary is shown in the following Chapter.</p> <p>HS1 HOUSING</p> <p>3.7 This Policy sets out the need to provide at least 4,000 additional dwellings over the plan period (2019-2034), equating to 265 dwellings per annum. The policy seeks to address prior under-provision in the first five years of the plan period, by increasing the annual requirement to 350 in the first five years. This strategy is supported.</p> <p>3.8 It is however noted that the SHMA sets out a range of need from 265-335 dwellings per annum, it is therefore questionable as to why the Council has simply chosen the lower end of this range, rather than opting for an aspirational target to ensure need is met and sustainable growth achieved.</p> <p>4. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE URBAN BOUNDARY</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>4.1 Previous consultations by the Council on the Review of the Green Belt and Urban Boundary has resulted in a number of proposed changes to the Urban Boundary line as shown on the draft Proposals Maps². The Council used a number of criteria to assess whether a change to the Urban Boundary would accord with the purpose of the Urban Boundary to clearly define and differentiate between designated settlements, Countryside and Green Belt.</p> <p>4.2 The subject site is situated with quick and direct access by public transport to Burnley to the north and Rawtenstall to the south with both towns via Burnley Road (A682). The bus stops adjacent to the site are served by the X43 'Witch Way' bus service which provides an express service into Manchester City Centre.</p> <p>4.3 Our proposed amendment is shown below:</p> <p>Fig. 4.1 Current Draft Boundary</p> <p>² The Council has produced a Borough-wide Proposals Maps and a number of Ward Proposals Maps.</p> <p>Fig. 4.2 Proposed Draft Boundary (site indicated by red dot)</p> <p>4.4 By assessing the inclusion of the site within the Urban Boundary against</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>the Council's criteria (as listed above), we reach the following conclusions: (Table)</p> <p>1 The Urban Boundary will be amended to correct any cartographic errors, anomalies and inconsistencies where:</p> <p>(a) Boundaries are inaccurately drawn, or: The current Urban Boundary in this location is some 20 years out of date and do not reflect the urban area on the ground.</p> <p>(b) Do not follow strong, robust and permanent boundaries, on the ground, or: The boundary should include the subject site which would be bounded by a clearly defined boundary line associated with the established boundaries to the garden centre. The new boundary would be well established, permanent and robust.</p> <p>(c) Areas of land no longer read as part of the wider built up area, or: N/A</p> <p>(d) Areas of land clearly read as part of the wider built up area : This site reads as part of the built-up area along Burnley Road, where there is already development on both sides of the main road.</p> <p>2 To meet the Borough's future development and community needs, additional land will be considered for inclusion within the Urban Boundary where</p> <p>(a) It is capable of being developed sustainably and integrated into the existing built-up area, and: Yes. The site is sustainably located and is already integrated into the existing built-up area.</p> <p>(b) It would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment unless it is capable of full mitigation, and: Yes. There would be no adverse effect.</p> <p>(c) It would not result in the amalgamation of settlements or adversely affect the character of the settlement; and: Yes. There would be no amalgamation of settlements or adverse effect on the character of the settlement.</p> <p>(d) It would not adversely affect heritage assets or their setting, and: N/A</p> <p>(e) It is capable of being developed without a significant adverse impact on local views and viewpoints, including where appropriate the use of appropriate mitigation measures : Yes. Development could be achieved without significant impact.</p> <p>3 Open land on the edge of existing settlements will be excluded from the Urban Boundary where it has existing recreational or community value (e.g. playing fields, allotments, playgrounds etc) to ensure it remains undeveloped: The site is not used for recreational purposes.</p> <p>4.5 The subject site is sustainably located and any future development, would represent sustainable development, which the Framework establishes a presumption in favour of.</p> <p>4.6 The Framework also encourages Local Planning Authorities to positively seek opportunities to meet the objectively assessed development needs of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>their area unless, inter alia, any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>4.7 With this in mind, we would recommend that the draft Proposals Map for be revised to reflect the urban area correctly so that the land at Leabrook Garden centre is included within the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>4.8 We reserve the right to add to make further submissions to the Council during the Local Plan preparation period.</p> <p>5. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>5.1 The Council should amend the Urban Boundary to include the subject site within this boundary line to further deliver a sustainable level of growth and to properly reflect the lie of the land. To amend the Urban Boundary at this location would be sound and would not harm the objectives of the Local Plan and would accord with the Council's criteria set out in the Review of the Urban Boundary.</p>		
1531	Christine	Storey	-		Object	I objected to this land being taken off greenbelt		-
1537	John	McGuinness	-		Object	I do not agree with the extension of the urban boundary into the former green belt areas. Rossendale is a beautiful place to live and these intrusions into greenbelt land will bring us a blighted landscape. - Loss of wild life habitat will also be impacte		You seem to be trying to implement a plan where nearly all patches of green within the urban boundary are built on. The hillsides may be green (for now) but all small breathing spaces seem to be a target for building on. Sustainable; how can building more houses on any green area be sustainable? Once land is lost to development, it's lost forever.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1549	Jane	Sacks		Urban boundary change off Goodshaw Lane	Object	<p>My purpose in writing is to bring to your attention my concerns regarding the above proposed redrawing of the Urban Boundary.</p> <p>You will note that I do not live in the areas, but I am a regular worshipper at St Marys & All Saints Church and I also attend many other events held there. I used to live in a house off the lane, and am very aware of the dangers of driving or walking in the area, because of the lack of pavements, the narrowness of the land and the "blind" corners.</p> <p>As this stand at the moment, it is a very difficult area to negotiate. There is a weekly Toddler Group at Church, and carers often need to park quite some distance from the venue and then negotiate their way in with babies, prams etc. In addition, a Community Lunch is held, and many guests have mobility problems. There is only a small length of pavement before the car parking at Harvey Longworth Couth and the Church building, and no parking or pavements whatsoever at the other side of the building going down the lane. I attended an event this morning, when a resident from Harvey Longworth Court had extreme difficulty in manoeuvring out of the car park because of cars parked on the other side of the lane (even though they were partly parked on the grass verge). Whilst this was occurring, vehicles were blocked in either direction.</p> <p>It is also challenging for churchgoers with disability to access the Church building even now, as we have no parking of our own and (naturally) are not allowed to park at Harvey Longworth Court since more of their residents are now car owners.</p> <p>In addition, when there are Weddings, Baptisms and Funerals it is not just difficult to find parking but the lane is completely blocked when a car or hearse needs to stop outside. It is already hazardous to try to walk in this area, due to the lack of pavements, and (over the years) the increased volume of traffic. It can be fraught with danger, as people have to squeeze into hedgerows or walls to let vehicles pass.</p> <p>If Planning Officers view this area in the middle of a weekday it will not immediately be apparent how hazardous this stretch of road can be, but I ask that my objections be taken into account when this proposal is considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This plan would pave the way for properties to be built that would undoubtedly increase the volume of traffic in this area, with all the attendant risk this would bring. - Access and parking for the Church is already problematic and could only be exacerbated by allowing more houses on this site. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1560	Stephen	Alderson	Alderson and Horan Funeral services Limited		Object	<p>I wish to offer an objection to the proposed boundary change, adjacent to St Mary's and All Saints' Church extending down to Goodshaw lane, Crawshawbooth.</p> <p>As the local funeral directors in Crawshawbooth, we use this church for many of our funerals within the village and we are concerned that the increase in use of this lane and the added volume of more traffic and parking in this area would cause serious problems with parking the hearse at the church entrance due to the road being very narrow, so turning the hearse and other funeral vehicles would prove impossible.</p> <p>Therefore, I would be grateful if ask you could take these issues into consideration when making your decision.</p>		
1565	Richard	Hardman		Designation of land on draft policies map	Object	<p>On behalf of myself and the three other co-owners of the land lying to the south of Newchurch Road at Cowpe, which is registered under Land Registry Title No. LAN74318 in our names, I am returning your questionnaire, in which I have indicated that our objection is to the designation on the Draft Policies Map 2017 of part of our land as "Greenland", as distinct from "Green Belt". The alnd in relation to which our objection arises is indicated on the atatched plan and the position is further explained in the "Comments" section on the Questionnaire.</p> <p>Our objection is to the description or designation as "Greenland" of the areas which we have indicated in red on the attached copy of the Draft Policies Map 2017 and also on the plan (marked "Plan A"), which we have attached to this Questionnaire. We submit that the areas, which we have so indicated, should be described or desiganted as "Green Belt" and not as Greenland. Part of the land, which we have marked or edged in red is occupied by garages, part is the front garden of number 2 Hardman Drive and the remainder should have the same description or designation as the land immediately to the north of it (being "Green Belt").</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1573	M	Hoyle			Object	<p>I would like to notify you of my objections to the proposed amends to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt, Local Plan Housing allocation site HS71- and Policy HS3 Edenfield.</p> <p>My primary reasons for objection are that the proposals in the draft Local Plan contravene advice in various components of Rossendale Council Evidence base documents i.e. Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) -Site Assessment 2017, Green Belt Review 2016 and Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan, Landscape Study 2015 and central government guidelines/policies. Rossendale Council has also failed to provide residents with substantial Infrastructure evidence to support the proposals.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>1.HS2.71- Removal of the Urban Boundary and Green Belt</p> <p>Sites identified for removal from the Green Belt especially in the southwest - Edenfield area, all have a potential harm to the surrounding environment, score moderately/Strong against the Planning Advisory Guidance (PAG) on the purpose of the Green Belt (Rossendaie Council Green Belt Review document). The parcels of land HS2.71 forms a large open area to the west of Edenfield village. At present this area of land performs a valuable contribution to prevent urban sprawl in particular to the northwest of the village. The loss of the Green Belt would result in the loss of characteristic linear settlement and encourage urban sprawl. A view supported by the Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan (3.6.7). The PPG Green Belt purpose 1- states removing areas of Green Belt should not result in urban sprawl. If this area were removed from the Green Belt it would result in urban sprawl and have negative implications on village of Edenfield and local community.</p> <p>Government Guide lines and case law (Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] EWHC 2077) states that alterations to the Green Belt boundary require local authority to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Rossendale Council has not provided any evidence to meet this criterion. The proposed alternation to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt parcel HS2.71 should be withdrawn from the draft</p> <p>Local Plan, as the council has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1577	Rebecca	Hoyle			Object	<p>I would like to notify you of my objections to the proposed amends to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt, Local Plan Housing allocation site HS71- and Policy HS3 Edenfield.</p> <p>My primary reasons for objection are that the proposals in the draft Local Plan contravene advice in various components of Rossendale Council Evidence base documents i.e. Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) -Site Assessment 2017, Green Belt Review 2016 and Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan, Landscape Study 2015 and central government guidelines/policies. Rossendale Council has also failed to provide residents with substantial Infrastructure evidence to support the proposals.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>1.HS2.71- Removal of the Urban Boundary and Green Belt Sites identified for removal from the Green Belt especially in the southwest - Edenfield area, all have a potential harm to the surrounding environment, score moderately/Strong against the Planning Advisory Guidance (PAG) on the purpose of the Green Belt (Rossendaie Council Green Belt Review document). The parcels of land HS2.71 forms a large open area to the west of Edenfield village.</p> <p>At present this area of land performs a valuable contribution to prevent urban sprawl in particular to the northwest of the village. The loss of the Green Belt would result in the loss of characteristic linear settlement and encourage urban sprawl. A view supported by the Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan (3.6.7). The PPG Green Belt purpose 1- states removing areas of Green Belt should not result in urban sprawl. If this area were removed from the Green Belt it would result in urban sprawl and have negative implications on village of Edenfield and local community.</p> <p>Government Guide lines and case law (Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] EWHC 2077) states that alterations to the Green Belt boundary require local authority to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Rossendale Council has not provided any evidence to meet this criterion. The proposed alternation to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt parcel HS2.71 should be withdrawn from the draft Local Plan, as the council has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1578	G P	Hoyle			Object	<p>I would like to notify you of my objections to the proposed amends to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt, Local Plan Housing allocation site HS71- and Policy HS3 Edenfield.</p> <p>My primary reasons for objection are that the proposals in the draft Local Plan contravene advice in various components of Rossendale Council Evidence base documents i.e. Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) -Site Assessment 2017, Green Belt Review 2016 and Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan, Landscape Study 2015 and central government guidelines/policies. Rossendale Council has also failed to provide residents with substantial Infrastructure evidence to support the proposals.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>1.HS2.71- Removal of the Urban Boundary and Green Belt</p> <p>Sites identified for removal from the Green Belt especially in the southwest - Edenfield area, all have a potential harm to the surrounding environment, score moderately/Strong against the Planning Advisory Guidance (PAG) on the purpose of the Green Belt (Rossendaie Council Green Belt Review document). The parcels of land HS2.71 forms a large open area to the west of Edenfield village. At present this area of land performs a valuable contribution to prevent urban sprawl in particular to the northwest of the village. The loss of the Green Belt would result in the loss of characteristic linear settlement and encourage urban sprawl. A view supported by the Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan (3.6.7). The PPG Green Belt purpose 1- states removing areas of Green Belt should not result in urban sprawl. If this area were removed from the Green Belt it would result in urban sprawl and have negative implications on village of Edenfield and local community.</p> <p>Government Guide lines and case law (Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] EWHC 2077) states that alterations to the Green Belt boundary require local authority to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Rossendale Council has not provided any evidence to meet this criterion. The proposed alternation to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt parcel HS2.71 should be withdrawn from the draft Local Plan, as the council has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1579	C J	Hoyle			Object	<p>I would like to notify you of my objections to the proposed amends to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt, Local Plan Housing allocation site HS71- and Policy HS3 Edenfield.</p> <p>My primary reasons for objection are that the proposals in the draft Local Plan contravene advice in various components of Rossendale Council Evidence base documents i.e. Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) -Site Assessment 2017, Green Belt Review 2016 and Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan, Landscape Study 2015 and central government guidelines/policies. Rossendale Council has also failed to provide residents with substantial Infrastructure evidence to support the proposals.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>1.HS2.71- Removal of the Urban Boundary and Green Belt Sites identified for removal from the Green Belt especially in the southwest - Edenfield area, all have a potential harm to the surrounding environment, score moderately/Strong against the Planning Advisory Guidance (PAG) on the purpose of the Green Belt (Rossendaie Council Green Belt Review document). The parcels of land HS2.71 forms a large open area to the west of Edenfield village. At present this area of land performs a valuable contribution to prevent urban sprawl in particular to the northwest of the village. The loss of the Green Belt would result in the loss of characteristic linear settlement and encourage urban sprawl. A view supported by the Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan (3.6.7). The PPG Green Belt purpose 1- states removing areas of Green Belt should not result in urban sprawl. If this area were removed from the Green Belt it would result in urban sprawl and have negative implications on village of Edenfield and local community. Government Guide lines and case law (Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] EWHC 2077) states that alterations to the Green Belt boundary require local authority to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Rossendale Council has not provided any evidence to meet this criterion. The proposed alternation to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt parcel HS2.71 should be withdrawn from the draft Local Plan, as the council has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1580	R J	Barlow			Object	<p>I would like to notify you of my objections to the proposed amends to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt, Local Plan Housing allocation site HS71- and Policy HS3 Edenfield.</p> <p>My primary reasons for objection are that the proposals in the draft Local Plan contravene advice in various components of Rossendale Council Evidence base documents i.e. Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) -Site Assessment 2017, Green Belt Review 2016 and Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan, Landscape Study 2015 and central government guidelines/policies. Rossendale Council has also failed to provide residents with substantial Infrastructure evidence to support the proposals.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>1.HS2.71- Removal of the Urban Boundary and Green Belt</p> <p>Sites identified for removal from the Green Belt especially in the southwest - Edenfield area, all have a potential harm to the surrounding environment, score moderately/Strong against the Planning Advisory Guidance (PAG) on the purpose of the Green Belt (Rossendaie Council Green Belt Review document). The parcels of land HS2.71 forms a large open area to the west of Edenfield village.</p> <p>At present this area of land performs a valuable contribution to prevent urban sprawl in particular to the northwest of the village. The loss of the Green Belt would result in the loss of characteristic linear settlement and encourage urban sprawl. A view supported by the Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan (3.6.7). The PPG Green Belt purpose 1- states removing areas of Green Belt should not result in urban sprawl. If this area were removed from the Green Belt it would result in urban sprawl and have negative implications on village of Edenfield and local community.</p> <p>Government Guide lines and case law (Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] EWHC 2077) states that alterations to the Green Belt boundary require local authority to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Rossendale Council has not provided any evidence to meet this criterion. The proposed alternation to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt parcel HS2.71 should be withdrawn from the draft</p> <p>Local Plan, as the council has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1581	H P	Barlow			Object	<p>I would like to notify you of my objections to the proposed amends to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt, Local Plan Housing allocation site HS71- and Policy HS3 Edenfield.</p> <p>My primary reasons for objection are that the proposals in the draft Local Plan contravene advice in various components of Rossendale Council Evidence base documents i.e. Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) -Site Assessment 2017, Green Belt Review 2016 and Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan, Landscape Study 2015 and central government guidelines/policies. Rossendale Council has also failed to provide residents with substantial Infrastructure evidence to support the proposals.</p> <p>Objections</p> <p>1.HS2.71- Removal of the Urban Boundary and Green Belt Sites identified for removal from the Green Belt especially in the southwest - Edenfield area, all have a potential harm to the surrounding environment, score moderately/Strong against the Planning Advisory Guidance (PAG) on the purpose of the Green Belt (Rossendaie Council Green Belt Review document). The parcels of land HS2.71 forms a large open area to the west of Edenfield village. At present this area of land performs a valuable contribution to prevent urban sprawl in particular to the northwest of the village. The loss of the Green Belt would result in the loss of characteristic linear settlement and encourage urban sprawl. A view supported by the Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan (3.6.7). The PPG Green Belt purpose 1- states removing areas of Green Belt should not result in urban sprawl. If this area were removed from the Green Belt it would result in urban sprawl and have negative implications on village of Edenfield and local community.</p> <p>Government Guide lines and case law (Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2015] EWHC 2077) states that alterations to the Green Belt boundary require local authority to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Rossendale Council has not provided any evidence to meet this criterion. The proposed alternation to the Urban Boundary and Green Belt parcel HS2.71 should be withdrawn from the draft Local Plan, as the council has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1582	Jean	Stewart			Object	<p>My last letter, received from MrX (18 Sept 14), in reply to mine of 8 Sept 14 outlining my various objection to the repositioning of the urban boundary RCGL(UB)6. This letter states that the Council was no longer proposing to take the site forward as a Boundary change. The onus being on the landowner to demonstrate that suitable access could be provided. As far as I am aware this has no happened.</p> <p>After the last round of consultations it was decided no to take this forward. Main reason for this decision was access, together with possible flood damage, loss to local dog walkers, runners etc. not to forget pupils of Alder Grange. I would also like to add that badgers, foxes and other wild life make this site 'their own' as it if presently countryside.</p> <p>In my humble opinion moving the present Urban Boundary before access has been resolved is like putting the cart before the horse!</p> <p>A neighbour and I visited the Rawtenstall venue where we viewed the various maps of the Borough. I must admit to being a little confused as the Boundary appeared already to have been moved to a different area. I questioned whether we were due for development but was answered our site was not scheduled in the near future.</p> <p>My objections to the development are very strong as I feel in addition to aforementioned reasons, that amongst other things, traffic in Rawtenstall is already at almost crisis level with no visible signs, or indeed promises of resolutions to ease congestion. Schools, medical facilities and other services are all under tremendous pressure. Newchurch Road is one such area. The swimming pool sports centre and future garden centre all add to more local traffic.</p>		
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>SD2: URBAN BOUNDARY AND GREEN BELT</p> <p>The Local Plan makes reference to the settlement boundaries set out within the Policies Map and states that Sustainable Development will generally be permissible in such locations. Development in rural areas will be supported if there is an identified need for such activity in the area.</p> <p>The Policy states: ‘All new development in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundaries, defined on the Policies Map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area’</p> <p>Key Point: The Council recognises the importance of Sustainable Development as identified within the NPPF and it will work proactively to ensure that such developments are delivered within the Borough.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1616	Janet	Simpson			Object	<p>Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary - Objection</p> <p>I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed changes to the Green Belt, Urban Boundary and Countryside as shown on the South West map in relation to land parcels 30 and 31.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 79 states that 'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.' One of the five purposes of the Green Belt is 'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.' (NPPF Para 80 – number 3).</p> <p>The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Helmshore are contrary to the fundamental aims outlined above for the following reasons.</p> <p>In the assessment criteria for Purpose 3 (NPPF Green Belt Purposes – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment) a Moderate rating is where a 'parcel of land contains the characteristics of countryside, has limited urbanising development, and is relatively open.'</p> <p>The current Green Belt boundary is clearly defined by Helmshore Road and Free Lane. In 'The Green Belt Review' document para 3.19 in terms of permanence 'it is recognised that there are benefits in using features which are clearly defined and which also play a physical and/or visual role in separating town and countryside to act as Green Belt boundaries.'</p> <p>There are no such strong physical features to define the proposed new Green Belt boundaries. As such there is nothing to prevent incremental encroachment into the Green Belt in the future.</p> <p>By moving the boundary away from the roads, and so allowing the potential for development/urbanisation on the land released, the Green Belt would lose the essential characteristic of openness it currently has in this area of Helmshore.</p> <p>Land Parcel 30</p> <p>In the proposed changes to the Green Belt, Urban Boundary and Countryside document Land Parcel 30's notes on Purpose 3 state that 'there is a sense of encroachment with the parcel as a result of a cluster of residential properties, facilities of Sunnybank Social Club and a children's play area' so that 'the north of the parcel has a somewhat weakened rural character.'</p> <p>This assessment does not take into account the length of time the properties etc have been situated here, nor the fact that they have not been classed as 'encroachment' in previous Local Plan reviews, where they have been included within the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Sunnybank Social Club and Helmshore Memorial Park (which includes the playground) have both been in their locations for over 100 years. Likewise the residential properties are mainly a farmhouse and cottage which have been on site for over 300 years, with associated farm buildings having been</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>converted or re-built on the original building's footprint. In this respect there has been no recent 'encroachment'. Other buildings/structures associated with equestrian use are recognised as accepted use in rural areas (Rossendale Borough Council's Core Policy LT5).</p> <p>The Review of the Green Belt considers that the Potential Degree of Harm caused by the removal of this area from the Green Belt to be Medium. However, this parcel is adjoining a large area of land where the Degree of Harm is considered High. If this parcel were to be removed the threat to the Green Belt would be increased.</p> <p>NPPF Para 81 states that 'once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively ... to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity.' Therefore this parcel of land should remain within the Green Belt, not only for its own value, but also to protect this whole section of Green Belt and the adjoining Biological Heritage Site (BHS).</p> <p>Draft Local Plan</p> <p>There are various policies in the draft Local Plan which strongly support the case of the Green Belt boundary not being moved in this part of Helmshore. Briefly there are:</p> <p>Policy ENV4: Landscape Character and Quality</p> <p>'In order to protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape, development proposals should:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retain and, where possible, enhance key views'</p> <p>'The Borough's landscape is significant in terms of its local identity ... and general contribution to quality of life and it is essential that it is protected.'</p> <p>Whilst the council are proposing the above policy for new builds, the same protection should be applied to existing properties. Visitors often comment that views from the properties at Tor View Farm are considered some of the best in Rossendale. Indeed the views were considered a selling point when one of the properties was recently up for sale.</p> <p>Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks</p> <p>'Ecological networks should be conserved, enhanced and expanded.'</p> <p>NPPF Para109 also states that 'the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.'</p> <p>This parcel of land forms part of the ecological network in Helmshore, allowing linkages between the different areas of landscape and biodiversity. If these linkages are broken this would leave wildlife vulnerable as a result of the loss of habitat, pressure on remaining habitat etc. The serious decline in various species of British wildlife is well documented and by releasing even</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>small parcels of land for development further pressure is placed on the remaining habitats and the populations these can realistically support.</p> <p>Policy ENV6: Green Infrastructure</p> <p>'Schemes which would result in a net loss of green infrastructure on-site will only be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on amenity, surface water run-off, nature conservation or the integrity of the green infrastructure network. <p>Green Infrastructure refers to the network of Rossendale's multi-functional green spaces, corridors and waterways ("blue infrastructure"), which provide multiple social, environmental benefits, and enhance quality of life. It has an important role in providing habitats and migratory routes for many plants and animals.'</p> <p>NPPF Para 114 also states that ' Local planning authorities should:</p> <p>☑ Set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.'</p> <p>The above policies (local and national) support my previous comments about loss of habitat and maintaining links and ecological corridors. In addition the reference that green infrastructure should 'enhance quality of life' is particularly relevant as the removal of this land from Green Belt and the protection from development which that status currently provides would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life enjoyed not only by the current residents in the properties at Tor View Farm, but also those at Snig Hole and in the immediate surrounding area, visitors to Helmshore Memorial Park, and those using the Public Right of Way and National Cycle Route.</p> <p>Land Parcel 31</p> <p>Many of the points raised in relation to Land Parcel 30 are also relevant to Parcel 31. For brevity I won't repeat them but these should be recorded as part of my objection.</p> <p>However I would repeat the point about the proposed new Green Belt boundary not having a permanent physical feature to provide a strong boundary.</p> <p>I've also noted that part of the adjacent Biological Heritage Site falls outside the proposed Green Belt boundary which could make this section vulnerable from development and fragmentation.</p> <p>Given all of the above the Green Belt boundary in this part of Helmshore should remain where it is currently to prevent inappropriate and unnecessary development, to protect ecological networks and biodiversity in the area and safeguard the integrity of Green Belt beyond the Local Plan period.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1617	Alex	Smurthwaite			Object	<p>I'm writing to you to express my opinion on the moving of the urban boundary affecting the area round Goodshaw Lane. I am a resident in the area and believe that there are several issues with the idea.</p> <p>Firstly, If development was to take place it would cause a huge increase in the amount of traffic, making it much more dangerous for children and parents leaving the grounds of Crawshawbooth Primary School. Obviously it is in everyone's best interest to keep our local area as safe for everyone as possible. Secondly, the area round Goodshaw Lane is very picturesque, many of the residents of Crawshawbooth and Loveclough use the area to walk dogs, horse ride and cycle. Not only would development make it more dangerous for people to partake in these activities. It would also massively distract from the enjoyment factor. Personally I believe we should do all we can to protect the green areas of our community. Moving the urban boundary is doing exactly the opposite and will undoubtedly lead to further development.</p> <p>Thirdly, there are several heritage sites in the area. Most notably St Mary's church and Goodshaw Chapel which dates back to 1760. I believe moving the urban boundary will place these sites in a very risky position. All too often we see beautiful old buildings bought out and demolished, only to be replaced by a modern, cheaply build monstrosity. This goes back to my previous point that taking care of our local area should be everyone's top priority.</p> <p>In conclusion I believe the entire concept is a frankly ridiculous proposition with absolutely no benefits to the local community and its residents.</p> <p>I hope you take my views into account and I look forward to hearing back from you.</p>		
1622	John & Maggie	Clegg		land east of Goodshaw Lane	Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the possible boundary changes on land east of Goodshaw Lane below St Mary and All saints C.E Church. My reasons for objecting are as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 .The possibility of further housing means increased traffic on an already busy narrow lane which has extremely limited parking. 2.The lane is well used twice a day by parents taking their children to Crawshawbooth County Primary School.It is also used by children making their own way to school. 3.Goodshaw Lane at this particular point is always extremely congested when any event takes place at St Mary and All saints Church. 4. The lane is also well used by pedestrians, ramblers and horses, which would all be adversely affected by increased traffic. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1633	Carol	Hayman		SHLAA16196	Object	<p>1. The possibility of further development would mean more traffic on an already busy single track lane. There is no space for parking and very few passing places.</p> <p>2. The lane is used by lots of children walking to and from school both on their own and with parents, leisure walkers, horse riders and cyclists. If the volume of traffic increases it will only be a matter of time before there is a tragic accident.</p> <p>3. Rossendale is beginning to encourage rural tourism encouraging walkers and cyclists to the area, we need to protect our assets from developers who are only interested in personal gain.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1634	Jean and David	Pilling		SHLAA16196	Object	<p>We wish to register our objection to the proposal to incorporate the land described as being to the East of Goodshaw Lane and referred to as SHLAA 16196 into the urban boundary.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this should not be done but we believe that the most compelling reason is the fact that without substantial investment the lane will simply be unable to cope with the increased traffic. The proposal envisages the eventual provision of housing which will lead to traffic which the lane was never designed to cope with and the danger to both adults and children will be totally unacceptable.</p> <p>The recent traffic counter will no doubt give some interesting results but we believe that other than showing the number of vehicles using the lane it will fail to show how these vehicles use the lane, parking and reducing even the widest part of the lane to a single vehicle width and, from time to time, blocking the lane entirely – sometimes for an extended period.</p> <p>Starting at the bottom of the lane the used car dealership finds it necessary to store vehicles on the lane, reducing access considerably. Complaints from residents have fallen on deaf ears.</p> <p>Moving along to the houses on the left hand side at the beginning of the lane; having no offstreet parking they are forced to park on the road. This wasn't helped when the houses on Albert Road (which links the bottom end of the lane with Burnley Road) were told recently that they were not allowed to park on Albert Road and have moved their vehicles to Goodshaw Lane</p> <p>School starting time is particularly difficult when parents park in the lane to drop off their children. We timed the photograph opposite so as not to include children in the picture but with bags and children in the road during unloading operations the area is crowded and dangerous. When a vehicle travelling down the lane has to reverse to allow passage of a vehicle travelling up the lane it becomes particularly hazardous.</p> <p>St Mary and All Saints' church is another danger spot. A recent coffee morning led to cars parked in both directions up and down the lane. Sunday services lead to a similar situation and a funeral can lead to obstruction of a different order entirely; the hearse stops to unload the coffin, the mourners in the following cars want to accompany the coffin into the church and so the following cars are parked higgledy-piggledy occasionally blocking the entire lane for the duration of the service.</p> <p>We have little recent experience of the lane after its junction with Goodshaw Avenue as it's too narrow, overgrown and winding to be navigated safely – a fact which speaks for itself.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1638	Craig	Bell		SHLAA16196 Land east of Goodshaw Lane	Object	<p>We would like to put on record our vigorous objection to the proposed move of the Urban Boundary on land to the east of Goodshaw lane, Crawshawbooth which would no doubt then allow more building of houses to commence on this land.</p> <p>We live at X Goodshaw Lane, on the stretch of lane below the proposed area near the bottom of Goodshaw Lane, a area of lane which already has very limited car parking and is extremely crammed with vehicles which makes for difficult driving up and down the lane. We already have a ridiculous amount of traffic using the lane that do not even live on here but use it to get to housing estates higher up. Building more houses in the area proposed would make the problem a whole lot worse. Vehicle speed on the lane is also a massive issue with residents on the lower stretch of this lane. We have previously asked the council for measures to reduce vehicular access, limit (preferably STOP!!) large lorries including massive articulated ones, who seem to follow sat-nav instructions with deliveries to farms higher up Goodshaw Lane, but this will no doubt make things even worse!!. This lane is a single track Lane with varying bends and very steep climbs. These lorries should not be accessing Goodshaw Lane at the Crawshawbooth end and should be using Goodshaw Avenue to go to the upper farms. We have previously asked for speed humps on the lower section of Goodshaw Lane to reduce the speed of cars. The proposed area, and following building of houses, will make this matter worse.</p> <p>As a resident of Goodshaw Lane for all my life (50 years) the east side of the lane has always been in the "Green Belt" and allowing this boundary to be moved in this instance would no doubt instigate more areas being opened up for similar building areas. This is a quiet residential area which is already becoming a busy location and more houses will mean more disruption and more cars, noise, accidents, speeding, risk to school children on way to and from Crawshawbooth Primary School.</p> <p>This proposal is not wanted by the residents around this location.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1640	Beryl	Harper			Object	<p>Re Peel Holdings proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth Lane</p> <p>My name is Beryl Harper and I have lived at X Bury Road Rawtenstall for over thirty years. The property I live in was built for my Grandfather in the 1950's. As a girl I lived at Duckworth Hall and attended Townsendfold School and the Methodist Church in Townsendfold. During my lifetime we have seen houses built down Holme Lane and a housing estate built at Hornccliffe Close. Both of these sites have caused an increase in traffic in our village, and during the winter months Bury Road becomes a car park because residents cannot access their properties.</p> <p>I wish to object to your proposals to remove our Green Belt south of Duckworth Lane as part of the new local plan. Our Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and saves a local beauty spot for future generations, to lose it would harm the important setting of the East Lancashire Railway and damage Rossendale's Tourist Industry which brings jobs to the Valley. There are plenty of Brown Field and previously developed sites which should be used instead of sacrificing our Green Belt. There are also many empty dwellings and buildings suitable for conversion.</p> <p>On a practical note, our local schools are full to capacity. There are no vacancies at our Doctor's surgeries. Several years ago a bypass was built to take traffic off Bury Road going through the village of Edenfield, however, this is still a very busy road and building more houses would make it even busier. I am very concerned about where they plan to access these properties, as this will cause further hazards.</p> <p>I appeal to the Borough Council to consider these proposals very carefully as the decisions they make could have a detrimental effect on the future of this beautiful valley.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1741	L	Horrocks			Object	<p>With regard to land adjacent to Marl Pits swimming pool and the proposal to re-designate it from green belt to urban development.</p> <p>We must state our objections.</p> <p>Marl Pits sports centre is a well used amenity for the whole community, it's good to see it so well supported with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Swimming Pool Gym Running Club Rugby Club Football Golf Range Triathlon <p>Soon to be garden centre.</p> <p>Add to that the use made of the complex by the schools for various events. Many charities organise event that are held at marl pits.</p> <p>As you can imagine all the above make for very heavy traffic both on Newchurch Road and the complex itself. All this we accept, in fact we are happy to think of all the benefit to the community. Building more houses can only make a difficult situation worse. In fact dangerous.</p> <p>With regards to the field itself, the public footpath is well used by young and old alike. For elderly folk it's a chance to walk in the peace and quiet without the strain climbing the hills. This in itself is a great free amenity for so many.</p> <p>Please consider carefully the future for this area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1747	Tom Morley	Jean Kay-Morley			Proposed Plans to alter an existing urban boundary In respect of the field behind Marl Pits and Waingate Close	<p>Object</p> <p>We are registering our objection to the alteration of the boundary, on the above mentioned land.</p> <p>The following are our main objections:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access, Safety and Parking issues 2. Flooding risk 3. Restriction of Recreational Use <p>Access, Safety and Parking issues</p> <p>We are really concerned about access as we have already experienced problems when there have been events at Marl Pits. When these events have been held at the Leisure Centre our crescent, the road leading into it and Newchurch Road quite often become congested with parked cars; despite the allocations of parking spaces created recently at the Leisure Centre.</p> <p>This has led to times when it has not been possible to gain access to our crescent. A safety concern is that drivers park so close to the junction of Marl Pits and Newchurch Road that it is impossible to see the traffic both ways on Newchurch Road. We believe that this could lead to an accident. We would ask you to also consider the extra volume of traffic, now experienced on the tarmac road, leading to the Golf range.</p> <p>Flooding risk</p> <p>There have been previous flooding issues on this land and over the last few years we have also had problems in our own garden; unable to cut the lawn due to lying water, even during the summer months. Flooding has also occurred at the back of our houses which has previously been brought to the attention of our local council.</p> <p>Restriction of Recreational Use</p> <p>This land is designated as countryside and is available for use of the local people for walking, running, cycling etc., which as we are all aware, are important for the health and well-being of local people. It is also a privilege to have the experience for our children to enjoy and appreciate local wildlife on this piece of countryside.</p> <p>To alter the boundary line, to build houses on this land, appears to us to be a travesty in order to enable property developers to make money. We appreciate our local council have a directive to build a certain amount of new housing, 4,000+ and we have our MP Jake Berry to thank for managing to have this reduced to 2,000+. However, we have many waste land areas, brown site areas and still have the problem of derelict, empty buildings, throughout the valley, which are eyesores, and could be converted into residential properties.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1751		Banks & Greenwood	Ivy Label Boutique	Land between Marl Pits Sport Centre and Waingate Village	Object	<p>Here is our appeal against the change in the urban boundary the council have put forward for the field between Marl Pits and Waingate Close.</p> <p>Myself and my partner live at number X Marl Pits, Rawtenstall. We overlook the back field and as mentioned scenic views really make our house a home. We have regular walks on the back fields and leading paths through chapel hill and drop down to the rugby fields. The field is also used on regular basis by school children, other dog walkers and general public.</p> <p>That a side, our biggest concern of all is the congestion of parking as it stands today! When events are held at Marl Pits Lesuire centre the traffic, parking and main road (Newchurch Road) is horrendous. As our close "Marl Pits" is off Newchurch Rd and our access is always bombarded with cars, visibility to get on and off Newchurch Road is very limited. Vehicles parked on either side of the road now, so adding extra traffic and additional parked cars to this is unbearable!!</p> <p>Myself and X are a young couple and we value where we live. Both full time workers and in the near future would like to start a family and would like them to grow up in a place they can enjoy greenery, fields and space. More housing is not needed in the space proposed it would feel cramped, invasive and would cause high levels of disturbance for all around.</p> <p>Traffic in a morning into Rawtenstall is already an issue, not to mention the higher risk it would cause to accidents. Safe to say we are strongly against this proposal and would like the council to really think about the issues raised in this appeal.</p> <p>Please keep us informed on any future developments related to this case.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1758	Rex and Constance	Trippier		Land at Marl Pits adjoining Waingate Close	Object	<p>It seems almost certain that the above changes will result in planning applications for housing development on the land at Marl Pits and adjoining Waingate Close, If so, a number of serious objections arise. These are summarised in my letter of 19 August 2014, namely Health and Safety, the loss of a popular local amenity and the aesthetic impact</p> <p>The decisive factor in the rejection of planning permission was the disruption of traffic caused by the exit of vehicles onto Newchurch Road. This will be increased when a proposal to build a garden centre near Marl Pits is implemented.</p> <p>Further objections are made by our neighbour, William Arnold in a letter of 9 September 2014.</p> <p>Finally, taking into account all these considerations it seems clear that any application for development of these sites should be rejected,</p> <p>Letter of William Arnold - 9 September 2014</p> <p>I write as the owner and sometimes resident of X Waingate Close, Rawtenstall. My neighbours have brought it to my attention that there has been an application submitted to the Council to extend the urban boundary beyond the bottom of the gardens of the houses on the even numbered side of Waingate Close to the brook over the field. I understand the intention is then to apply to build 55 houses on this field if the boundary change is authorised by the Council.</p> <p>Although number X is one of the pair of houses (with number X) at the top of Wain gate Close, so that my garden boundary is with the Marl Pits development and not with this field, I have one particular concern to which this proposal gives rise, which I wish to bring to your attention.</p> <p>When X Waingate Close was built in 1965 (I know - I was there aged 12), the old Second World War single storey pre --fab housing on the Marl Pits site was much further away from boundary at the bottom of our garden to which the Marl Pits land also sloped down. As a consequence the land down there though often marshy (there was said to be a natural spring there) was never more than that and the trees my mother then planted were so effective at taking up water that the land then remained dry effectively year round.</p> <p>When Marl Pits was re-developed, however, no doubt in order to gain the best value from the site, the developers built up the gentle slope into a much steeper one. This enabled them to put more properties on to the site and coming much closer to the site boundary with Waingate Close (i.e the bottom of my garden). Unfortunately one of the, no doubt unforeseen, effects of this redevelopment seems to have been to disturb the water table I natural drainage.</p> <p>Ever since then (probably 20 years now), the relevant area at the bottom of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						<p>my garden and also that of number X next door has every winter / spring been a pond for weeks on end (the time depending on how much it has rained), which only very slowly drains - and it appears to drain through the garden at number X (which then unusually has a similar pond) and into the field which is the subject of the present application. And by pond I mean several feet deep of standing water, which in some winters has even had ducks use it as home. This water definitely does not drain in the other direction (towards number 23), since the natural high point of the land is about midway along the bottom fence in my garden. This pond has also now killed all the trees which were there (and used to soak up some water), so that I am now having to think about re - planting with only alders and willows, ie, trees which will tolerate standing in water.</p> <p>My concern is that building on the field will block the only natural drainage route for this water from my garden and that of number X, compounding a problem which itself resulted from the Marl Pits redevelopment. I do not want to find myself in a position where a lack of natural drainage means I have a larger / deeper pond for much of the year. A large pool of what would effectively be stagnant water obviously raises potential health and safety issues, Apart from this I would only add my name to what I am sure are general concerns that, if the proposed access to this site is to be through the Marl Pits sports area (and I cannot immediately think of any other access, given the deep valley that is Waingate Road), there will be an increase in traffic both on Newchurch Road and more particularly in the Marl Pits sports area itself, making participation in sporting events there more difficult and therefore less attractive,</p> <p>And if there is also a consequential loss of car parking spaces at the Marl Pits sports area, that will equally directly work against the Council's efforts to support and promote the various sports clubs which operate there. However good the sporting facilities themselves, people will not come and use them, if they cannot easily park nearby. Given how much public money has recently been spent by the Council on improving the Marl Pits sporting facilities, it would be verging on the irresponsible for the Council now actively to diminish the availability of parking there.</p> <p>Letter of Rex Trippier 19 August 2014</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention the following valid objections to the above proposal.</p> <p>Firstly, the Health and Safety aspect should be considered, especially regarding the increased volume of traffic emerging onto Newchurch Road from Marl Pits. This single exit already serves traffic from the swimming pool, social club, golf driving range and the football fields.</p> <p>Local residents report one serious and several minor accidents at this junction in recent months.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
						Mingling with this traffic are pupils on their way to Alder Grange High School and young unaccompanied visitors to the baths. The potential loss of well used local amenity is a further serious consideration. As well as the fore mentioned school pupils, the field is frequently used by dog walkers, young families and elderly people taking a stroll, Rossendale Harriers and child visitors to the swimming pool. Lastly, the aesthetic impact of building on a site of natural beauty should not be overlooked especially as there are surely more suitable sites available.		
1761	D	Bonney		SHLAA16196	Object	I am writing about the proposal outlined in the draft plan above. My concerns would be about the hazards this may create for children going to and from Crawshawbooth Primary School.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Support	<p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1 Pegasus Group are instructed by Taylor Wimpey (UK) Ltd to make representations to the Rossendale Draft Local Plan Consultation, which ran between 24th July and 9th October 2017.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey's Land Interests</p> <p>1.2 Taylor Wimpey are pursuing various interests within the Rossendale Local Authority Area and have made separate site specific representations on the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land West of Market Street (Draft Allocation HS2.71) • Land at Grane Road, Haslingden (Draft Allocation HS2.78) <p>1.3 This document provides general comments on the consultation and supporting evidence base involving the land at Grane Road, Haslingden, which is hereafter referred to as Grane Village.</p> <p>Representation Structure</p> <p>1.4 The structure of these representations takes the following form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section 2 we provide general comments on the various strategic and development control policies (which are largely duplicated across both representations, with some site specific references). • In Section 3 we make site specific comments on Grane Village which is divided into 3 subsections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Outlining the site's current status. ii. Assessment of the evidence base documents concerning Grane Village. iii. Conclusions on Grane Village. • In Section 4 we provide our overall conclusions on the draft plan and allocation of the Grane Village site. <p>2. STRATEGIC AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES</p> <p>2.1 This section comments on the strategic and development control policies in the Draft Plan, how the allocation of the Grane Village site for residential purposes upholds their objectives, and justifies the requested amendments where necessary.</p> <p>Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt</p> <p>2.2 As we understand it, this policy confirms that the Green Belt boundaries will need to be amended to accommodate the Borough's development needs. We fully support this assertion, as it reflects the Council's evidence base, which demonstrates that the authority area is highly constrained, by topography, ground conditions and other issues, meaning that there is insufficient suitable and viable non-Green Belt land to meet the borough's needs in full. This has also been acknowledged in the text supporting Policy HS2.</p> <p>2.3 However, paragraph 83 of the NPPF confirms that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances', which have not been</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>established or even mentioned within polices SD2 or HS2 as currently drafted; whilst the recent Housing White Paper suggested further amendments to this guidance in terms of justifying Green Belt release (paragraph 1.39).</p> <p>2.4 In our view, it is the combination of increased housing need (both market and affordable) and insufficient supply, and the harm that will occur from failing to meet these needs; in terms of slower economic growth, a lack of labour force mobility, affordability issues, disruption to commuting patterns and the delivery of housing choice; that generates the exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release in Rossendale, and we would ask that the policy text is updated on this basis.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>7.5 Policy SD2 states that development will be “All new development in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundaries...except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area...”.</p> <p>7.6 And that: “...Development in the countryside will be supported where it is for a use that needs to be located in this location. Examples would include farm diversification or certain types of tourism uses...” (page 5)</p> <p>7.7 In some cases infrastructure projects need to be situated in a countryside location. We therefore suggest that the text referred to above is amended to make clear that “infrastructure” is amongst the examples of development which may be acceptable in a countryside location. Similarly, infrastructure projects are not always capable of enhancing rural character, but this does not mean that they are unsustainable. In this regard, the policy itself should be amended to state that “...except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and, where possible, enhances the rural character of the area...”.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1772	Peter	Wood			Object	<p>I object most strongly to all proposal made by Rossendale Borough Council to Rossendale's Green Belt & Countryside and to move these areas into the Urban zone.</p> <p>RBC have again followed the exact same mythology as caused their last attempt at a Local Plan to be abandoned and have not learned from their previous mistakes or listened to advise.</p> <p>Rossendale has a distinctive high density housing and industrial character. The proposed losses would have a devastating and unnecessary effect on the character and nature of the Rossendale Valley.</p> <p>The proposals in RBC's local plan consist mainly of very low density sprawling housing estates and industrial estates which require far more space than is necessary to meet its targets.</p> <p>Further RBC have failed to identify large amounts of brown field sites and previously developed land.</p> <p>Further the combined effect of the commutative loss of green spaces will have a major increase on flood risks within the borough and down stream in the Bury Metropolitan Borough area which have both suffered from devastating floods in recent years.</p> <p>RBC needs again to go back to the drawing board and start it's Local Plan this time working with local organisations, people and the Environment Agency.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1775	Tom	Whitehead	16 different groups		Not Applicable	<p>Draft Policy SD2</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary should be extended in the area south of Rawtenstall to meet the southern boundary of Rossendale's borough boundary. This would assist in protecting against 'urban sprawl' (wind turbines and ancillary development being urbanising), to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and to protect the character and setting of historic towns. These are of course three of the five purposes of Green Belt as defined in NPPF; there is therefore a compelling case for this. At the time the current Green Belt boundaries were set previously, it would have been inconceivable for the threat of windfarm development of the scale now present and threatened. There is a compelling need to update policy and land allocations to reflect modern challenges.</p> <p>Signed on behalf of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rooley Moor Neighbourhood Forum • Holcombe Society • Bury Rural Inequalities Forum • Ramsbottom Heritage Society • Prickshaw & Broadley Fold Area Community Group • Rossendale Harriers club • Friends of Rooley Moor • Whitworth Residents • Turn Village Residents • Townsend Fold Residents • Affetside Society • Lane Head residents group • Edenfield Village Residents Association • Rochdale & Bury Bridleways Association committee • Rural Rossendale Trust Accommodation Providers • Norden Area Forum 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt</p> <p>All new development in the Borough will take place within the Urban Boundaries, defined on the Policies map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area. –</p> <p>RCT support SD2 and note Examples would include farm diversification or certain types of tourism uses. But does this mean farms becoming almost inset villages in the Green Belt as proposed 2016 - 0424 Pleasant View Farm housing in Holcombe – located just outside the Green Belt to the west of Holcombe Road. RCT also note Rossendale’s “protected areas” within the unparished areas (c) Containing the settlements of Haslingden, Rawtenstall and Bacup - 2009 No. 2098 HOUSING, ENGLAND The Housing (Right to Enfranchise) (Designated Protected Areas) (England) Order 2009. It’s intended to stop affordable rural social housing being lost.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1788	Anna and Neil	Warburton		Land at Co- operative Street, Helmshore	Object	<p>Further to the publication of the proposed urban boundary changes in the draft Rossendale Plan we are very disappointed to find that our proposed inclusion of a small site on land at Co-operative Street Helmshore has yet again been opposed.</p> <p>We also note that a similar piece of infill land has been proposed as a site for housing within the urban boundary - this site by the Park at Snig Hole, Helmshore is on high land, its access point is a very narrow blind access to Helmshore Road and it is next to a children's park and play area and zebra crossing. The inclusion of the land at Snig Hole suggests that our application has not been treated fairly or equally - as the 'poor' access referred to at Co-op St is not at all poor by comparison.</p> <p>Co-operative Street is in a quiet area just serving a short row of terraced houses and the addition of of a very small development of sympathetic houses would have a minimal impact on the access road. Indeed a road widening and surfacing of the unmade road would enhance access, turning and parking for the current residents of Co-operative Street.</p> <p>We have only just been made aware of the reasons the Council had for opposing the inclusion and we refute the reasons given as outlined below.</p> <p>1) The land is close for a scheduled Ancient Monument - any development of the land would affect the setting of the chimney. The chimney is entirely isolated built on a very high piece of land at the top of a steep sided hill with a flue going diagonally across the road to Higher Mill. It toward above any of the buildings in the area and is a considerable distance from Co-op St which is in the valley. Any development would have no impact whatsoever on the chimney either visually or archaeologically.</p> <p>2) Any development would be built in sympathy with the proposed conservation area - in character stone - in vernacular form and scale and fenestration and with slate pitched roofs.</p> <p>There would be a limited number of extra dwellings and the impact of such a small scale development would be at neutral on the area and would probably enhance it as it would stop encroachments and fly tipping.</p> <p>3) The Council mentions a complex system of culverts. Further advice was to be sought from Archaeology Officers before a decision was made. Has this advice been sought? I was the Assistant Keeper at Higher Mill Museum from 1976 to 1983 and was in charge of the day to day running of the museum. We ran a Youth opportunity scheme to repair and restore the drainage systems for the lodges at Higher Mill coming from the land at the west of Holcombe Road. The drainage pipes went in the current garden and under the new house on Holcombe Road therefore I can confirm that they were to the North of our land.</p> <p>In view of this please reconsider our application.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SD2	Further comment
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Not Applicable	Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt 8. We are pleased that Policy SD2 seeks for all new development in the Borough to take place within the Urban Boundaries, defined on the Policies map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the area. The exceptions need to be strictly controlled. 9. We are aware that today, in part down to our efforts, people have a much higher level of awareness of the importance of our green natural spaces, both rural, and urban, and the elements that constitute 'Green Infrastructure'. We believe that everyone benefits from the wide ranging roles of greenfield land: from its green lung function, flood resilience, wildlife habitats, food production, recreational opportunities, tranquillity and contribution to our cultural heritage, so we trust that the Council will take an integrated and strategic approach to the provision and management of land for development while protecting and enhancing the countryside and green spaces that are so loved in Rossendale.		
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council	Boundary change opposite Goodshaw Parish Church	Not Applicable	Boundary change opposite Goodshaw Parish Church, Goodshaw Lane (3 or 4 houses) – Goodshaw Lane is narrow on this section and experiences on-street parking partly on the grass verge which is a concern. The Highway Authority would seek improvements to address the issues as part of any application that came forward.		

Number of comments SD2

96

Chapter 1: Housing

Reference HS01 Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement

6	Christopher	McManus	Park Royal Development s (NW) Ltd		Object	The explanation of Policy HS1 states: "The SHMA particularly highlights a need for larger, aspirational property types in Rossendale to rebalance the stock away from small terraced properties and reduce the high levels of outmigration to adjoining areas" but Policy HS4 a) details "A requirement of 30% on-site affordable housing from market housing schemes subject to site and development considerations (such as financial viability)." - - It could be easily argued that these two policy points are in direct contradiction of each other. While RBC may believe Developers should build out larger, and as such more expensive, properties for affordable housing this is likely to stymie projects being brought forward due to lack of margin. RBC will argue that they have given Developers the opportunity to make their case based on financial viability but simply put this is a barrier to entry for smaller Developers who would have to pay to contest their appraisals vs RBC's (which reduces their project's viability further). -		
---	-------------	---------	-----------------------------------	--	--------	---	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
93	Norman	Crook	-		Support	The net housing target requirement seems reasonable and based on sound evidence. The requirement for delivering an overall amount of 20% of all new dwellings on previously developed land is strongly supported, so that such land (e.g. land at Blackwwod Road, Stacksteads (HS2.24) can be recycled for housing to reduce the need for building on greenfield and green belt land.		No. - - If further information, clarification or explanation is required, please do not hesitate to contact the Agent.
323	Anne	Dixon			Object	I am very upset that we have to build a large quantity of houses in this Region, just because the Government have set a target for each area. I would like to see the following completed:- - a) An investigation into how much housing is actually needed in the area. - - b) An investigation into how many empty houses/flats there are in the area, and more drives to bring them back into usage. - - c) An investigation into how many of the proposed houses are luxury houses, not affordable housing for 1st time buyers. There seem to be a lot of 4 bed luxury homes featured in the plans. This will not help people buy their 1st home. - - d) An investigation into how many of the new proposed houses will be built on ecological sustainable principals - eg solar panels, flood proof, etc. - - e) An investigation into how many of the new proposed houses will be built with the needs of disabled and elderly people in mind - eg level access, wide doorways, wet rooms, etc. - - f) An investigation into the existing services and infrastructure to see if they can cope with an increase in people using their services - ie schools, medical practices, dentists, hospitals, highways, police, etc. My concern is that schools etc. are already at full capacity and cannot cope with the influx of new people that building such a large quantity of housing will require. - - g) More flood prevention measures need to be implemented for existing housing stock. - - h) Environmental impact on the ecosystem locally. - - i) We need to work to preserve the character and heritage of Rossendale, and this includes preserving green spaces, mature trees, and valuing the natural beauty of the region. - - j) We need to attract morevisitors to the area. This means keeping the area green and pleasant, and re-opening our valuable heritage museums that have been closed. -		Rossendale is a wonderful area to live in, and I am passionate about preserving the heritage and character of the place. I am a volunteer at Civil Pride and help maintain the flower beds that so many people in the area appreciate. People need green spaces, trees and interactions with wildlife for mental and physical well being. Housing should not be built on green field or forest areas - it increases the risk of flooding and land erosion, and takes away the lungs and soul of the area. We need a local strategy for housing that takes into account existing housing stock and old mills, etc that could be made habitable, and looks at the local needs, not just works blindly to meet a target set by Government officers in Whitehall. We need to consider what the local infrastructure can cope with, and we need to ensure that the houses built are suitable for the needs of disabled, and elderly, and flood resistant, and in keeping with the local environment. We need balance. - - The proposed plan also needs to be publicised more widely. A lot of people in the area do not know that housing is being proposed near to them, and therefore cannot comment on your proposals.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
677	Phil	Ramsden	Lindon Park Development s Ltd		Object	<p>Policy HS1: Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement - - The net housing requirement for the period 2019-2034 will be achieved through the development of a number of sites proposed in the draft plan as allocations for housing development. - - This policy confirms that the new plan provides for at least 4,000 additional dwellings over the plan period, equating to 265 dwellings a year, which addresses prior under-provision of 425 dwellings (as of 31st March 2017) within the first five years of the plan period; delivering an overall amount of 20% of all new dwellings on previously developed land (PDL) across the Borough; and keeping under review housing delivery performance on a yearly basis. - - The Representor questions whether, based on previous poor delivery rates, 4,000 additional dwellings is an adequate requirement/target. In addition, while the Representor agrees with the presumption that the plan should aim to try to play catch-up on the issue of under delivery in previous years, it questions whether 425 dwellings within the first five years of the plan period is an achievable target given previous poor performance on delivery, which in part is due to the lack of suitable, available and viable development sites. - - A further point of concern is the fact that the target for brownfield development, which is 20%, seems very low when the nature and profile of the borough is considered. We would have expected the target to be greater. Indeed, the figures for neighbouring authorities in previous years have been considerably higher. If the target is correct, based on a full review of available opportunities, it suggests that what greenfield sites are proposed to be allocated should be suitable, available and viable for development and, ideally, deliverable in the short term, given the point made earlier about the need to play catch-up. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
763	Alan	Billingsley	-		Object	<p>The need for new housing in Rossendale has been assessed in the Council's Strategy - Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMA) (2016). This study, is NOT consistent with the - Government's current policy position. The SHMA recommendation that the need for additional housing in Rossendale of between 265 and 335 dwellings per year is therefore, at the very least, questionable and consequently the total number of dwellings to be provided over the plan period (2019-2034) of 3,975 is also questionable. - On the 14th Sept 2017, Sajid Javid Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government issued a statement - https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/local-housing-need - in which he announced the following: - 'If we're going to make a lasting change – building the homes we need to meet both current and future demand – we need a proper understanding of exactly how many homes are needed and where. The existing system for determining this simply isn't good enough. - It relies on assessments commissioned by individual authorities according to their own requirements, carried out by expensive consultants using their own methodologies. - The result is an opaque mish-mash of different figures that are consistent only in their complexity. - This piecemeal approach simply doesn't give an accurate picture of housing need across the country. - Nor does it impress local people who see their area taking on a huge number of new homes while a town on the other side of a local authority boundary barely expands at all. - If we're going to get the right number of homes built in the right places we need an honest, open, consistent approach to assessing local housing need'. - This would suggest you need to re assess the housing needs of the Borough in line with the new proposals which would probably result in a much more sympathetic outcome when trying to meet the housing development requirement in the Rossendale Valley, with its inherent limited land availability, flooding issues, limited road access and limited infrastructure.</p>		No
1414	Gavin	Cox	-		Object	<p>Given the latest reduction from circa 4000 to 2000 houses the current local plan should be revised to take out all of the reallocation of greenbelt in the current addition. Only once existing brownfield sites cannot meet the housing need should encroachment of green belt be considered and then only on a case by case basis. If the Council allows 4000 houses to be built locally house builders will want to build 4000. If the need is reduced to 2000 houses, builders should only be allowed to build 2000.</p>		-
1455	Diane	Steels	N/A		Object	<p>We don't need anymore houses.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
1473	K	Howieson	C/O Agent		Not Applicable	<p>Please see submitted Representation Document</p> <p>Email received 09/10/2017: HS1 HOUSING 3.7 This Policy sets out the need to provide at least 4,000 additional dwellings over the plan period (2019-2034), equating to 265 dwellings per annum. The policy seeks to address prior under-provision in the first five years of the plan period, by increasing the annual requirement to 350 in the first five years. This strategy is supported. 3.8 It is however noted that the SHMA sets out a range of need from 265-335 dwellings per annum, it is therefore questionable as to why the Council has simply chosen the lower end of this range, rather than opting for an aspirational target to ensure need is met and sustainable growth achieved.</p>		Please see submitted Representation Document

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
1478	N/A	N/A	Winfields Holdings Ltd and Winfield's Ltd		Object	<p>Whilst the principle of addressing the proposed borough's objectively assessed housing need is supported, the proposed annual provision is at the bottom of the range identified as being required by the up-to-date SHMA (published December 2016). It is appreciated that Government is undertaking a consultation on a standard methodology for assessing housing need, but this has only just commenced and does not address borough specific issues. As such, the exercise undertaken on behalf of the Authority has to be given precedence as it assesses the objectively assessed housing needs for this borough in the light of its specific circumstances and aspirations. The growth aspirations of the Local Plan will not, however, be realised without the amount of housing being increased, as a restricted approach will significantly and adversely affect the growth strategies being pursued (as confirmed by the commentary to the SHMA).</p> <p>The need to address the current housing deficit following a prolonged under provision is also supported. However, whilst the Council propose to deal with this within the first 5 years of the plan period, there is no evidence that this is achievable and a buffer of 20% should be applied to the total provision for there to be a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply (as required by Paragraph 47, second bullet, of the NPPF).</p> <p>The explanation to the policy confirms that brownfield land is to be used in preference to greenfield, and utilised wherever possible. It suggests, however, that the supply of sites without significant constraints is limited. In this respect, it is noted that there is a significant supply of land that has been identified for employment purposes since at least 1995 that has not come forward. As stated at Paragraph 22 of the NPPF, planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of them coming forward. The land at Hud Hey, the site specific aspects of which are drawn out below, is one such site. Given the amount of unused previously developed land across the borough the aspiration of achieving 20% of all new dwellings on such land is supported. It is the case, however, that flexibility needs to be incorporated into other policies (such as Policy EMP3 which relates to employment sites) to achieve this objective.</p> <p>Separate representations are made below with respect to the status of land at Hud Hey (EMP2.14) that could assist with helping meet the Council's objective of bringing forward brownfield land in preference to releasing greenfield.</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
1550	Shelley	Carter			Object	<p>I have not been able to look at the detail of this Draft Plan as much as I would have liked, due to it being such a large and complex document. So, my comments about specific sites relate to my local area of Weir Village, followed by more general comments about the Valley as a whole.</p> <p>In general, it appears to me that the Urban Boundary is being expanded into Greenfield areas when there are still Brownfield sites that need to be re-developed. Looking down the list of proposed new housing sites throughout Rossendale, this is quite striking. My concern is that once our grazing land has gone, it's gone for ever and the impact on our Valley would be detrimental to residents' wellbeing and also the tourism industry which is providing much needed employment and bringing revenue into the area.</p> <p>All this additional building on the hillsides could result in more flooding in the valley bottoms.</p> <p>Having lived in the Valley all my life, I can see that flooding is occurring more severely and more regularly than in the past and it is a growing concern for both homeowners and businesses alike.</p> <p>The quantity of homes that Rossendale is expected to build does not take into consideration the geography of this area and this needs to be addressed. The Rossendale Valley is a collection of valleys and because of the geographical constraints, there is a limited amount of developable land for any usage. The same geographical constraints also limits any improvements to our road network and in its present form it cannot sustain any further increase in vehicle numbers. It's no good building houses if people cannot access facilities and commute for work. The old industries of our Valley have disappeared due to foreign competition and those jobs which were lost have not been replaced by other industries within the Valley.</p> <p>Officers and Politicians alike need to pressure Government, to ensure that the number of proposed new homes is reduced throughout our much loved Valley. Future development needs to be sympathetic to and enhance Rossendale's natural and built environments. The Valley's landscape is valued by locals and visitors alike and it is essential that it is protected for future generations.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>2.2 HOUSING</p> <p>This section of the review focusses on the current context in regard to employment and identifies opportunities that Rossendale's Town Centre and other District Centres within the Borough can capitalise upon to further improve upon their economic output.</p> <p>HS1: MEETING ROSSENDALE'S HOUSING REQUIREMENT</p> <p>The Local Plan states that a Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMA) was undertaken in 2016 by Rossendale Borough Council and recommended that there is a need for additional housing of between 265 and 335 dwellings per year over the Local Plan period (2019 – 2034). The Council has stated that the figure of 265 dwellings per year is sufficient which therefore equates to a total of 3,975 dwellings being delivered over 15 years. It is also stated that provision of dwellings during the first five year period will need to take into account the requirement to address the under-provision of 425 dwellings. Therefore, the annual delivery of dwellings during the first five year period will increase to 350 dwellings.</p> <p>The Policy states: 'The net housing requirement for the period 2019 – 2034 will be achieved through: Providing at least 4,000 additional dwellings over the plan period equating to 265 dwellings a year; Addressing prior under-provision of 425 dwellings (as of 31st March 2017) within the first five years of the plan period.'</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
1619	Michael	Onley	Planning Sense NW		Object	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the emerging Local Plan. Rossendale Borough Council has identified a need to provide “at least 4,000 additional dwellings over the plan period” [Rossendale Draft Local Plan policy HS1, RBC 2017] despite there being a number of serviced, well-located and accessible residential development sites with planning permissions dating back twenty, thirty or more years [5 Year Housing Land Supply Report (2017 – 2022) RBC 2017]</p> <p>Rossendale's house affordability has lain stable for 12 years [ONS]. There are currently 653 houses offered for sale in Rossendale; 268 of them at asking prices of £125k or less. A bike ride away in Burnley and Accrington, decent homes can be bought for £25k [RightMove, October 2017]</p> <p>In 2001 8.9% of the Elevate East Lancashire housing stock was empty, more than twice the national average [DCLG 2009]</p> <p>The number of households in the Elevate East Lancashire area is predicted to increase at half the national rate [National Evaluation of Housing Market Renewal Pathfinders 2005–2007, Leather, Ferrari and Cole for DCLG 2009]</p> <p>In the face of over-supply, lack of demand, high void rates and low house prices it is wholly wrong to impose a southern-biased analysis of the housing market (planning constraint causing under supply, causing affordability problems). The problem for the post-industrial north-west is that more houses are being built than we need to meet demand [Sustainable Communities: Homes for All ODPM 2005]</p> <p>It is not a lack of residential allocations which restricts house construction in Rossendale, but market forces. Lack of demand deflates prices and diminishes return for the developer. Inflating the supply side of the housing market is wholly counter-productive. What keeps Rossendale’s quality of life above its neighbouring Boroughs is affordable housing, decent accessibility and enviable landscape quality.</p> <p>However, misplaced analysis has obliged Rossendale Borough Council to set an unattainable housing target of at least 4,000 additional dwellings over the plan period. Allocating yet more housing sites will only exacerbate the problems of over-supply and lack of profitability, and lead to fewer completions.</p> <p>The geographical challenge of 4000+ new-build houses in a tightly constrained post-industrial landscape has obliged Rossendale BC to abandon its target of 65% of new housing on previously developed land [Rossendale Core Strategy policy 2, RBC 2011] and to adopt an unsustainable target of 20% of all new dwellings on previously developed land [Rossendale Draft Local Plan policy HS1, RBC 2017]</p> <p>Clients fear cherry-picking of the most desirable sites. This is reflected in the abandonment of density target of 50+ dwellings per hectare appropriate to urban renewal [Rossendale Core Strategy policy 2, RBC 2011] in favour of a</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>suburban 30+ figure [Rossendale Draft Local Plan policy HS5, RBC 2017]. Clients oppose planning blight upon precious greenfield sites such as achingly lovely meadows east of Johnny Barn (variously identified as HS2.53 and duplicated as HS2.54), and cinematic quality, rail-side pasture at Haslam Farm (HS2.60). Access and road safety concerns have been raised in respect of allocation HS2.86 (St Peter's School) - photos attached.</p> <p>(...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Draft policy HS1 in respect of residential over-provision over the plan period •Draft policy HS1 in respect of low brownfieltarget 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Object	<p>Policy HS1: Meeting Rossendale’s Housing Requirement</p> <p>2.5 This policy outlines that 4,000 dwellings will be required over the plan period (2019-2034), which equates to 265 dwellings per annum (dpa), and represents a slight increase from the 247 dpa set out in the previous Core Strategy which was based on the RSS.</p> <p>Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) December 2016</p> <p>2.6 This figure comes from the SHMA which was produced in December 2016 by Lichfields, and suggested that Rossendale’s objectively assessed housing need (OAN) is 265-335 dpa.</p> <p>2.7 Whilst we do not dispute the SHMA’s findings, and accept that the proposed target represents an increase from the adopted Core Strategy, we have concerns with the Council’s adopting a figure at the lower end of the range.</p> <p>2.8 Firstly, we note that the 265 dpa figure represents the demographic baseline with uplifts for market signals and affordable housing; however it does not take account of economic aspirations, as employment-led needs suggested a range of 269-335 dpa. Yet the NPPF is clear that housing strategies within Local Plans must take account of economic aspirations (paragraph 158), whilst the NPPG (paragraph 2a-018-20140306) notes how failing to align housing and jobs “could result in unsustainable commuting patterns... and reduce the resilience of local businesses”.</p> <p>2.9 Secondly, adopting a figure at the lower end of the OAN range provides no flexibility to take account of potential unmet needs of adjacent authorities, and whilst we accept that Rossendale is considered to be its own Housing Market Area for the purposes of the SHMA, it’s level of containment is actually lower than the 70% threshold set out in the NPPG and it is directly adjacent to Greater Manchester, where a new Spatial Framework (GMSF) is being prepared across the 10 authorities which will necessitate substantial housing growth. Indeed the SHMA acknowledges that Rossendale has strong commuting flows with Manchester, and significant housing market overlap with both Bury and Rochdale, with paragraph 13.3 noting: “Through the Duty to Co-operate process RBC must consider the housing issues of adjoining authorities, particularly Bury and Rochdale, and assess any additional need required to be met. The target requirement is for Rossendale to judge based on the evidence provided to them.”</p> <p>2.10 In light of this, it is pertinent that neither Manchester or Bury are currently able to demonstrate a 5-year supply, whilst Rochdale claim between 5.1 – 6.1 years, suggesting existing issues in respect of housing capacity.</p> <p>2.11 Moving onto the GMSF itself, the December 2016 draft set a housing target of 227,000 from 2015-2035 and proposed significant Green Belt across 55 large strategic allocations, totalling close to 70,000 units; although this still left over 157,000 units to be met by each individual authority.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>2.12 However since then, the new Metropolitan Mayor, Andy Burnham has called for the plan to be redrafted to minimise Green Belt release and therefore it looks likely that the 10 GM authorities will be looking for even greater numbers within their urban areas. This will generate huge delivery challenges in these areas and unless the Mayor's position changes, this is likely to generate unmet need, which will need to be accommodated by the surrounding authorities, unless they can demonstrate and evidence that this is not achievable.</p> <p>2.13 As such we would recommend an uplift to take account of employment needs, and to provide some flexibility to accommodate any unmet needs from surrounding GM authorities. Adopting a higher figure, which goes above and beyond meeting just Rossendale's basic need, would align with paragraph 154 of the NPPF which states that Local Plans should be aspirational, as well as realistic.</p> <p>2.14 Furthermore, paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires local authorities 'to boost significantly' the supply of housing. Adopting a housing requirement which utilises a higher figure within the OAN range would therefore obviously assist in achieving this overall goal, and would provide a more aspirational figure to drive growth in Rossendale.</p> <p>Consultation on Standard Housing Need Methodology– 14th September 2017</p> <p>2.15 Following the publication of the SHMA and Draft Local Plan, the government have issued a consultation paper proposing a new standardised approach to calculating housing need. At the outset, it must be noted that this is only a consultation document at this stage and cannot be afforded any meaningful weight at the present time. It is likely to generate a significant number of responses and objections, given it is such a fundamental element of the planning process, and therefore it is entirely possible that it will be subject to change before it makes its way into formally issued policy.</p> <p>2.16 In Rossendale's case, the proposed methodology generates a housing need of 212 dpa from 2016-2026; which is below the OAN range suggested in the December 2016 SHMA (269-335 dpa). However, there are a number of flaws/implications that result from the Government's drafted approach, which we have identified.</p> <p>2.17 Firstly, the suggested calculation of objectively assessed housing need is simply based on anticipated demographic change and uplifts associated with affordability</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>market signals. It does not automatically include the need to take account of economic considerations.</p> <p>2.18 Helpfully, the consultation does note that authorities will be able to plan for higher housing numbers to support a strategic infrastructure project, or increased employment ambitions (giving examples of a Local Economic Partnership investment strategy, a bespoke housing deal with Government or a modern Industrial Strategy). In short, economic considerations effectively become a ‘policy on’ decision rather than a direct input in terms of calculating what the OAN will be.</p> <p>2.19 The critical point to note is that the revised housing OAN methodology does not obviate a Local Planning Authority from promoting a sound Development Plan, which needs to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.</p> <p>2.20 Importantly, there is no proposed change to the relevant Acts which require a Development Plan to embody the principles of ‘sustainable development’ and there is no proposed change to the definition of sustainable development, which embodies economic, social and environmental considerations, as set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>2.21 Indeed, the NPPF will continue to state that “local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area”, as required by paragraph 14. Given such needs include economic development as well as housing development, it is difficult to see how the two considerations can be meaningfully separated when preparing a holistic, sound Development Plan and one that fully adheres to the principles of delivering the “presumption in favour of sustainable development”.</p> <p>2.22 Furthermore, this methodology only covers the period 2016-2026, whilst most emerging or adopted Local Plans cover a 15-20 year period, with Rossendale’s running from 2019-2034, and therefore the current figures cover less than half the plan period.</p> <p>2.23 In short, the revised OAN methodology will still only continue to represent the starting point in forging a sound Local Plan.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>2.24 The SHMA has already confirmed that a minimum of 269 dpa would be required to support their job growth aspirations and align with the NPPF requirement. Furthermore, affordable housing need is real issue in Rossendale with the 2016 SHMA (paragraph 13.19) confirming a need of between 158-321 dpa, which would also justify an uplift, whether as part of the OAN calculation as it is now, or as a 'policy on' adjustment if this new methodology is adopted.</p> <p>2.25 There are also other economic objectives within Rossendale that will be aided by an uplift in housing. Much of the borough currently suffers from low property values, with more than half of the Borough's properties (51%) falling in Council Tax band A, well above the Lancashire County average of 37% and more than double the average for England of 25%.</p> <p>2.26 Providing additional housing beyond the minimum demographic need, and particularly greenfield and Green Belt development, which promotes lower density, higher value, large family housing, will help to raise this profile and secure higher Council Tax bandings and receipts which can then be reinvested in local services, which have been subject to significant cuts in recent years. This additional choice and variety of housing will also help to inject more dynamism and mobility at all levels of the local housing market.</p> <p>2.27 Penultimately, the consultation proposes that Local Authorities agree Statements of Common Ground with neighbouring authorities on areas of cross-boundary housing need and other strategic matters. Given the issues raised above in terms of supply pressures within Greater Manchester, and particularly the adjacent authorities of Bury and Rochdale where there this significant housing market overlap; this would again support Rossendale building some flexibility into their housing requirement to accommodate unmet need as part of this SoCG/ duty to cooperate process.</p> <p>2.28 Finally, a criticism we will be raising in relation to the government's revised OAN approach is that it effectively restarts the clock on housing need, without looking at what backlog or concealed</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>households have been generated in years gone by due to the lack of delivery.</p> <p>2.29 In the case of Rossendale, the Borough has been without a full Local Plan (i.e. one that specifically allocates housing sites to direct the development industry in where it should seek to develop) for a considerable period of time. Indeed, the Core Strategy was adopted in 2011, prior to the NPPF.</p> <p>It does not allocate housing sites. Furthermore, the previous Local Plan dates back to 1995 and its Proposal's Map is still being relied upon for settlement boundaries. Whilst we note there are other issues within Rossendale (such as the topography), combined with the lack of a full and directional Local Plan, this has seriously restricted housing delivery across the Borough for over of 20 years.</p> <p>2.30 To continue to delay the delivery of the Local Plan will only continue to compound affordability issues in certain parts of the Borough, which could ironically push the Council's housing requirement up further overtime. For the above reasons, we consider the Council should press on with the submission of the Local Plan but should consider an increase in the housing requirement to take account of economic needs, to address structural issues in the housing market, and to provide flexibility to accommodate unmet needs of adjacent authorities if required in the future.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment													
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>4.1 This chapter comments on the DLP's content in respect of the scale of new residential development which is proposed.</p> <p>Evidence of Housing Need</p> <p>4.2 RBC commissioned a Strategic Housing Market Assessment6 (SHMA) for Rossendale, which was published at the start of the current Local Plan consultation. This provides an objective assessment of housing need (OAN) in the Borough over the plan period. Reflecting the methodology advocated by the PPG, the SHMA follows a stepped approach in establishing the OAN, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the latest 2014-based household projections as a 'starting point'7; • Sensitivity testing the 'starting point' through the application of alternative assumptions on population and household formation, in order to determine the demographic need for housing8; • Responding to market signals of imbalance between housing supply and demand9; • Taking employment trends into account; and • Taking affordable housing needs into account. <p>4.3 The following table summarises this stepped methodology by replicating Table E.1.1 of the SHMA. This indicates a need for between 265 and 335 dwellings per annum in Rossendale over the plan period (2014 – 2034). Table 4.1: Approach to OAN for Rossendale 2014 – 2034</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Dwellings per annum 2014 – 2034 / Adjustment from previous stage / Uplift from 'starting point'</th> <th>Demographic 'starting point'</th> <th>183 / – / –</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Adjustments to demographic-led needs</td> <td>220 / +37 / +20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Uplift for market signals (10%)</td> <td>242 / +22 / +32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Employment-led needs</td> <td>269 – 335 / +86 – 152 / +47 – 83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affordable housing needs (10%)</td> <td>266 – 335 / +83 – 152/+45 – 83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Objectively assessed need</td> <td>265 – 335/ +82 – 152 / +45 – 83%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: Lichfields, 2016</p> <p>4.4 The OAN concluded in the SHMA evidently uplifts the 'starting point' referred to above by at least 45%. This reflects a series of adjustments following the PPG methodology, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sensitivity testing of the 'starting point' projections to take account of the impact of factors shaping recent trends. This includes a stated preference to base needs on a demographic scenario based on longer-term migration trends recorded over ten years (2004 – 2014), as opposed to the five year trend (2009 – 2014) which largely underpins official 2014-based projections. The demographic scenario preferred also allows for an improvement from suppressed household formation rates13; • A 10% uplift from the preferred demographic scenario to reflect the 'moderate' imbalance between housing supply and demand in the Borough, 	Dwellings per annum 2014 – 2034 / Adjustment from previous stage / Uplift from 'starting point'	Demographic 'starting point'	183 / – / –	Adjustments to demographic-led needs	220 / +37 / +20%	Uplift for market signals (10%)	242 / +22 / +32%	Employment-led needs	269 – 335 / +86 – 152 / +47 – 83%	Affordable housing needs (10%)	266 – 335 / +83 – 152/+45 – 83%	Objectively assessed need	265 – 335/ +82 – 152 / +45 – 83%		
Dwellings per annum 2014 – 2034 / Adjustment from previous stage / Uplift from 'starting point'	Demographic 'starting point'	183 / – / –																			
Adjustments to demographic-led needs	220 / +37 / +20%																				
Uplift for market signals (10%)	242 / +22 / +32%																				
Employment-led needs	269 – 335 / +86 – 152 / +47 – 83%																				
Affordable housing needs (10%)	266 – 335 / +83 – 152/+45 – 83%																				
Objectively assessed need	265 – 335/ +82 – 152 / +45 – 83%																				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	------	-----------------

following a review of market signals;

- The need to accommodate the labour force growth required to support job creation forecast by Experian (269dpa) and currently planned by the Core Strategy (335dpa). This recognises that a continuation of recent demographic trends will not provide an adequately sized labour-force to support forecast and planned job growth in Borough; and
- A further 10% uplift on the implied need related to demographic and market signals adjustments to reflect the high level of affordable housing need in Rossendale.

4.5 The approach followed in the SHMA is considered to align with the PPG methodology as currently drafted, and confirms that a minimum of 265 dwellings per annum are needed in Rossendale over the plan period. Provision of this scale would not, however, provide the growth in labour force required to support the level of job growth indicated by the Strategy's adopted target of 3% net growth in jobs over a fixed five year period, with at least 335 dwellings per annum required to ensure that housing and economic policies are fully integrated. This is a requirement of the NPPF (paragraph 158) and would support the creation of 3,115 jobs over the plan period, or 156 jobs per annum.

4.6 The SHMA notes that such a level of job growth exceeds that implied by the then-latest Experian forecasts used within the SHMA, which were released in September 2016 and forecast the total creation of 1,800 jobs in the Borough over the plan period (90 jobs per annum).

4.7 A review of the latest available data confirms, however, that the most recent Experian forecasts released in September 2017 indicate a level of job growth which more closely aligns with RBC's adopted target, as summarised in the following table. This suggests that it remains appropriate to retain the employment target adopted in the Core Strategy, particularly in light of the strong employment growth seen in the Borough since its adoption in 2011/14. This will ensure that the Local Plan remains positively prepared as required within the NPPF and will contribute to sustaining a strong, responsive and competitive economy (paragraph 7).

Table 4.2: Future Job Growth in Rossendale 2014 – 2034

Total job growth 2014 – 2034 / Annual job growth 2014 – 2034	
Adopted Core Strategy	3,115 / 156
Experian, September 2017	2,600 / 130
Experian, September 2016	1,800 / 90

Source: Lichfields; Experian

4.8 While the upper end of the range fully takes account of these more positive economic factors, the SHMA indicates that the lower end of the range accommodates only the previously lower forecast level of job growth. This suggests that the lower end of the range risks constraining the potential of the local economy.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>4.9 The OAN range does, however, take account of proportionate uplifts based on market signals and affordable housing need. With regards to market signals, this reflects guidance in the PPG, which supports reasonable upward adjustments where worsening market signals are identified. The analysis in the SHMA highlights inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively significant growth in average house prices, when compared to other areas; • A short-term worsening in affordability, based on the relationship between house prices and earnings; and • Falling levels of housing delivery since the recession, which have generated ‘adverse outcomes for people who still need to access the housing market’ and resulted in increasing reliance upon the private rented sector. <p>4.10 Although the SHMA presents data which remains comparatively up-to-date, it is of note that the latest available evidence continues to reinforce the fact that there has been no recent improvement in market signals in Rossendale. The ratio between both median and lower quartile house prices and earnings has worsened over the latest calendar year¹⁵ (2015/16) and average house prices in the Borough have also increased¹⁶. The adopted housing requirement has been met only once (2013/14) in the past six years¹⁷, with this an important contributing factor to a worsening of market signals relating to an imbalance of supply and demand.</p> <p>4.11 The SHMA concludes that ‘moderate’ housing demand pressure in Rossendale requires a ‘relatively modest’ increase in housing delivery to improve affordability, indicating that an uplift of 10% from the demographic-led projections would be justified. It is considered that the evidence of market signals provides a clear justification for this level of adjustment.</p> <p>4.12 The SHMA includes a further adjustment made to reflect the sizeable annual need for 158 – 321 affordable homes, uplifting housing need to the lower end of the concluded range (265dpa).</p> <p>4.13 The Housing Register data favoured in the calculation highlights a net backlog of some 744 households currently in need of affordable housing. While this is annualised over twenty years within the SHMA, clearing this backlog over the next five years – as stipulated within the PPG¹⁸ – would require a more significant elevation in affordable housing delivery in the short-term. An average of 149 affordable homes would need to be annually provided within this period to clear this backlog, which is more than three times the average level of affordable housing delivery in the Borough over the past five years¹⁹ (2012 – 2017). Need is elevated further when taking account of the net newly arising need for up to 285 affordable homes per annum.</p> <p>4.14 The delivery of affordable housing through market-led development will make an important contribution towards meeting this need. This reinforces the need to plan for a boosting of housing supply in Rossendale, with a higher level of housing provision inherently supporting the greatest level of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment								
						<p>affordable housing delivery on this basis.</p> <p>Proposed Changes to Methodology for Calculating Housing Needs</p> <p>4.15 As noted earlier in this section, the SHMA correctly follows the methodology currently detailed in the PPG in establishing the OAN for housing in Rossendale. At the current point in time, this remains the latest official guidance on establishing housing needs, pending the outcome of the Government's ongoing consultation on a new draft standardised methodology.</p> <p>4.16 A standardised methodology for calculating housing needs formed one of the recommendations to Government made by the Local Plans Expert Group (LPEG), with its proposed methodology including a number of key deviations from the approach detailed in the PPG20. In establishing the OAN for Rossendale, reference is made within the SHMA to adjustments suggested by LPEG, particularly in relation to market signals and affordable housing needs. Proportionate 10% uplifts applied at these stages within the SHMA align with those advocated by LPEG.</p> <p>4.17 Reflecting the recommendations made by LPEG, the Government's Housing White Paper – published in February 2017 – set out an intention to consult on the introduction of a new standardised approach to assessing housing needs²¹. This followed Government's appreciation of the scale of the national housing crisis and the need for 'radical, lasting reform that will get more homes built right now and for many years to come'.</p> <p>4.18 Consultation on the draft methodology commenced on 14 September 2017, and runs until 9 November²². The method proposed differs from that suggested by LPEG and represents a considerable simplification of the existing approach, with three stages as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Starting with the average household growth annually projected by the latest official household projections over the next ten years; • Adjusting based on the ratio between median house prices and earnings in the latest available year; and • Capping adjustments to 40% above housing requirements adopted in the last five years, or the latest household projections if higher than a requirement adopted more than five years ago. <p>4.19 The Government has indicatively calculated a housing need figure for each local authority in England based on its proposed formula, suggesting that a need for 215 dwellings per annum is implied for Rossendale. This is solely derived from the household projections with an adjustment based on affordability, which falls below the 40% cap. The implied outcome for Rossendale is summarised in the following table.</p> <p>Table 4.3: Indicative Housing Need Based on Proposed New Methodology</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="891 1369 1653 1495"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Dwellings per annum</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Household projections</td> <td>187</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affordability ratio</td> <td>6.14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adjustment factor</td> <td>13.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Dwellings per annum	Household projections	187	Affordability ratio	6.14	Adjustment factor	13.4%		
	Dwellings per annum															
Household projections	187															
Affordability ratio	6.14															
Adjustment factor	13.4%															

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
					<p>Housing need</p> <p>Source: DCLG; Turley analysis</p> <p>4.20 Application of the proposed draft methodology results in a level of need which falls below that suggested by the SHMA and below that identified in the adopted Core Strategy (247 dpa).</p> <p>4.21 The methodology is limited to a single upward adjustment of 13% to respond to market signals, a level which falls above the 10% in the SHMA but below that applied when accounting for the identified scale of affordable housing need²⁴.</p> <p>4.22 It is important to recognise that the proposed removal of the existing requirement to sensitivity test the latest official household projections, which – as demonstrated in the SHMA – would lead to an underestimation of the growth which would occur in Rossendale if longer-term demographic trends persist over the plan period is a key factor in suggesting a lower level of need.</p> <p>4.23 Importantly the proposed methodology also removes the step in the existing methodology which requires the consideration of the relationship between employment growth and housing need. This currently forms the basis for the upper end of the range concluded in the Rossendale SHMA, recognising the need for further growth in the labour force to support likely job creation. The 2014-based projections underpin the new proposed approach, but suggest that the working age population (16 – 64) of Rossendale will decline over the next decade (2016 – 2026) and beyond. This inherently presents a risk to the Borough’s economy and its capacity to support future growth.</p> <p>4.24 The consultation document acknowledges the consequences of this proposed omission, and importantly makes clear that ‘local planning authorities are able to plan for a higher number than set out by our proposed method’²⁵. The consultation paper recognises that this may result from a range of factors – including increased employment ambition – and indeed makes clear its continued expectation that authorities plan to reflect the effects of the Government’s Industrial Strategy in promoting prosperity in every part of the Country. The NPPF as drafted emphasises the importance of integrating housing and employment strategies in this regard²⁶.</p> <p>4.25 The consultation document includes proposals around transitioning to the new approach, confirming that this is dependent upon the status of current and emerging Local Plans. RBC’s intention²⁷ to submit its Local Plan for Examination in January 2019 means that it will be expected to take account of the implications of the new methodology, as will all authorities submitting after 31 March 2018.</p> <p>4.26 Finally, it is important to note that the formulaic nature of the proposed methodology means that housing needs will iteratively change upon release of new datasets, including new household projections – released in summer 2018 and every two years – and new affordability ratios, updated annually.</p>	215		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>The minimum need figure implied for Rossendale will therefore be subject to change in advance of the submission of the new Local Plan, further cautioning against reliance upon the current indicative figure published for consultation by DCLG.</p> <p>Planning for Housing Need</p> <p>4.27 Peel considers that RBC has assembled a robust evidence of housing needs in Rossendale.</p> <p>4.28 The SHMA concludes with a minimum lower OAN of 265 dwellings per annum. This recognises need pressures resulting from projected demographic growth and a positive response to evidence of worsening market signals, which have at least partially resulted from a sustained failure to provide the level of homes needed. This lower end of the range also provides a proactive response to elevating the supply of much needed affordable homes.</p> <p>4.29 It is noted that this minimum OAN is somewhat higher than the indicative minimum need implied through the DCLG's current consultation on a draft standardised methodology which indicates a minimum baseline need for 215 homes per annum.</p> <p>4.30 There is currently no certainty around how the proposals set out within the Housing White Paper – including the proposed standardised methodology for calculating housing need – will progress in the coming months, following the conclusion of the current consultation and a subsequent consultation on proposed changes to the NPPF.</p> <p>4.31 Peel strongly considers that RBC should continue to plan to provide for a level of housing growth which exceeds either of these minimum need positions. The evidence published by RBC confirms that planning on the basis of this level of provision (i.e. 215dpa) will mean that there is insufficient labour within the Borough to support the job growth planned through the Core Strategy. This reflects the projected ageing of Rossendale's population under a trend-based demographic projection. Supporting planned levels of job growth without generating unsustainable in-commuting into the Borough will require a retention and attraction of additional working age people. This in turn will result in the need to provide housing to accommodate this additional population.</p> <p>4.32 The Government retains a recognition of the importance of plan-making in supporting economic growth with the current consultation confirming that authorities will be encouraged to plan for levels of housing need above the minimum position where this supports wider economic growth objectives. The wider benefits of growth with regards to investment in infrastructure and the vibrancy and vitality of places across Rossendale must also be considered in this context.</p> <p>4.33 On this basis, and recognising the challenges facing authorities in developing Local Plans through the current period of transition, Peel strongly recommends that RBC plans to provide housing to accommodate its</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>evidenced need for target homes per annum to be in accordance with the SHMA. This is particularly the case given that the emerging standardised OAN identified by the Government is based on past recessionary trends which do not reflect the future needs.</p> <p>Housing Growth Options</p> <p>4.34 Policy HS1 of the DLP proposes a net requirement for at least 4,000 homes in Rossendale over the plan period (2019 – 2034), or 265 dwellings per annum on average. This is the only housing growth option presented in the DLP.</p> <p>4.35 RBC has, however, also published an overview of the options considered in developing the Rossendale Local Plan²⁸. While the level of development associated with each option is not specified, these options can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 – “Do Nothing” – reliance upon the existing Core Strategy, with no allocated sites and progressively outdated local policies. There is acknowledgement that this would result in residents leaving the Borough through its failure to meet housing needs, and the relocation of employers due to a loss of jobs or opportunities; • Option 2 – “Go for Growth” – maximising employment and housing growth ‘at or close to [the] maximum levels achievable’. It is recognised that this would deliver wider economic benefits and increase provision of affordable housing; • Option 3 – “Environmental Protection Focus” – with a focus on environmental and infrastructure constraints, it is acknowledged that this would not ‘provide the housing and employment needed’, restrict opportunities for young people to remain in the Borough and create difficulty in delivering ‘anticipated housing requirements in full’, threatening its soundness; and • Option 4 – “Draft Plan” – by seeking to ‘meet the housing and employment requirements set out in the evidence base’, this option ‘aims to balance creation of new employment and housing provision with environmental protection’ and would help to retain the Borough’s working population. <p>4.36 The absence of detail on the specific level of housing growth associated with each of these options inhibits consideration of their capability to meet housing needs as considered above. The extent to which each has been meaningfully considered in arriving at the position advanced in the DLP is similarly unclear.</p> <p>4.37 Based on the information available, however, it is clear that a “do nothing” approach will fail to meet the need for housing in Rossendale. Furthermore, Government has legislated to make clear ‘beyond doubt the requirement for all areas to be covered by a plan’²⁹ and reiterated its intention to intervene where necessary to ensure that plans are put in place. Doing nothing evidently is not an option for RBC, and should not be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>considered as such.</p> <p>4.38 The “Draft Plan” option is taken forward within the DLP, and provides for at least 265 dwellings per annum over the plan period. This aligns with the lower end of the range concluded within the SHMA, albeit covering a different period. As recognised above this would not provide for the higher levels of housing growth needed to grow the labour force and support future growth in the Borough’s economy, given the SHMA’s conclusion that 335 dwellings per annum will be needed to support a continuation of the Core Strategy’s job target. The statement that this option is sufficient to meet housing needs is therefore unjustified and not evidenced.</p> <p>4.39 The “go for growth” option would maximise housing provision and inherently support the highest level of employment growth, ostensibly exceeding the growth proposed in the DLP. By implication, therefore, this would deliver a level of growth which approaches or indeed exceeds the upper end of the OAN range, delivering the greatest economic benefit and supporting the required elevation in affordable housing delivery as recognised by RBC. Although the absence of detail on the absolute level of growth which could be accommodated under this option is unhelpful, in principle this growth option should be given further consideration in advancing the Local Plan to ensure that housing needs are met in full and that the economic potential of the Borough is realised.</p> <p>4.40 In contrast, the “environmental protection focus” option explicitly recognises that it would fall short of meeting needs, albeit the level of provision is not quantified. Peel considers that this option should be disregarded given that RBC has not presented evidence to indicate that needs cannot be met in full. Equally, the realisation of this option from a plan-making perspective would have significant detrimental effects on the long-term sustainability of the Borough’s settlements and the vibrancy of its communities.</p> <p>4.41 On this basis, Peel strongly suggests that RBC dismiss any consideration of Options 1 and 3 as they will fail to provide a sustainable Local Plan for Rossendale. Peel considers that RBC should continue to explore and articulate in more detail an option which is more aspirational than Option 4 and fully accounts for the benefits associated with pursuing Option 2. This should take into account updates to the underpinning evidence regarding the economic prospects of the Borough and the associated implications for supporting infrastructure including housing.</p> <p>Delivering the Type of Housing Needed</p> <p>4.44 The NPPF requires Local Plans to recognise the ‘size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand’ and encourages authorities to plan for a mix of housing³⁰. More recently, the Government’s Housing White Paper reinforced the ‘need to build many more homes, of the type people want to live in, in the places they want</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	------	-----------------

to live’31 – appreciating both the quantitative and qualitative factors shaping housing needs.

4.45 Peel considers that it is critical that the Local Plan seeks to plan positively in providing for the types of homes that will be required in Rossendale over the plan period.

4.46 In evidencing its understanding of these future needs, the DLP importantly references the SHMA in highlighting: “...a need for larger, aspirational property types in Rossendale to rebalance the stock away from small terraced properties and reduce the high levels of out-migration to adjoining areas”32

4.47 Peel strongly supports the planned provision of homes of this type. Qualitative issues in the existing housing stock of Rossendale are highlighted within the SHMA, and are seen to emphasise a ‘qualitative need to rebalance the housing market’. The SHMA cites stakeholders’ views that ‘younger families with children are moving out of the borough seeking more aspirational executive housing’, and notes that:

“It is only by developing higher quality 3 and 4-bed detached properties in [areas with poor quality flatted and terraced stock] that Rossendale can hope to effectively compete against more diverse housing markets or housing markets with a higher concentration of aspirational homes nearby, and to stem the tide of out-migration of affluent residents which is currently a serious problem for the borough. This is particularly important if the upper end of the OAN housing range is targeted, which will aim to reverse the trend of out-migration and seek to attract and retain economic migrants to move to the borough”33

4.48 Accordingly, the SHMA recommends making provision for 60% of all new homes to be houses with at least 3 bedrooms, with half of all homes (50%) detached or semi-detached overall.

Table 4.4: SHMA Recommendation on Size and Type (2014 – 2034)

Size ▶	1 or 2 bedrooms			3 or 4 bedrooms	
All property types	40%			60%	
Type ▶	Semi	Detached	Terraced	Flat	Bungalow
All property types	25%	25%	10%	10%	30%

Source: Lichfields, 2016

4.49 The SHMA notes that diversifying the housing stock towards larger, better quality dwellings will ‘help to ensure that there is a more clearly defined housing ladder within the borough, which is currently overly weighted towards the value end of the market’.

4.50 Planning to support the provision of such homes will contribute towards rebalancing the housing stock profile of Rossendale, which it is agreed is currently skewed towards lower quality homes. In 2017, the Valuation Office Agency34 (VOA) recorded some 51% of the Borough’s properties in Council Tax Band A, which is more than double the national average (24%) and also

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>exceeds the average in the North West (42%).</p> <p>4.51 Delivering higher quality housing in higher Council Tax bands can also have wider benefits in that it offers the potential to increase the revenue of RBC. Households living in Band C properties annually pay some 33% more in Council Tax than Band A35, for example, with an increased representation of higher value properties in Rossendale therefore likely to generate an increased financial benefit to the Council over a lasting period. This important revenue source will enable RBC to reinvest in local community infrastructure and services.</p> <p>4.52 Peel considers that in order to support this objective, it is imperative that RBC directs allocations towards areas where this higher quality family housing can be viably delivered. A balanced spatial distribution is required which takes account of these qualitative factors and development viability, and delivering housing of the quality needed will likely require allocations in areas of higher market demand.</p> <p>4.53 Peel considers that this will require a re-consideration of the proposed spatial distribution of the housing supply / land allocations identified within the DLP. This currently suggests that approximately 31% of land allocations are located around Bacup, Stackheads, Britannia and Weir. In other parts of the Borough, there are more established and stronger housing markets to support the delivery of homes which can be considered as more aspirational and of higher value. The following plan highlights western areas in which higher prices were paid on average over the last two years (2015/16), based on Land Registry data.</p> <p>Figure 4.1: Average Price Paid by Postcode Sector 2015 – 2016</p> <p>4.54 The implications for the spatial approach to providing land allocations taking account of the recognised need for larger higher value homes is considered further in the following section. The additional Green Belt releases required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is sound must be directed towards those areas at the west of the Borough which are currently under-served in terms of housing land supply.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Object	<p>Policy HS1: Meeting Rossendale’s Housing Requirement The net housing requirement for the period 2019-2034 will be achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Providing at least 4,000 additional dwellings over the plan period equating to 265 dwellings a year b) Addressing prior under-provision of 425 dwellings (as of 31st March 2017) within the first five years of the plan period c) Delivering an overall amount of 20% of all new dwellings on previously developed land (PDL) across the Borough d) Keeping under review housing delivery performance on a yearly basis <p>A. RCT object to HS1’s focus on “aspirational” housing, despite explanations: Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMA) (2016).....based on the projected increase in the number of households over the plan period, uplifted to take account of worsening market signals and the need to provide affordable housing.....particularly highlights a need for larger, aspirational property types in Rossendale to rebalance the stock away from small terraced properties and reduce the high levels of outmigration to adjoining areas. It also evidences the need for more good quality, specialist accommodation designed specifically for the growing elderly population.</p> <p>B. RCT compare this proposed build rate of 265/year, with the 172/year delivered from 2011 – 2016, the present Core Strategy 247/year and the Inspectors 222/year:- Report to Rossendale Borough Council by Roland Punshon BSc Hons, MRTPI 29. The Council’s proposed annual rate of housing delivery would be in general conformity with the RS. Whilst I am satisfied that house building rates of more than 222 dwellings per annum could be achieved, I have seen no evidence to persuade me that substantially higher annual rates could be consistently maintained. In addition, given the character of the local environment with its narrow, developed valleys and open uplands, I am concerned that a substantial increase in requirement to meet the need/demand levels identified by the Council’s SHMA could be difficult to achieve without causing unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.....A robust Monitoring and Implementation Strategy will assist in this regard (see Issue 10 below). In these circumstances I am satisfied that, in the light of the existing evidence, the adoption of a housing requirement of 222 dwellings per annum is appropriate although the level of the overall housing requirement will need to be kept under regular review and the DPD should be adapted as appropriate.</p> <p>C. RCT now see 212/year 2016-2026 in 14 September 2017 Department for Communities and Local Government Planning for the right homes in the right places: consultation proposals, and explained:- Indicative assessment of housing need based on proposed formula, 2016 to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>2026. This is calculated based on the formula proposed in the consultation document Planning for the right homes in the right places. It uses affordability ratios for 2016, and average household growth over the period 2016 to 2026 from the 2014 based household projections. The Local Plan figures used to calculate the proposed cap are included in column I. The assessment is indicative, as actual figures will depend on the most recent data available at the time the need is calculated. For the purposes of the calculation, plans adopted within five years of the date of publication have been considered up to date.</p> <p>Current local assessment of housing need, This has been collected by DCLG from publically available reports. Where possible we have used the latest available figure on the Local Authority's website, with sources for these provided in column G. This is to provide a point of comparison for the formula based assessment of need. Whilst every opportunity has been taken to ensure the latest figures have been taken, these figures should be treated with caution as not every local authority has been able to provide confirmation prior to publication.</p> <p>Proportion of Local Authority land area covered by Green Belt, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Sites of Special Scientific Interest Calculated from publically available data from DCLG, Natural England and the ONS. This provides an indication of land that is not generally available for development, to illustrate the point in the consultation document that not all authorities will be able to meet their need in full within their own area.</p> <p>RCT note Rossendale ONS Code - E07000125, and its neighbours:- Indicative assessment of housing need based on proposed formula, 2016 to 2026 (dwellings per annum) – 212. Bury - 597. *Hyndburn – 60.</p> <p>Current local assessment of housing need, based on most recent publically available document (dwellings per annum)- 265. Bury – 610. *Hyndburn - 180 - 350</p> <p>Proportion of Local Authority land area covered by Green Belt, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Sites of Special Scientific Interest - 31%. Bury - 60%. *Hyndburn - 58%</p> <p>D. RCT 18/9/17 question to DfCLG: 14 September consultation on housing numbers, that proposes 212/year 2016-2026, and notes present revised local plan consultation of 265/year, and current 2011 – 2016 Local Plan Core Strategy of 247/year, which was based on Planning Inspector's 222/year and a previous shortfall. Now on a first scan through/word find look at this consultation, as it makes no mention of individual LA's past 2011-2016 Table 100 deliveries – Rossendale 172/year, am thinking that it's based on where we are now nationally, and so past shortfalls on local plans are not a issue;</p> <p>21/9/19 HOUSSTATS: You are correct that the method does not account for past shortfalls (except where these impact affordability).</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						<p>So we are now looking at a reduction from the present Core Strategy 3700 growth to 2026, on basis of 860 for 2011-16 plus 10 x 2120, to 2980 dwellings. and to 2034???</p> <p>RCT see for Rossendale a potential problem in areas close to neighbours with high demand: Bury and Rochdale, and low demand: Hyndburn and Burnley. E. RCT see as still relevant comments on abandoned 2015 Local Plan's Housing Needs</p> <p>The 1951 Census shows Rossendale with a population of 68958 living in 22550 dwellings. The 1971 Census shows 61857 in 22460 dwellings. In 2001 the Census shows 65600, and the Council Tax Dwelling Stock Total was 28960. By 2009 LCC estimate population at 67100, and 2009 Council Tax Dwelling Stock Total is 30544.</p> <p>We see an occupancy reducing from c3/dwelling, c2.75/dweling, c2.3/dwelling, to an estimated c2.2/dwelling. Will the 2011 Census help to show where Rossendale's housing stock is becoming so underoccupied? With the retirement of the "baby-boom" generation will this underoccupation increase?</p> <p>To counter the Local Plan's aim for 3 and 4 bed "asprational" needs. Is there an unmet demand for new 2 bedroom 3 person and 3 bedroom 4 person houses, with their wheelchair accessible ground floors as required by current Building Regulations: to facilitate policies for more care in the home?</p> <p>What's the engines driving growth in Executive, Low Cost Market, Affordable and Registered Social Landlord Housing. The RSS's target was 222 dwellings / year from 2003 - 2021, it had a shortfall of c370 due to a market slump, and so we see the :Local Plan11/26's 15 years target is now 3700: (222 x 15 + 370). But is this really just a paper target of convenience, that does not take account of the practicalities: that most of Rossendale's potential housing sites are not large, and further many have access problems of steep roads, that will need significant investment to enable there satisfactory use. And what's real aims? Planned urban villages at 50/Ha or, as appears so frequently in Stage 2, "low density" 25/Ha suburban estates?</p> <p>Compare with other Core Strategies for the period 2011 – 2026:- Warrington, CS estimated 2010 at 198,900*, 9099 dwellings = 0.046d/p *now 202,228. Blackburn + Darwen, CS at 141,200, 9365 dwellings = 0.066d/p. Rossendale, CS at 67,300, 3700 dwellings = 0.055d/p. Given Warrington's strategic location on M6, M62, M56, West Coast Main Line, Liverpool to Manchester Line, future HS2, Manchester Ship Canal, and between Liverpool and Manchester Airports, and no hilly terrain, why should the more remote Pennine Lancashire be aiming for so much more new housing? Are we seeing the same sort of wishful aims that produced that oversized bus station in Preston?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Object	<p>Policy HS1: Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement</p> <p>10. CPRE published research showing the problem of Councils setting inflated targets, as required by the NPPF to be found sound. It has promoted unnecessarily the accelerated countryside loss,. Regrettably, housing assessments produced by local authorities (SHMAs) were shown often to be inaccurate, inflated and unreliable, and are not being balanced with sensible planning for infrastructure, consideration of environmental constraints, and realistic assessments of what housebuilders will be able to deliver. For more details please read the research paper here: http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/housing-and-planning/housing/item/4158-set-up-to-fail-why-housing-targets-based-on-flawed-numbers-threaten-our-countryside</p> <p>11. Therefore CPRE believes the figure of 265 dwellings per annum (dpa) is much too high and will not be found sound at examination.</p> <p>12. The Government is consulting on a new method for calculating housing need and it uses a three step process, to identify a baseline, apply an adjustment to take account of market signals and a cap of up to 40% to ensure delivery. The new indicative assessment of housing need based on proposed formula, 2016 to 2026 new annual housing requirement figure for Rossendale is 212 dwellings per annum (dpa), less than 53 dpa than the 265 dpa identified. The new calculation will take effect from March 2018.</p> <p>13. Over the plan period (2019-2034) this equates to 3,180 homes, 795 less units than the 3,975 figure being consulted upon. If an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare is applied (although this should probably be at least 40 to make the best use of land in the future) this equates to 26.5 hectares less of housing land being needed over the plan period. This can save 26.5 hectares of Green Belt land being released, as the exceptional circumstance no longer exists.</p> <p>14. The North West Regional Spatial Strategy had a 65% brownfield target figure, compared to the unambitious draft local plan target for brownfield development of 20%. CPRE believes the brownfield target should be higher at least 65%. As it stands the policy is non-compliant with the NPPF, or Local Plan Policies SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development and SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt.</p> <p>15. We will scrutinise the Brownfield Register, December 2017 to understand how robust it will be. The public need assurance that all of the land classed as Previously Developed Land (PDL) is included in Part 1 and that sites suitable for housing are given Permission in Principle as Part 2 sites. The Council must do everything in its gift to ensure brownfield sites are recorded thoroughly in order to achieve effective reuse through partnership approaches to regeneration. All brownfield sites captured on previous National Land Use Database records, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS01	Further comment
						Employment Land Registers need to be considered. Also, local property firms have a good idea of clients aspirations for land holdings. 16. Developers must be encouraged to focus activity on PDL in urban locations, and not chasing rural consents. Rossendale Council must properly plan to ensure local plan policies and allocations achieve an adequate level of homes to market, including affordable homes, effectively enabling brownfield regeneration. Allocating too much greenfield land undermines the viability of brownfield land, so it must be strictly controlled, or the local plan will fail in its core purpose of seeking sustainable development.		
1790	David	Trivett			Not Applicable	Policy HS1: Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement. Providing at least 4000 additional dwellings over the plan period equating to 265 dwellings per year. This number may have been correct when the draft was released but; from the Rossendale Free Press article of 22/09/17 I understand this number, though still to be confirmed is now likely to be reduced to 212 dwellings per year following the "Keep Rossendale Green" campaign taken to Whitehall by Councillor Alyson Barnes and Jake Berry MP to protect our green spaces. With consideration to the protection of our "green spaces" I now raise my concerns about the housing proposals related to Bankside Lane Bacup.		
1794			The Methodist Church		Not Applicable	Policy HS1: Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement 2.7 A net housing requirement of 4,000 dwellings, or 265 dwellings per annum (dpa), is established under this policy. Having reviewed the Strategic Housing Market Assessment prepared by Lichfields (December 2016) it is noted that the intended housing requirement is at the bottom end of the recommended range of 265-335 dpa. The figure of 265 dpa should therefore be treated as an absolute minimum and should not in any way be suppressed following the consideration of the revised OAN Methodology that is currently being consulted upon. 2.8 The figure of 265 dpa, although at the bottom end of the SHMA recommendation, does to an extent take into account economic growth and employment led aspirations and the Duty-to-Cooperate requirements given the south of the borough's undeniable relationship with the Bury and Rochdale housing market areas (as confirmed in the SHMA). These factors should continue to be taken into account when establishing the correct housing requirement and a failure to do so would deviate from the tests of soundness when examining Local Plans as set out at paragraph 182 of the Framework.		
Number of comments						HS01	18	
Reference		HS02	Housing Site Allocations					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
9	Sharon	Milton	-		Object	We cannot possibly sustain any more houses in Whitworth , we simply do not have the infrastructures in place , GPs , schools, roads. We have had so many new houses built in the valley recently . The traffic in a morning is already horrendous and if for any reason there a road works it is already a nightmare.		-
13	Lewis	Woodruff	-		Object	Stop any more building of houses in Whitworth. - Road infrastructure totally inadequate for the amount of traffic it will generate. - Already congested at peak times with only one road in and one road out. - Also schools and medical centres need building to support influx of new residents		Stop building houses in Whitworth and leave the green spaces to be enjoyed as they are. - Spoiling everything that makes Whitworth a nice place. At least provide some recreational space of facilities if green spaces are to be developed. Whitworths roads cant sustain anymore traffic its ridiculous
15	Mike	Royds	-	HS2 Tonacliffe	Object	We need to know what provision will be made for roads and traffic which are already heavily congested, what provision for more school places, more doctors etc		not at this time
29	Lynn	Holland	-		Object	Schools are over subscribed already. - Doctors surgery far to small to accommodate more people. - Traffic - roads already overcrowded and in a poor state. - Entrance to new estates not adequate - Services throughout whitworth already overloaded - Electricity and water supplies often faulty		-
30	Jammie	Mc Ninch			Object	The infustructure of the village will not allow anymore development. Schools are over crowded,water and sewer are over powered, not to mentioned roads are congested.		-
34	Marie	Eccles	-		Not Applicable	The main worry that people seem to have about the proposed extra housing developments in Whitworth is the potential extra burden on the infrastructure (schools and doctors' surgeries, sewage systems, increased traffic etc.). I have not been able to find any reassurance in the plan that these will be taken into account and provision made - although I have to say that navigating around the files on the website is extremely difficult, so I may have missed it.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
35	Catherine	Duffy	-	HS2.108 in particular, + all the other proposed sites in Whitworth	Object	I am very concerned about all these proposals, especially Sandbank Gardens! - - 1) Where is the access going to be? Sandbank Gardens is a cul-de-sac with private gardens at the top, it is a very narrow street with already many residents cars parked on the kerb/street. The public house close by is one of the hubs of the community and as such hosts regular events, ie meetings re the local football teams, starts for races and many more. Sandbank Gardens then takes the brunt of people attending these events parking their vehicles on Sandbank Gardens. Maybe the plan is to use Tong End as the access, again another nightmare! On a very narrow over used road. It is used every week day by the waggons up and down to the quarry, lots of visitors to the water ski centre, the reservoir and off road centre in the quarry, along with residents cars parked outside their homes on the road. - - 2) The water and electricity struggles already with the amount of properties in the village. We have frequent disruptions in services in both these areas, more properties on this clearly out of date system would surely lead to even more disruption. - - 3) The majority of the primary schools and the high school are running on full capacity (even with waiting lists), therefore, who will fund the building works and staffing, to accommodate the influx of children wishing to be educated, as I am presuming that the proposed sites would be family homes! - - 4) Our village has one road in and out, which is already busy. The slightest disruption makes for major delays, surely more users would make these delays more permanent.		Leave our village as a village, don't make it into a town. It's facilities and amenities are already at full stretch with no sight of extra funding to accommodate these proposed extra residents!!
41	Catherine	Swift	-		Object	Too many houses for small village - Issues with congestion/traffic on market street - Schools - edenfield, stubbins and haslingden already over subscribed - Few local amenities - v small run down park and community centre		
43	Jill	Hunt	-		Support	Edenfield is the perfect location for us to move to so we support plans for new homes, as there is a real lack of opportunities to purchase new builds in this area. Obviously the impact on local area and residents and improvements to public transport and local infrastructure must be considered carefully as this is critical in ensuring a successful plan for Edenfield.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
48	Chris	Comer	-		Object	Whitworths current infrastructure is over capacity. - - Schools are at capacity with Whitworth residents unable to gain places - - Whitworths one Medical practice is well over capacity with appointments spanning 2 weeks away. They cannot take on more patients without further effecting its current services. - - Whitworths Dental practice has stopped taking on NHS patients and is again over subscribed. Appointments are approximate over 3 weeks away. - - Whitworth has two childrens play areas which are over 2 miles from each other, these are in a diabolical state and give local families little or no use due to their distance from most people and their condition. - - Whitworth is a one road in one road out under funded village. In recent years it has had a massive influx of new builds which have contributed to increased congestion and strain on ALL local services. There are already passed plans for more homes in areas at frankly stupid places that will cause ridiculous and dangerous traffic. - - Overturning current green belt classifications so that it can be built on is an absolute disgrace and an ignorance of the current poor infrastructure of Whitworth and its surround areas. -		
166	Isabel	Hannah			Object	I ask have you seen a plan of Edenfield? Have you seen how there are a few roads where one were tracks? Please realise the the present roads can cope barely with the amount of traffic. I see heavy farm vehicles passing , huge blocks of stone plus large lorries (I count the wheels) apart from other limitations		
211	Sarah	Broxton	-	-	Object	The village has no facilities to sustain the increase in housing and people. The school is small, no shop., pub and very limited parking.		
241	Lyndsay	Hastings			Object	I wish to object on the plans regarding more houses being built in Edenfield. I am no longer an Edenfield resident but feel this move would spoil the highly desirable village. The extra housing that has been built over the last few years has increased congestion and with more housing this will worse. Edenfield has the charm of being a small friendly village, if the plans go ahead to build hundreds of houses, this will no longer be.		
261	David	Eyes	-		Object	Please accept this email as an objection to your plan of building a substantial number of homes within Rossendale over the next 15yrs. This proposal is profit driven as the proposed buildings will only decrease the standard of living in the Borough. I know that elderly neighbours are already in tears at the thought of their current 'green' back yard view will one day be covered in houses. Regards		This smells of greed over common sense

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
286	Christina	Pieper	-	building new houses in Whitworth	Object	Whitworth is far too overcrowded as it is. It is a village and can not facilitate more houses it is not a town.		-
351	James	Fulton			Object	The Rossendale Valley is, as the name suggests, a valley with single road running through the middle. Infilling here and there with new build houses throughout the valley is not only detrimental to the character but it will also have a significant impact on the infrastructure. It already takes 30 minutes to drive from Crawshawbooth to Rawtenstall on a week day morning due to the sheer amount of traffic on the roads. Infilling will only make this worse. Surely the best option would be build on the outer end of the valley, near to the bypass that everyone is trying to reach. There is plenty of space there and a new slip road could be created to allow the new residents immediate access to the bypass. Ewood Bridge and Townsend Fold would be much more suited as there is plenty of spare land such as the old football club and the Mayfield Chicks site. The residents can have easy access to the bypass at Road End, they are near to Haslingden High School and Tesco is there as well. Building on these sites will also be much easier and more attractive to developers as they are easily accessible, flat and will have little impact on local residents are there very few.		-
364	Paul	McAteer	-	4344	Object	I object to this proposal due to the increased population of the village over a short period of time causing traffic chaos to the village and increased pressure on the social infrastructure and resources locally. There appears very little coverage of the damage to the green belt area in this vicinity. The proposal should be rejected.		No
389	Kirsty	Stott	-		Object	To many houses being built on the area our roads schools and facilities won't stand to footprint.		Taking away all our green belt land .
437	Geoffrey	Bramwell	-	Sites for the proposed circa 400 new homes not yet identified	Object	Whitworth is already a very busy village with too few schools, General Practitioner service, poor transport connection that cannot support the traffic streams currently trying to depart/enter to/from Whitworth. It would not be terribly difficult and could have minimal effect on local households if the authorities and government looked at a new route over the moor connecting to the M66.		Only that I will write to our local MP to express my concerns. It is to be hoped that councillors will include their suggestions/support for the schemes to increase the housing stock in future canvassing material.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
521	Lynn	Phillips	-	HS2, South West plan: Edenfield and across the Authority	Object	<p>I support the plan for 300 new homes for Edenfield in principle as it would boost the local economy. However the Market Street highway is already difficult to navigate due to parked vehicles either side of the road. How does the highway authority propose to address access for the new development? Surely a new highway infrastructure would have to be constructed. How would this be funded? - - M66: 4000 new homes in Rossendale would decrease the capacity of the motorway. New homes development in Edenfield would be a factor in itself. Capacity is already at maximum. At evening rush hour its often second gear all the way from Bury to Rawtenstall. Regarding Edenfield, access to the M66 would have to be improved: i.e. slip roads into and off the motorway at Edenfield and Ramsbottom. I work in Oldham and drive via the M66 junction at Ramsbottom. Often in the morning the traffic is backed up from the Duckworth Arms at Edenfield to the M66 slip road: it can take 20-30 mins to travel the two miles. - - The overview of the master plan for the 273 new homes off Market St, Edenfield, has an emphasis on the use of public transport and cycling. Public transport is woeful! The X Witch Way service through Edenfield was cancelled 6 years ago. There is no bus service from Edenfield to Rochdale along Rochdale/Edenfield Rd. The current bus service is limited and not frequent. Cycling: sorry but the topography of the area lends itself to only athletes, the average cyclist cant cope with the steepness of our local roads! - - The Metrolink needs extending from Bury to Ramsbottom, Edenfield and beyond, to service the thousands of new commuters the new homes across the borough would create. However not at the expense of the East Lancs railway which brings in much needed tourist income to the area and our history needs to be preserved for future generations. - - Finally, with regard to 4000 new proposed homes across the authority: the additional council tax receipts will not be sufficient to cover the cost of the required increase in services such as policing, emergency services, schools. GP surgeries, refuse collection, highway maintenance, adult social care, environmental services etc etc. With ever decreasing central government payments, how would Rossendale support this? - - -</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
639	Roy	Lister	-		Not Applicable	<p>PROPOSED LOCAL PLAN FOR ROSSENDALE - - I attended the consultation meeting held at Kay St. Baptist Church on Thurs. 7 Sept. - - With regards to the proposed local plan for Rossendale, I wish to make the following comments. - - There appears to be a tremendous amount of proposed housing developments alongside the Newchurch Road corridor. - - Newchurch Rd. already has to cope with an ever increasing volume of traffic. I feel that to place more vehicles on this road will create increased problems for drivers. Traffic has been increasingly problematic over the last two years or so. This is due to the fact that Alder Grange School, along with LCC decided in their wisdom, to build a rear access tarmac path which links to Hurst Lane. This has invited a large volume of traffic to avoid having to travel along the busy A682, Burnley Rd. then having to turn into Constablee housing estate to access the school via Calder Road. The A682 is busy enough at the best of times but exceptionally busy at early morning/mid afternoon times as school commences and closes. Much of the School traffic can now avoid long delays due to being held up at the traffic lights outside of the Market/Old Ram's Head pub. It is now using Union Street to gain access to Hurst Lane and the rear entrance to the school instead. - - Because most residents on Union St. park their cars outside their houses, Union St. is a single track road 100% of the time. Upon reaching the top of Union St. traffic has to make a right turn into Hurst Lane round a blind corner. At this point on Hurst Lane, there are no pavements for the first 100 yards: the lane is quite narrow. School children have to walk in the middle of the road at the very point where cars have just driven around a blind corner. This creates a danger to both the children and to drivers. - - Union St. itself has a very steep incline. In Winter it is especially a very difficult road to drive on and unless you have a four wheel drive vehicle you will be unlikely to ascend Hurst. Lane. Trying to attempt to descend is extremely difficult in icy conditions. It has parked vehicles 90% to 100% of the time on one side of the road, if you happen to start sliding as you descend, you have very little manoeuvring space to avoid colliding with another vehicle particularly at the junction with Newchurch Road. - - Furthermore since the introduction of the rear entrance to the high school, it has been calculated by Residents that Union St. and Hurst Lane have experienced a higher volume of traffic to the tune of 10,600 to 13,680 per annum. The regular increased volume in traffic generates this figure. - - Calculation used:- 30 to 40 vehicles per visit, twice per day (Morning & Aft.) = 60 to 80 vehicles per day. - - Number of school days per year, (Days per year – 365 less (14 wks. Holidays) 14 times 5 = 90 - less 52 weekends = 104 Total usage days 365 minus 194 - - Days of school days therefore 365 minus 194 equals = 171 days per yr. At average of say 70 per day equals a traffic surge of 11,970 per year on road's and lanes that were not designed for such volumes. - - In respect of the junction at the bottom of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>Union St. with Newchurch Rd, there are two shops and two bus stops(one either side of the road) close to the junction. Regularly cars,van's and lorries are parked outside these shops. This creates a gridlock at this point.</p> <p>Newchurch Rd. in this area reduced to being a single lane road for much of the day. This has proved to be a nightmare for those residents of Union St., Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent, Waingate Village and Chapel Hill, wishing to gain access to Newchurch Rd. - - Union Street is the ONLY highway available from the area to access the Town. The bottom end of Hurst Lane, connecting to and passing the top of Whithead St. and leading into Crankshaw St as shown on highway maps, is only just wide enough for the smallest of vehicles. No Emergency vehicles, Fire, Ambulance etc. would be able to access the whole of the Chapel Hill area using this section of the road as it is far to narrow. - - Waingate Road, leading off Newchurch Rd. up to Waingate Village as shown on the highways map, is only a footpath/bridle-path with no capacity for vehicles. - - Any changes to the Urban Boundary, in order to facilitate further housing development in the Springside, Higher Cloughfold and Newchurch area would put tremendous pressure on the volume of traffic using Newchurch Road, which is already full to bursting. - - It is noted that planning permission has already been granted for two five bedroom houses outside of the existing Urban Boundary, on a greenfield site. (2015/0308.) although according to the draft local plan, it is not proposed to move the Urban Boundary line to incorporate the area of land where these houses are to be built. Therefore the Council are already proposing to allow houses to be built in the Countryside, outside of the Urban Boundary. - - In view of the news that the target for house building in the area that the Central Government are imposing has dropped by some 50%. I would strongly urge the Council to abandon any proposals to develop outside the Urban Boundary and especially to look very closely at any development proposals that would affect the Newchurch Rd. and Springside area's of the town. - - Please try and concentrate on developing any Brownfield sites along with redundant buildings and former Industrial sites. - - SUGGESTED SITES:- - 1) The old Poundland store site on Newhalley Rd. - 2) The old Broadley Factory site on Burnley Road (A682) - 3) Land opposite the bottom of Woodcroft St. (A682) The old White Factory site. - 4) Land at the old Social Services day care centre on Haslingden old road. - (This building has been closed for over two years at least) - 5) Site of "Horncliffe House" on Bury Rd. (Ex A56) Closed and in disrepair. - 6) Site of former Holmfield Garage on Burnley Rd (A682) - -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
662	Joanne	Ormerod	-	Helmshore	Object	I want to object to any form of housing being built in Helmshore. Our village (or village that was) is being destroyed. I moved to Helmshore in 1994 when it was a quiet community. Since then i have seen at least ten developments of 3 or more houses. Every small space is being filled and not always with quality housing in keeping with the area. The roads are busier and are rarely repaired or prepared for the over use. I work at the local primary school where more and more children are being squeezed in yet funding is being cut and support staff are being lost. I accept some of the housing in Helmshore is justified and has been built on brown field sites. More and more now i am seeing plans and rumours of green sites being destroyed. Helmshore is a desirable place to live but not for long. New houses are being squeezed in but the desirable local schools that bring families to Helmshore are not even available to people who have lived in Helmshore for years as the catchment area is so overcrowded that houses 5 minutes from school have to be allocated school places in Haslingden! Stop the building now and think about what you are doing to lovely individual places like Helmshore. They are being turned into toy towns with queues of traffic everywhere and every green space filled with bland houses .		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
677	Phil	Ramsden	Lindon Park Development s Ltd		Object	<p>Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations - - This policy identifies a number of sites on the Policies Map that have been allocated for housing development. The Representor does not object to the intent and purpose of the policy but it does question why a site off Lindon Park Road, Ewood Bridge, Haslingden is not included. - - This site was granted outline planning permission for 235 dwellings in 1972 (under planning permission ref no. 13/2/2600LA). Subsequently, a further detailed planning permission was granted for 231 dwellings at the site (under planning permission ref no. 13/2/2758) albeit the extent of the application site was slightly smaller than the area covered under planning permission ref no. 13/2/2600LA. In or around 1974, 44 of the consent dwellings under planning permission 13/2/2758 were constructed and later sold and occupied. As a consequence of the fact that the relevant detailed planning permission has been implemented, as evidenced by the fact that 44 of the permitted dwellings were built and stand and remain occupied today, confirms that the other non-implemented elements of the permission can be built out in future. The owners of the site, the Representors in this instance, have sought learned counsel's opinion on this matter, which was provided to a prospective housebuilder in 2013, which concludes the same. As such, this site, for which we would be happy to provide further details and background information and documentation on, should be included in the schedule introduced by this policy as a residential allocation for up to 187 dwellings (number not yet built out under planning permission ref no. 13/2/2758) or another number to be defined through a fresh planning permission. - - The fact that this site benefits from a planning permission for residential development raises the question about whether all of the sites forming part of Policy HS2 need to be retained. In the Representor's view, a number of sites currently included in the policy are not obvious development sites by reference to site and other related constraints. For example (in no particular order): HS2.82, HS2.84, HS2.24, HS2.33, HS2.53, HS2.80, HS2.32, HS2.24, all of which raise different issues regarding whether they are suitable and viable for development of housing and within the plan period, a key issue being that many would seriously impact on existing urban areas and cause urban cramming by virtue of the fact that no new infrastructure is planned to cope with the additional development. Indeed, the Representor is of the view that the Council should give serious consideration to adopting a new and more sustainable development strategy which involves releasing Green Belt in the southern section of the district so that new development has better access to the primary route network, public transport and main centres both in and out of the borough. - - Regardless of this preferred strategy, the Representor is of the view that all of the sites currently proposed to be allocated need to be fully and properly reviewed to ascertain their suitability for development, and linked to this the Council should consider formulating an infrastructure</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						masterplan to ensure that with all of the planned development in place, the urban areas of the borough can still operate effectively and sustainably. It also needs to carry out a full and proper audit to ensure that sites like the Representor's are not missed or ignored, given the significant role they might be able to play in housing delivery. -		
706	Jackie	Taylor	-		Object	Whitworth has green belt areas that support and enable a multitude of wildlife to flourish - - Proposed change if use of these sites in the plan will be detrimental to any protected species - - Whitworth is already experiencing pressures of more recent housing builds---the infrastructure of roads, schools and health is not equipped for the numbers of proposed new people that additional housing will bring		I trust our council will consider the unintended consequences of harming our village and take a responsible decision to safeguard our environment for the people and wildlife
801	Melanie	Spence	-	Tonnacliffe and whitwirth	Object	More housing will put more strain on already bad roads. Not enough schools or doctors places let alone policing which is non existent in whitworth		-
906	Graham	Smyth	-		Object	Only that caution should be exercised in proposing development in Bacup because of the wider infrastructure / access / capacity issues highlighted in my above representation.		While accepting that the task set the council is a difficult one, it is my view that further destruction of the countryside areas in and around Bacup should be resisted, and that Bacup has neither the capacity nor the infrastructure to absorb a high number of houses. Bankside Lane in particular is unsuitable as an access route for more housing, which would create dangers and obstacles for vital services.
914	Daniel	Allen	-		Object	HS2.86 - this development is above a school and the traffic would present a danger to kids. It is already dangerously packed with people and cars at picking up and dropping off time, extra cars would only make this worse. Also the exit to Newchurch Road from St Peters is almost blind, extra cars using this exit would only increase the risk of accidents. - HS2.53 - this land is always boggy - building on here would cause an increase in flood risk. - HS2.54 - this would build over a current wildlife corridor as this land was intended for. Access from Peel St and exiting on the 'bad bend' on Newchurch Road would also increase risk of accidents. - HS2.82 - the south west end of this development would be over precious wild land bordering on Staghills Woods and for the number of houses which could be accomodated in this area is surely unnecessary, and access would be difficult at best.		Some of these proposed developments need further consideration as to their merit with regards to road safety, unnecessary destruction of wild land, flood risk and drainage issues. Consideration also needs to be given to how the local area can support these extra houses with regards to school places, medical facilities, road capacity, dirty water drainage and sewage. I'm not convinced that this has been carefully considered.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
917	A J	Hill	-	General Objection To All Building Sites In Whitworth	Object	Reasons for objection. - Wildlife, All the land in the Whitworth and Shawforth area that is not built on is of great importance to the local wildlife ie, Deer, Badgers,Bats, Various species of birds,Foxes,Hares to name but a few. - - The infrastructure in the area is already at breaking point Doctors and Dentists are struggling to accommodate existing residents. On a personal note I had to travel to Rochdale walk in centre with a bad ear infection when i was told that I would have to wait for one week to get an appointment at Whitworth Medical Centre. - The existing Gas Water and Electricity supplies are continuously having to be repaired, all these supplies are situated under the main road which runs through Whitworth. This is the only road in and out of the valley and is frequently gridlocked due to temporary traffic lights. It is not uncommon to have tailbacks of traffic of between four to five miles in length. The Gas main outside my property has fractured twice in the last four years, in the last instance five properties were evacuated whilst these repairs were undertaken due to the high risk of explosion. - - Landscape. The landscape is such that Whitworth is situated in a valley and due to the changes in weather patterns a lot of the land that is not built on is required to help to soak and help drain the heavy rain that the area has been experiencing over the last few years. To build on it would only increase the risk of flooding.		In my opinion if the Government is intent on putting pressure on local councils to build houses, it would make much more sense to create new towns and villages instead of proposing to build in areas where it is quite obviously not where the majority of people want them to be.
1058	Faye	Murphy	-	HS3.12	Object	I have lived in Edenfield all my life and I think adding extra housing is not the way forward. There is not enough schools, GPs and parking space so I think it isn't a good idea.		-
1158	Richard	Hughes	-		Object	Whitworth is a single through road village. Congestion is increasing on all side roads with the current housing stock additional housing in the village will only add to this issue. Other local infrastructure is failing - e.g. Water supplies. There are frequent outages in the village - Tonnacliffe being a prime example. Adding additional demand on water will lead to pressure being increased in the pipes leading to additional outages. One GP surgery which is at bursting point. The most excellent Whitworth Community High School is at absolute capacity, the kids can hardly move in the corridors now , additional demand cannot be catered for within the existing buildings. - The village is full, no more houses -		as above
1177	trevor	thomson			Object	to many houses in whitworth now not enough schools and only one road get wise		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1199	Wendy	Hamer	-		Object	Whitworth is village which is already struggling with traffic travelling to other towns is a nightmare most days - Also the doctors is heavy under pressure getting an apt is pot luck as with so many now registered ,,schools are now full so where are those pre school children already in village going to go ,before you even build more houses bring more children in - All the services are already stretched we have regular water failure,power failure building more house will surely have an impact on these services as there is no mention of updates to the services nor has there been for years - Also the police,fire and ambulance services are struggling to provide adequate cover of Whitworth now due to government cuts ,we have in recent months had a very high number of crimes - We have one road which at peak times is sometimes very congested the proposed site one near a school which at school times now is hazardous to all children due to the volume of cars ,another is off the main road with a street which is not wide enough now for traffic - Whilst I understand the need for more Social housing that our children will need to rent I understand some of the proposed sites in whitworth are for private sale where does that help our already struggling village as those who buy are usually from else where and will want to commute to work on an already packed road -		Before plans to build further housing perhaps up date the services ,look at another road to Rochdale the road over lobden/Skye would be a good alternative if it was brought up to standard then if road closed at least could get to work and not risk losing their jobs
1269	Alex	Rushton	-		Object	The traffic in and out of Whitworth is already a nightmare! More houses means more cars and with one road in and one road out it's not feesable. - Also I moved into Whitworth because of the beautiful countryside surrounding my home. I don't want to see more housing blocking the way. - - -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1273	Robert	Baron	-		Object	General objection to the building of housing throughout the area of Whitworth. - The proposed sites for these houses would require the destruction of woodland having an incredibly negative impact on the health and wellbeing of the wildlife and the people living in these areas. - Also, some proposed housing would put a strain on the drainage that is already at near breaking point, leaving many residents at the risk of major flood damage affecting infrastructure and local businesses. - Also, since there is only one way in and out of whitworth, the roads are already at breaking point. Traffic is regularly backed up and a 5 minute journey often takes over an hour due to the sheer volume of traffic on the road. Adding further properties to this would only increase the misery on whitworth drivers who already have to endure ridiculous traffic jams on a regular basis. The increase of traffic will put lives at risk due to the number of vehicles using an already oversubscribed road. - - As some of this housing is proposed to be built on greenbelt land, some of which has already had planning permission denied in the past, please can somebody explain the exceptional circumstances that will enable these developments to go ahead? - - Our water, electricity, internet, and gas are regularly pushed to the limits. Regular power cuts and water problems occur already so building these extra houses will put even more pressure on these services and pile even more misery on the residents of whitworth. - The schools are already under immense pressure, more houses will bring more families and more children and teh schools will not be able to cope. Also, the extra road traffic at school times will not only increase volume of traffic on the roads but it will also put poeple's lives at risk. - The fact that the council is even considering building over 350 more houses in whitworth when we dont even have the infrastructure, resources, roads and schools to cope with the population at present is ridiculous.		-
1319	Raymond	Teague	-	41	Object	Local infrastructure not in place to cope with increase in housing		-
1338	Alexandra	Foster	-		Object	Whitworth (and surrounding areas) is a small village which is already over capacity, and local resources stretched. - Building of new houses of the quantity that the council propose is going to be detrimental to the everyday lives of inhabitants of the village including parking, GP services and crime are a few to name. - The surrounding areas are idyllic and habour various varieties of wildlife and to see this be destroyed is not right. This village sits on green belt land and this should not be tampered with build houses that the village cannot accomodate.		-
1340	Rachel	Jones	-		Object	I do not believe that edenfield infrastructure can cope with the extent of the building proposed. - Traffic/pollution and parking is already a problem, which is further exacerbated when traffic is directed from the bypass.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1346	Samantha	Culshaw	-		Object	I am worried about the amount of cars this will bring to our roads and how over crowded our schools will become. I. Like oue village and how small it is, that's why I bought a house here. If it was bigger it wouldn't be as quaint.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1382	Gaynor	Mellor	-	Whitworth	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - DON'T FORGET EACH ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CAN PUT		
1421	VALERIE	BENNETT			Object	The areas that are being considered for change of policy ie Green Belt and the areas in consideration for new housing. I am objecting on the grounds primarily that the infra structure of this small town just couldnt sustain the increase in volume of cars that would be caused by more new builds - primarily Whitworth is one road running through the town- the current volume of traffic is already more than enough to cause travel disruptions and when the snow arrives and inclement weather this can cause major issues even now - so if the plans to increase the volume of housing within the town go ahead - then the traffic will become a major headache for existing and new residents to the area. The Green Belt areas should remain as they are - that being areas for people to visit and enjoy - to remove the habitat of many wild animals and flora is not acceptable Whilst I appreciate that new builds are needed to keep economies alive and for them to thrive - they should be built on existing sites that are residential areas within the current Local Plan and new sites shouldnt not be placed at the detriment of Green Belt Land.		I Hope you do take into account the feelings of the people that do live in this town - as it is important we do protect our heritage and that consideration is given to what must be protected for future generations and balance that out with what is needed within the Borough and where the new builds are best placed to be so as to keep a balance for everyone within the Borough - please dont destroy this community and cause animosity please reconsider where the new builds are best to be built
1426	David	Evans	-		Object	Firstly the proposed development is on green belt land which under central government guidelines should only be permitted under exceptional circumstances. There is absolutely no evidence included in the local plan suggesting exceptional circumstances exist that warrant housing development on greenbelt land in Edenfield. - Secondly infrastructure in Edenfield including the road network, school facilities and medical provision are not sufficiently robust to support any further housing development.		No.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1458	Jodie	Fairfax	-	Housing Site Allocations - specifically the sites behind Bankside Lane and at the back of Rooley View, but on housing development in general on any green land	Object	<p>I am a current resident of Bacup living on Edward Street with my husband. My parents (who live on Rooley View) and my sister and her family who live on Bankside Lane will also be objecting as will many of their neighbours. - - Empty houses already in Bacup abd Stacksteads - Firstly, I question the need for housing at all. If it is proven that housing is required, then there are hundreds of current buildings lying vacant in Bacup, as well as vacant industrial units where housing could easily be developed without touching the green land around Bacup and it's surrounding areas. In fact, from my house, within 20 yards of my front door, there are 4 houses boarded up that could easily be affordable housing. Not to mention no end of vacant properties on Newchurch Road through Bacup and Stacksteads. The Britannia Estate is still partially empty and those houses have been on the market for 2 -3 years already. - - Infrastructure - we have no police dedicated to the area; schools that are already oversubscribed, no high school or colleges; roads are already in a state of disrepair; public transport links are confined to the centre only; the healthcare in the area could not sustain the influx - doctors, dentists, not to mention no hospital. - - Width of roads (congestion) and width and lack of paths - specifically looking at Bankside Lane, the roads are already congested, double parking is rife. My husband drives a van and struggles to drive it up Bankside. The volume of vehicles required for a large housing development would not be feasible on the current road structures let alone the volume of extra residents using the road. Also, the paths are already too narrow for - the elderly, disabled and parents with prams and young children. - - Surface drainage problems and sewerage problems - possible flooding in some of the areas (e.g. Bankside Lane). Also, there is already existing issues with sewerage on Bankside Lane. The pipes frequently get blocked and overflow. My brother in law is a water specialist and had regularly unblocked it with rods so it stops running into his and other residents gardens. More sewage is not sustainable with the current system. - - Traffic in and out of Bacup at peak times - I commute to Salford daily. It often takes me 30 - 40 minutes to drive the 10 minutes to Rawtenstall at rush hour. This would increase. - - Wildlife and Areas of natural beauty - As already mentioned, I don't believe there is a need to build on green land, for example, behind Bankside near Animal Quackers. The impact on local residents, the environment and wildlife in the area will be catastrophic, and when there are many other options within current buildings and land, and so many empty houses, I don't believe this is needed. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1461	Peter	Toulmin	-		Object	All the greenbelt land is of great importance. We have rare species of protected newts, deer that sleep within the wooded areas at night, bats that roost in the trees and badgers, foxes and hares that exist in the areas. - The one and only main road that runs through Whitworth is already full to capacity, and more vehicles that will be brought about by this planned house building will only make the problem worse. Only one set of temporary traffic lights causes absolute havoc throughout the valley, increasing travelling times and air pollution. - Access to the proposed sites is only accessible down narrow streets or tracks.		-
1475	Kim	March	-		Object	The sites relating to Whitworth in respect of the draft local plan do not take into account the infrastructure of Whitworth. There is one road into and out of the village and this is extremely congested during peak times, having queued for an average of 45 minutes to an hour to get to Rochdale most week days. Further houses will make this bad problem much worse. You have made no proposal as to how the extra cars will be accommodated in terms of egress from the village? - The school have waiting lists, so presumably you will advise new residents that they will be unable to get their child into a local Whitworth school if they are moving from a different area? Again, your draft policy makes no mention of this issue? - The GP surgery states that the average appointment waiting time is four weeks at least, so further residents will increase this problem. Your draft plan makes no allowance for a second GP surgery, and so again how do you plan to resolve this issue? - Your draft plan is flawed as it looks at the sites in isolation. Your plans do not take into account an already bursting infrastructure within the village. - -		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1478	N/A	N/A	Winfields Holdings Ltd and Winfield's Ltd		Object	<p>As set out above, in order to meet the Borough's identified housing need and reduce pressure on greenfield sites, historic employment land that has little or no prospect of being developed should be released either as part of a mixed use scheme or for stand alone residential development. The land at Hud Hey (EMP2.14) extends to over 8Ha and much of it is long-term vacant despite having being allocated for employment purposes since at least 1995. A restricted area currently accommodates Winfield's Limited's warehousing and head office operations, but It is the company's intention to relocate these operations to the company's site at Acre, as indicated by the representations submitted with respect to Policy SD2 (thereby retaining it and expanding its existing contribution to local employment).</p> <p>The land currently identified for employment purposes includes a number of residential properties which extend into the northern section of the site as well as being located to the west of an existing residential area that extends along much of its eastern boundary. The site also includes an extant consent within the recently listed Britannia Mills for retail use.</p> <p>A significant proportion of the site has historically been cleared in order to make it more attractive to the market, but without any interest arising despite being allocated for employment purposes since at least 1995. In this respect, Government is clear, as set out at Paragraph 22 of the NPPF, that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of them being used for that purpose.</p> <p>As identified, there is a recognised supply of vacant employment sites of this nature within the borough with there being no reasonable prospect of them being used for the allocated purpose. Government states that alternative uses should be treated on their merits with regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities. It is not suggested that employment uses are necessarily excluded but rather that the site is identified as being suitable for residential purposes. In this manner, the site would make a meaningful contribution to the Council's housing requirement on a brownfield site in a sustainable location close to a range of opportunities and services that are well served by public transport. This would, in turn, reduce the need to release greenfield sites.</p> <p>The status of the site has, therefore, changed since its initial allocation for employment purposes prior to 1995, with the grant of a retail consent within Britannia Mill (lawfully commenced) demonstrating that the site is already being used for mixed use purposes. The recent Grade II Listed status accorded to the Mill requires an alternative approach, particularly given the cost of renovating and maintaining this building, which the allocation also needs to address.</p> <p>In summary, the site should be allocated for mixed-use and/or residential</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	------	-----------------

purposes.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1488	Karen	Grantham	-	HS2 Combined	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. Tonacliffe school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school and residents, increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked every day not only at rush hour. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others be overlooked and I bought it knowing it had a great view up the hill. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public</p>		I'm sure i could think of many more things to say about how much I love Whitworth and how this ridiculous proposal affects the town but my 600 words should cover it for now

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	------	-----------------

footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - Ask yourself- After reading all of these points which have been thought about and agreed by many of the residents and If YOU lived in this area would you be happy with these proposals and the massive impact it would have on you, your family, your home and the area?

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1489	Peter	Wallace		HS2 Combined	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. - 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. - 3. Tonacliffe school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school and residents, increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. - 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. - 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? - 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. - 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. - 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked every day not only at rush hour. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. - 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. - 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. - 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. - 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - My house and others be overlooked and I bought it knowing it had a great view up the hill. - 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. - 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. - 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. - 17. A public</p>		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - Ask yourself- After reading all of these points which have been thought about and agreed by many of the residents and If YOU lived in this area would you be happy with these proposals and the massive impact it would have on you, your family, your home and the area?		
1507	Rachael	Campbell	-		Object	I feel that the proposal of new homes could not be supported by the infrastructure and would ruin the village		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1512	David & Ann	Rhodes	-		Not Applicable	<p>These are comments relating to the draft local plans prepared by Rossendale Borough Council -</p> <p>- 1. Oversight. - Abbreviation - RBC - Rossendale Borough Council - Because of topography of the area, and a lack of homogeny, there is a substantial case for looking at local plans in a strictly local, rather than borough-wide context. The Whitworth district is at the periphery of Rossendale and surveys over a period of years have consistently shown that Whitworth is more closely associated with the Rochdale Metropolitan Borough in relation to housing, employment and recreational services. These observations relate solely to the proposals in relation to the Whitworth Township, and not to such proposals as relate to the wider Rossendale Borough Council.</p> <p>- 2. Pre-disposition to develop - The documents prepared by RBC appear to be pre-disposed to development within the Borough, and actions such as the borough positively seeking nomination of land for development appears to reinforce this impression, as such lands appear, in relation to the Whitworth area, to be put forward for housing development in the plan and no land has been identified for purposes other than housing development. There is negligible evidence in the documents produced by RBC to show high projected housing demand and certainly none in relation to the Whitworth area which, as mentioned already, is more closely linked to Rochdale Metropolitan Borough. In documents of the Rochdale Metropolitan Borough showing their local planning proposals, these documents do not reveal any pressing significant development requirements for their area - and therefore by substantial implication, the Whitworth district.</p> <p>- 3. The Whitworth District - a) The Whitworth area is a 'ribbon' township: it has one major road which traverses the valley between moorland hills. All traffic - road access of any kind has to use this single (2 single lanes, one in each direction) road, including all emergency vehicles and emergency services (it should be noted that there are no police, fire, ambulance, or accident services or facilities in the Whitworth area, therefore all residents in this area rely ENTIRELY on this lifeline). Any problem in this road, and there have been many, involves a diversion of 14 miles to Rochdale. This is a major and significant limitation to the continuing development of this district, yet RBC in its infrastructure plan document of July 2017, makes no reference to this severe limitation to the further development of the district.</p> <p>- b) The one road contains all of the major services to the area beneath its surface. Any problem in these services immediately leads to disruption to traffic in the one road. It is reasonable to assume that some local, regional or government agency will be able to quantify days and hours of delays in recent years, which should be quantified and presented by RBC if its development proposals - which would lead to significant increase in traffic volume - are to be considered. Presumably, RBC has already undertaken studies of traffic volume in the district, and such studies will be made readily available in further consultation</p>		I should appreciate an acknowledgement so that I can be reassured that my comments have been received

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>of RBC proposals. - c) Local Services - electric and water especially - are already evidencing problems in coping with the increasing demand which has been caused by developments of the last decade in the Whitworth district. Subjectively, there are reports of reductions in water pressure and residents installing pressure compensating devices and reducing the size/bore of shower-heads because of the deterioration in water pressure. Similarly, there have been a number of recent occasions where leaks have led to interruptions to water supplies. It would appear that electricity supplies are similarly finely balanced with at least three major interruptions to supply in the last year or so. This information should be available to RBC from the various utility companies, and it would be prudent for the Council to investigate the position regarding gas supply, and sewage capacity also. - d) RBC proposals seem to envisage housing development only. - i) There is no evidence of any development of employment opportunity, nor commercial premises in the proposal. The absence of commercial development would mean that all employment would arise outside the district. It is reasonable to conclude that this would further exacerbate transport pressure on the single road. Further, the jobs density data indicates that for every two people aged 16-64 there is one job available in Rossendale. It would be irresponsible of RBC to sanction housing development where little or no provision has been made to increase employment opportunities. - ii) The Council has already recognised that Primary school provision in the Whitworth area will not sustain further development. If the Council is proposing to increase school provision in the area, this could not be met by a further school: there will be no land remaining if the Council's development proposals are approved. - iii) RBC has a responsibility to build balanced communities: communities where an area is not blighted by over-development and where the provision of additional housing is not the sole consideration. There is nothing in the Council's proposals which suggest that the Council has given even cursory consideration to the wider needs of the community. Where are the social/health, recreational and community provisions that equate to a reasonable quality of life for residents? Are the Council really pretending that there will be a continuing void, and that demand and expectations for such service provision will not rise exponentially in the next 15 years? - e) RBC has failed to identify a need in this district for further development. There is nothing in the Council's documentation which identifies a need for further development in this district. There is no identified need based on unsuitable housing stock - the 3.8% is the lowest in rossendale except for prosperous area of helmshore/edenfield. There is no action needed on grounds of affordability of housing: affordability test results – Proportion of Existing Households Unable to Afford LQ Market Housing - Whitworth second lowest after Bacup. - No doubt others will raise issues relating to the suitability of specific areas but I shall confine my observations to just one - how can the Council consider</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						further development beneath a reservoir that is the subject of 48-hour inspection regime because of fears about its stability: if you would not build a Primary School on such a site then the question of housing should be a non-starter also. Put allotments there, or leave it as a walking and recreation area. I shall leave to others to make representations about any proposals for the unwelcome development of green belt when the Council has failed to justify that any development is appropriate for the Whitworth area. - - Ann & David Rhodes - 9th October, 2017 -		
1515	Nikita	Hanson	-		Object	Whitworth is already at its stretch with educational needs, school's and medical services at a push. The traffic is on a constant rise and I feel more houses would only make the above matters even more demanding and unmanageable. -		No
1537	John	McGuinness	-		Not Applicable	Due to the impact on biodiversity and loss of greenbelt land there do not seem to be any plans for further Local Nature Reserves which would help to mitigate the impact on wildlife, flora and fauna. - - Will there be increased tree planting to replace tr		You seem to be trying to implement a plan where nearly all patches of green within the urban boundary are built on. The hillsides may be green (for now) but all small breathing spaces seem to be a target for building on. Sustainable; how can building more houses on any green area be sustainable? Once land is lost to development, it's lost forever.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1538	Mike	Burgess		All HS2 locations	Object	<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public footpath (Right of way) could be lost. - 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an</p>		<p>1. Wildlife – All the greenbelt land is of great importance to the local wildlife of Whitworth. Deer Sleep within the Forest areas at night. We have rare protected newts living in the pond. Badgers/Foxes and Hares are often seen with in this area. Bats nest in the forest. 2. Loss of Trees - The forest at Tonacliffe would have to be cut down a totally unnecessary action once again having a negative effect on the local environment. 3. The local school at both dropping off and collection time around Tonacliffe area is already very dangerous for the children. The impact of more cars passing could be fatal. Parking around that area is already a concern for the school increasing traffic will make it worse. Local residents regularly voice their concerns on this. 4. A Culvert runs through the middle of the Tonacliffe proposed site which takes land drain water off the moors this is already at near bursting point when it is heavy rain. If this site goes ahead I believe we are in danger of flooding. 5. Landscaping - The site geographically is unsuitable for housing the features of the landscape would make it difficult to build. These would need to be radically altered in order to build. Has a land survey been done? 6. Local amenities such as Schools, Dentists and Doctors are already full and building more housing would have a negative effect on the living standards of the people of Whitworth. 7. The infrastructure of the town is stretched already facilities such as Water, Electric and Gas would need a major uplift to</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
					unbearable strain on this network.			<p>accommodate more housing has this been looked at? We regularly suffer power cuts is this due to other new building developments already completed in Whitworth. 8. The road network both ways to Rochdale and Bacup is already gridlocked. The road was never intended to take such huge amounts of traffic adding more houses will make it worse. Would the increase of residents put a strain on the already poor public transport in and out of the village. 9. If Access to the proposed site is via private roads and in making these roads drive through roads instead of cul-d-sacs would this endanger the lives of the residents living there especially the children. 10. It is Government policy is to protect greenbelt areas except for "Exceptional circumstances" what are those exceptional circumstances. 11. Increased noise pollution - The area is surrounded by wildlife and local residents building in this area would have a detrimental effect on both. 12. What would the impact be on the carbon footprint of the valley ? - 13. Loss of privacy - Would my house and others be overlooked. 14. If the houses will be higher than ours due to the landscape we would suffer a loss of light and overshadowing. 15. The safety of all the local residents would be put at risk with the increase of traffic including local children who play near the proposed access roads. 16. Some of the areas and the surrounding areas have already had planning refused in the past and nothing has changed since that application apart from more wildlife moving in to the area. 17. A public</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
								<p>footpath (Right of way) could be lost. 18. Local drainage cannot cope with the usage now would more residents put an unbearable strain on this network. - DON'T FORGET EACH ADULT IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD CAN PUT IN THEIR OWN OBJECTION FORM TO THE BUILDING WORK. Extract from the Governments Planning Policy Statement - Protection and Enhancement of the Environment 17. The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and historic environment, in both rural and urban areas. Planning policies should seek to protect and enhance the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole. A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. Those with national and international designations should receive the highest level of protection. 18. The condition of our surroundings has a direct impact on the quality of life and the conservation and improvement of the natural and built environment brings social and economic benefit for local communities. Planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design, conservation and the provision of public space. 19. Plan policies and planning decisions should be based on: –up-to-date information on the environmental characteristics of the area; – the</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
								potential impacts, positive as well as negative, on the environment of development proposals (whether direct, indirect, cumulative, long-term or short-term); and, – recognition of the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage. Planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, planning authorities and developers should consider possible mitigation measures. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. In line with the UK sustainable development strategy, environmental costs should fall on those who impose them – the “polluter pays” principle.
1539	Gary	Wright	None		Object	Road infrastructure cannot take the amount of traffic in or out of Bacup already one road works on Bacup rd (which must be the most dug up rd in the country) causes traffic chaos at peak periods and it's getting worse Do not allow any more housing developments in the area for this reason alone		-
1550	Shelley	Carter			Object	The on-road parking along Burnley Road (A671) in Weir Village causes a bottleneck and results in congestion at peak times, so any increase in traffic would only add to this problem. The rural location of Weir Village and the lack of a regular bus service means that residents are reliant on their own private vehicles to travel to the following services: shops, doctor, dentist, nursery school, high school, theatre, cinema, railway station. It is also several miles from both the M66 and M65, which are the nearest motorways. As such, I believe that any further housing development in Weir Village is not sustainable and any future Planning Applications should be refused on the above points.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1554	Neil	Grayson			Object	<p>I wish to take part in the initial informal consultation on the draft local plan for Rossendale especially regarding the proposed plans for housing in Whitworth.</p> <p>Whilst appreciating that new housing is required in Rossendale, I am very concerned about the impact that such a large number would have on the village of Whitworth.</p> <p>Perhaps some indication could be given by the Council on proposals to relieve the obvious increase in traffic congestion, oversubscribed schools and medical services, should all these houses be built in Whitworth.</p> <p>I would also object to any planned changes to the Green Belt that may be considered in the Green Belt Review.</p>		
1574	John	Walker			Object	<p>Further to the Rossendale local plan which would appear to be threatening Whitworth with an inordinate amount of new housing. Already Whitworth is under extreme pressure from lack of school places, a road system that is to say the least under extreme pressure from the amount of traffic already dependant on it, To make an appointment at my doctors requires two weeks wait, Many of the proposed sites are unsuitable to carry the amount of traffic already using them, in particular the Cowm Reservoir site, where the road is basically a tarmacked Cart road, further damaged daily by very large and heavy vehicles servicing Cowm Quarry.</p> <p>School times are an accident waiting to happen with inconsiderate parking by parents on the school run.</p> <p>I feel it is absolute lunacy to continue to load a donkey until it collapses, which is what You are doing with Whitworth.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment																																																							
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>HS2: HOUSING SITE ALLOCATIONS</p> <p>The Council has provided a list of Housing Site Allocations that contains both existing planning applications which have not started or are still being built out and are not expected to be completed by the end of the 2017/18 financial year. Although the total potential housing number is 3,622, a density of 30 dwellings per hectare has been applied where there is a lack of detailed information.</p> <p>Of the sites which have been identified, only five are considered to be of significant scale, in that they can accommodate in excess of 100 dwellings. These are listed in the table below.</p> <p>Table 2-1 – Housing Site Allocations >100 Dwellings</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Housing Allocation Ref.</th> <th>SHLAA Ref.</th> <th>Site Name</th> <th>Area (ha)</th> <th>No. of units</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>HS2.7</td> <td>SHLAA16067</td> <td>Land of Cowtoot Lane</td> <td>5.03</td> <td>151</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6-15</td> <td></td> <td>Housing</td> <td>Greenfield</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2.54</td> <td>SHLAA16393</td> <td>Land off Newchurch Road, east of Johnny Barn</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Years 1-5</td> <td></td> <td>Housing</td> <td>Greenfield</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2.71</td> <td>SHLAA16262</td> <td>Land west of Market Street</td> <td>9.12</td> <td>273</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6-15</td> <td></td> <td>Housing</td> <td>Greenfield</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2.78</td> <td>SHLAA16304</td> <td>Grane Village, Land south of Grane Road/ east of Holcombe Road</td> <td>3.53</td> <td>106</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6-15</td> <td></td> <td>Housing</td> <td>Mixed</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2.107</td> <td>SHLAA16005</td> <td>Land off Eastgate</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>111</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 6-15</td> <td></td> <td>Housing</td> <td>Brownfield</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Key Points</p> <p>Of the sites listed above, sites HS2.7 and HS2.107 are located in Bacup and Whitworth respectively, which are both some distance from the A56(T) and hence any traffic generated by housing developments on these sites would be likely to dissipate throughout the local highway network prior to reaching the SRN. Site HS2.54 is located in Rossendale itself, approximately 2km from the A56(T) via the A682. Site HS2.78 is located west of Haslingden, approximately 500m from the A56(T) Haslingden bypass, accessible via the B6232. Whilst these sites are therefore located closer to the SRN, the relatively modest scale of the sites would not necessarily result in a significant or severe traffic impact, however this would be confirmed through a review of Transport Assessments for the sites which would be expected as part of any future planning applications.</p> <p>Site HS2.71 is the largest allocated site for housing and is the Edenfield site discussed in detail in Policy HS3. This is summarised in the following section. The remaining sites are generally small in size and are sporadically located in various locations within the Borough and the traffic impact of such individual</p>	Housing Allocation Ref.	SHLAA Ref.	Site Name	Area (ha)	No. of units	HS2.7	SHLAA16067	Land of Cowtoot Lane	5.03	151	Year 6-15		Housing	Greenfield		HS2.54	SHLAA16393	Land off Newchurch Road, east of Johnny Barn	3.5	105	Years 1-5		Housing	Greenfield		HS2.71	SHLAA16262	Land west of Market Street	9.12	273	Year 6-15		Housing	Greenfield		HS2.78	SHLAA16304	Grane Village, Land south of Grane Road/ east of Holcombe Road	3.53	106	Year 6-15		Housing	Mixed		HS2.107	SHLAA16005	Land off Eastgate	3.7	111	Year 6-15		Housing	Brownfield			
Housing Allocation Ref.	SHLAA Ref.	Site Name	Area (ha)	No. of units																																																											
HS2.7	SHLAA16067	Land of Cowtoot Lane	5.03	151																																																											
Year 6-15		Housing	Greenfield																																																												
HS2.54	SHLAA16393	Land off Newchurch Road, east of Johnny Barn	3.5	105																																																											
Years 1-5		Housing	Greenfield																																																												
HS2.71	SHLAA16262	Land west of Market Street	9.12	273																																																											
Year 6-15		Housing	Greenfield																																																												
HS2.78	SHLAA16304	Grane Village, Land south of Grane Road/ east of Holcombe Road	3.53	106																																																											
Year 6-15		Housing	Mixed																																																												
HS2.107	SHLAA16005	Land off Eastgate	3.7	111																																																											
Year 6-15		Housing	Brownfield																																																												

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>sites is therefore less likely to have a significant impact on the SRN. Notwithstanding this, the potential cumulative impact of this number of sites remains an important consideration and hence it is crucial that all housing sites are appropriately assessed as part of the highways evidence base which is required in order to underpin the Local Plan.</p> <p>As a general point, which applies to all allocated sites, no information is provided in relation to access arrangements. Due to the topography of the Rossendale Valley, in many places there are limited existing access points or opportunities, which creates pressure for new accesses onto the A56(T). It is known that some existing employment sites are served by outdated and substandard 'left-in / left-out' access arrangements and any material increase in traffic using these as a primary access to new site allocations would be of concern.</p> <p>For reference on the above point, Policy Circular 02/2013 sets out a presumption against new accesses and junctions being created on high-speed routes such as the A56(T), except at the plan-making stage where it can be demonstrated that it would facilitate 'strategic, planned growth'. It is Highways England's view that the scale and of these proposed allocated sites would not meet the criteria of being 'strategic' in the context of the Policy Circular / Highways England Licence. It is recommended that careful consideration is given to the access arrangements for all sites and that Highways England is kept informed of this.</p>		
1662	Teresa	Barber		Whitworth	Object	<p>I wish to forward my objection to the proposed building of new houses in Whitworth The area is still a village, whilst it's over stretched with schools GP services and the one road in and out , it would be unsustainable to say the least to add new builds</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations</p> <p>2.31 Taylor Wimpey wholly support the allocation of the Land south of Grane Road, Haslingden (HS2.78) for residential development, and we discuss this site, and its delivery assumptions in more detail in Section 3 of these representations.</p> <p>2.32 We would also reiterate our comments on policy SD2 in that we support the Council's acceptance that Green Belt release is necessary, but that the Plan needs to clearly articulate the exceptional circumstances that support the amendment of their Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>2.33 Looking at the allocations themselves, there are 109 in total, with an expected capacity of 3,622 dwellings based on a standard density 30 dph; which falls short of meeting the proposed housing requirement of 4,000 dwellings in full.</p> <p>2.34 The supporting text does state that sites with extant consent and those nearing completion have not been included with reference to the Council's 5-Year Housing Land Supply Report (2017-2022). This document suggests an existing deliverable supply of 985; however it should be noted that this covers the period 2017-2022, whilst the plan covers the period 2019-2034, and when you consider the 5 year trajectory only 174 of the 985 dwellings are to be delivered from 2019 onwards, with the numbers set out below (2019 onwards in brackets):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwellings under construction: 436 (48) • Dwellings with planning permission: 261 (54) • Dwellings with resolution to grant permission: 256 (40) • Small sites allowance: 32 (32) • Deliverable Capacity: 985 (174) <p>2.35 This generates an overall capacity of 3,796 and suggest that Council's proposed allocations and existing supply will not meet its basic housing requirement to 2034, and this shortfall would be even greater if the housing requirement is increased as we advocate above.</p> <p>2.36 We would ask that the Council provide clarification on this matter, particularly the relationship between the allocation figure in the consultation document and the 5 year supply figures, given the differing time periods; as this is not explained within the Draft Plan.</p> <p>2.37 If our calculations are correct, then clearly the Council will need to allocate additional sites to meet its basic requirements, which we consider should be increased anyway.</p> <p>2.38 Furthermore, the NPPF is categoric that housing requirement is a minimum figure which Local Plans should seek to surpass, and this interpretation has been endorsed in numerous Local Plan examinations. Exceeding the basic requirement also generates a buffer in the supply and provides flexibility within the plan to take account of under-delivery and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>additional choice in the market.</p> <p>2.39 A buffer of sites will therefore provide greater opportunities for the plan to deliver its housing requirement. Such an approach is recommended within the LPEG report to Government (dated March 2016), with recommendation 40 (at Appendix A) noting that Local Plans should: ‘focus on ensuring a more effective supply of developable land for the medium to long term (over the whole plan period), plus make provision for, and provide a mechanism for the release of, developable Reserve Sites equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF. Reserve Sites represent land that can be brought forward to respond to changes in circumstances.’</p> <p>2.40 As such the Council should consider allocating additional sites over and above its housing requirement. Based on the Council’s current requirement a 20% uplift would require allocations for up to 4,800 dwellings, and based on our findings above this would require land for approximately 1,000 additional dwellings to be identified.</p> <p>5 Year Supply</p> <p>2.41 Moving on to the Council’s 5-Year Housing Land Supply Report (2017-2022) we note that this confirms that Rossendale are currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply, and claim between 2.4 and 2.6 years depending which scenario is used.</p> <p>2.42 This is a clear indication that there are a lack of deliverable housing sites in the borough and that the Council could be vulnerable to speculative development proposals through S78 appeals until they get a robust plan in place.</p> <p>2.43 Whilst we welcome the Council’s acknowledgement of this issue and the detailed trajectories included in this document we do raise the following issues with the methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council add the 20% buffer before adding the shortfall; however the approach adopted by Pegasus Group is to apply the NPPF buffer to the requirement and backlog combined, and this has been endorsed in several appeals, including the Droitwich Spa decision (Refs: APP/H1840/A/13/2199085 & APP/H1840/A/13/2199426). • The Council have not applied any discounts to their claimed supply to allow for underdelivery; yet a 10% lapse rate is generally advocated by S78 Inspectors (see Droitwich Spa decisions above), and would be appropriate here given Rossendale’s physical constraints and historic under delivery. <p>2.44 If the above adjustments are made in the methodology this gives a 5 year supply figure of between 2.11 and 2.33 years:</p> <p>Figure 2.1 – Rossendale’s 5 Year Housing Land Supply</p> <p>2.45 Finally, we note that if the Government’s draft/proposed standard housing needs methodology were applied in Rossendale, it would still only result in a 2.49 year supply (or 2.76 years with no lapse</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>rate deductions). In short there are acute supply issues in the area that should be addressed at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Policy HS4: Affordable Housing</p> <p>2.46 Taylor Wimpey fully support the need to deliver affordable housing, and agree that policies of this nature should be set within a Local Plan or other statutory planning policy. Taylor Wimpey also recognise their obligations as a responsible housebuilder to assist in meeting such needs.</p> <p>2.47 As noted above the SHMA confirms that there is acute affordable need in Rossendale, ranging from 158-321 dpa, which equates to between 60% and 121% of the Council's chosen housing requirement. Meeting this need in full is unlikely to be realistic as this must balance against the impacts that the policy requirement has upon the viability of development. As such, we welcome the Council's flexible approach in HS4 part a, in applying a 30% requirement for market housing schemes 'subject to site and development considerations (such as financial viability)'.</p> <p>2.48 We also welcome the requirement in part c that the tenure, size and type of affordable provision be based on the 'latest available information on housing needs' rather than any prescriptive requirement. This allows the plan to be more flexible and individual schemes to respond to more localised needs at the time they are being considered. That said, we reserve the right to make further comments on future local needs assessments.</p> <p>2.49 In respect of part d, we note that some schemes may lend themselves, or specific Registered Providers may prefer, to locate the affordable housing in a specific part of the site for practical purposes (i.e. maintenance) or for other site-specific reasons (proximity to public transport routes etc.), and therefore we would ask that some flexibility is built in, such as adding the wording "should be evenly distributed throughout the development, where practical".</p> <p>2.50 Finally, we welcome the acceptance that both on and off-site provision of equivalent value will be considered.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>5. Approach to Land Allocations</p> <p>5.1 This chapter comments on the DLP's approach to the proposed release of land from the Green Belt and the allocation of development sites to meet the needs of the Borough. The chapter concludes that additional land is needed to meet the borough's development needs and that further allocations should be identified through the DLP.</p> <p>Exceptional Circumstances for Green Belt Release</p> <p>5.2 The DLP states that: "Green Belt releases have been avoided wherever possible in line with the Government's White Paper which maintains strong protections for Green Belt, however it is recognised that some releases will be required to meet the housing requirements." (page 12)</p> <p>5.3 In respect of housing, it is evident that there is a significant 'gap' between the development needs of the Borough and the delivery which can be achieved from the extant housing land supply. The DLP does not itself identify the size of the 'gap'. However, based on the evidence presented in the DLP, it appears to be approximately 1,518 dwellings based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A need to deliver 4,425 dwellings over the over the period up to 2034 comprised of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A housing requirement of 4,000 dwellings between 2019 and 2034; and – The need to address under-provision of 425 dwellings since the adoption of the extant Core Strategy³⁶. • A potential land supply of 2,907 dwellings from non-Green Belt sources of land (including 997 dwellings from "brownfield"/"mixed" land and 1,910 dwellings from land outwith the Green Belt, including development on land designated as green infrastructure). <p>5.4 It is noted that RBC has considered the implications of a lower level of housing growth. For example, the SHMA published alongside the DLP considers the implications of delivery 183 dwellings per annum (dpa)³⁸ – a level of growth which would be broadly consistent with what can be achieved from non-Green Belt sources of land (193 dpa). However, this level of growth would fall significantly short of the identified OAN for the Borough. As noted in the preceding chapter, it would result in significant risk that the identified needs for housing and employment would not be met.</p> <p>5.5 Peel does not consider that this level of growth is a sustainable or "sound" growth option mindful of the tests at paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Whilst it may enable the Borough to meet its baseline demographic needs, it would mean that the Borough would face a future of gradual economic decline and a housing market which is increasingly inaccessible, particularly to younger and lower/middle income families. It would also result in new housing delivery being focussed in inner-urban areas which are not in high demand; it would provide very little land for new high quality family homes in strong market</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>areas.</p> <p>5.6 Peel considers that such an approach would be contrary to the clearly stated aims of the NPPF that “Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth...” (paragraph 19); it would therefore be unsound. As such, it is evident that there is an urgent need to identify new sources of development land if Rossendale is to be capable of meeting its housing needs and address economic growth requirements.</p> <p>5.7 The Green Belt is not an environmental designation. It is a strategic planning tool which was introduced to manage the growth of urban areas. It is wholly appropriate to revisit Green Belt boundaries when development requirements justify this. This is acknowledged in the recent Housing White Paper, which states that Green Belt land can be released where all other reasonable options for meeting their identified development requirements have been fully examined.</p> <p>5.8 Peel therefore strongly agrees with RBC that there are clear “...exceptional circumstances...” to undertake targeted Green Belt releases in order to make land available for development to meet the Borough’s needs. Indeed, the release of such land is critical if the Borough is to grow sustainably and deliver its ambitions for growth. Peel notes that the DLP does not explicitly state that exceptional circumstances exist; this should be rectified in the next draft of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Scale of the Land Allocations Required</p> <p>5.9 The extent of Green Belt release proposed in the DLP is unclear. However, based upon a high level review of the evidence presented in the DLP, RBC appears to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have identified a “gap” between the housing requirement and the housing land supply from non-Green Belt sources of land of 1,518 dwellings. • Propose the release of land from the Green Belt in the DLP to deliver 715 dwellings, which when added to the potential supply from non-Green Belt sources of land equates to a total potential supply of 3,622 dwellings. <p>5.10 Peel considers both that a) the scale of the “gap” is significantly larger than that identified by RBC and b) the extent of Green Belt releases required address that “gap” has been underestimated. This is discussed in the following paragraphs.</p> <p>5.11 It is noted at the outset that the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt falls far short of the “gap”. The 715 dwellings from proposed Green Belt releases are equivalent to less than half (47.1%) of the 1,518 dwelling “gap”; there is a shortfall of 803 dwellings. It is therefore immediately evident that the extent of Green Belt releases proposed by the DLP need to be more than doubled if the emerging Local Plan is to be found sound, before the matters discussed below are taken into account. We highlight that this requirement for additional Green Belt releases is based on the 265dpa requirement proposed by RBC; as such, it is clear that additional releases will</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>be required even if the proposed housing requirement is reduced.</p> <p>The Extant Land Supply Deliverability and Developability</p> <p>5.12 RBC's SHLAA41 does not quantify the scale of the potential housing land supply across the Borough. However, as noted above, the DLP appears to identify the potential to deliver 2,907 dwellings from non-Green Belt sources of land. Peel considers that it is likely to have been overestimated.</p> <p>5.13 For example, the SHLAA identifies two sites north and south of Hollin Lane in Rawtenstall (references SHLAA16184 and SHLAA16392 respectively) which are considered to be developable in years 6 to 10. These two sites have a cumulative dwelling yield of 51 dwellings. It is noted, however, that both are accessible only via Hollin Lane, which is a narrow single-carriageway farm track. As the SHLAA notes, this track would need to be substantially upgraded to facilitate the residential development of both sites. However, the track is enclosed on both sides by existing residential properties so cannot be upgraded to a suitable highway access – including pedestrian footways – without the use of third party land. As such, the current evidence does not demonstrate that the residential development of this land is achievable. This is particularly the case given that the land south of Hollin Lane has previously been included within RBC's 5-year housing land supply with no meaningful progress regarding its delivery, presumably due to the nature of its constraints.</p> <p>5.14 It is therefore considered that the amount of housing delivery which can be secured from the extant land supply is overestimated by the SHLAA. It is considered that sites which are the subject of significant constraints – should be removed discounted from the supply until there is clear and robust evidence that those constraints can be overcome in order to justify their continued allocation, such as the submission of Development Frameworks by the landowner or promoter.</p> <p>Small sites</p> <p>5.15 66 (48.2%) of the 137 sites which are proposed for allocation in the DLP are small-sites which are under 0.5ha in size, whilst a further 26 sites (19%) are just 0.5-1ha in size. This means that 92 – over two-thirds (67.2%) – of the proposed allocations are 1ha or less in size. These sites have a combined yield of 1,236 dwellings, equating to over one-third (34.1%) of the total supply identified in the DLP.</p> <p>5.16 Peel acknowledges that the Housing White Paper³⁹ encourages greater use of small sites in emerging Local Plans in order to ensure that there are sufficient opportunities for custom and SME builders. It recommends that 10% of sites allocated for development should be on sites of <0.5ha. It is clear that the DLP – which proposes that 48.2% of allocations are such sites – goes far beyond the requirements of the White Paper. It must be recognised that the resources of such developers and their capacity to deliver a high rate of completions is limited. This is particularly the case in Rossendale where</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>developments must be of sufficient size such that they have the critical mass required in order to be viable.</p> <p>5.17 Peel supports the ambition to create opportunities for smaller and custom builders. However, it is clear that the housing land supply identified in the DLP is over-reliant upon small sites of less than 10 dwellings. There is therefore a significant risk that this supply will not be delivered in the timeframe envisaged by the DLP.</p> <p>Providing flexibility through “reserve sites”</p> <p>5.18 It is unrealistic to expect that every identified site – either brownfield or greenfield – will be delivered or will provide the number of new homes from it within the plan period. Recent DCLG analysis⁴² has indicated that between 10-20% of planning permissions are not implemented, whilst a further 15-20% are subject to a revised application process which delays delivery. As a result, it is reasonable to assume that upwards of 15% of the total supply anticipated within the plan period will not come forward by 2034. It is therefore essential to allow the flexibility of additional provision.</p> <p>5.19 Numerous Local Plans have acknowledged that not all allocated sites will come forward in a plan period and have therefore included flexibility allowances or reserve sites. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cheshire East Local Plan provides an additional 7% housing land to provide for an element of non-delivery; • The West Lancashire Local Plan includes ‘Plan B’ sites, which was concluded to be “...a constructive response to the uncertainty inherent in planning for housing provision...”⁴³ which would maintain the level of supply whilst allowing for peaks and troughs in the trend of provision; and • The draft St Helens Local Plan⁴⁴ has identified land for Green Belt release and safeguarding, and includes a mechanism in Policy LPA05 ‘Meeting St. Helens’ Housing Need’ to undertake a review of those sites for release should there be under-delivery during the course of the plan period. It reduces the capacity of the identified SHLAA supply by 10% to reflect non-delivery and adds a 20% buffer for “...choice, flexibility and to compensate for lead in times...”. <p>5.20 Moreover, this is also an approach currently being taken by the Secretary of State (SoS). For example, in determining a recovered appeal for a mixed-use development proposal including 235 dwellings in July 2017⁴⁵, the SoS considered the housing land supply position of the relevant authority and noted that:</p> <p>“...planning permissions exist for 4,465 dwellings on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings. The Secretary of State has deducted 10% from this to allow for non delivery...” (paragraph 22)</p> <p>And that:</p> <p>“Applying average lead in and delivery rates, the Secretary of State has gone on to deduct 1,458 units from the supply of planning permissions on sites of</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>10 or more dwellings, to reflect the fact that some sites may not deliver, or may not deliver within the five year period. The Secretary of State considers that this is likely to reflect the overall rate of non-delivery.” (paragraph 23)</p> <p>5.21 RBC has made no such allowances and there is therefore a very high degree of risk that the land supply identified in the DLP will not be delivered. The Local Plans Expert Group⁴⁶ (LPEG) identified this as a particular problem in maintaining the supply of homes which are required to meet needs: “...because Plans tend only to allocate the minimum amount of land they consider necessary, once adopted, there is little that Local Plans can do to address any shortages that appear in the five year supply...” (paragraph 11.2)</p> <p>5.22 This is a particular issue where, as in Rossendale, Green Belt boundaries are (and as proposed will be) tightly drawn around the urban area. The LPEG report therefore set out a clear recommendation that Local Plans should make provision for, and provide a mechanism for the release of, developable ‘reserve sites’ equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement. The inclusion of a similar approach in the emerging Local Plan for the Borough would be a positive way of reducing the delivery risk which is currently inherent within it and will ensure that it meets the soundness test of being “effective”, i.e. deliverable over its plan period.</p> <p>Safeguarded land</p> <p>5.23 In accordance with national policy the emerging Local Plan must identify areas of safeguarded land “...in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period...”⁴⁷. This is necessary to “...take account of longer-term requirements...”⁴⁷ and to provide confidence that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period. The DLP makes no such provision; rather, given that the extent of Green Belt release is insufficient even to meet the requirements during the current plan period up to 2034, it is clear that a further review will be required to take account of longer-term requirements. This is particularly the case given that the DLP is predicated upon the delivery of all non-Green Belt sources of land within the plan period. As such, the DLP is inconsistent with national policy.</p> <p>Conclusion on the scale of land allocations and Green Belt release</p> <p>5.24 The DLP makes insufficient land available to meet the Borough’s housing needs. As highlighted above, it is immediately evident that the allocations proposed in the DLP fall short of the proposed housing need by 803 dwellings. However, additional releases will also be needed to take account of the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to extend the plan period such that the emerging Local Plan is capable of covering a 15-year timeframe, as required by the NPPF (see chapter 4). <p>⁴⁶ Report to the Communities Secretary and to the Minister of Housing and Planning, Local Plans Expert Group (March 2016)</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>47 NPPF paragraph 85</p> <p>24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to revise the potential capacity which can be realistically achieved from non-Green Belt sources of supply, given: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the concerns regarding the deliverability and developability of some sites within it which has resulted in the supply being overestimated; and – The over-reliance which is placed on delivery from small sites (<0.5ha). • The need to identify at least “reserve sites” equivalent to 15-20% of the Borough’s development needs, to reflect the risk of non-delivery of sites in the supply. • The need to identify safeguarded land to take account of longer-term development requirements beyond the plan period. <p>5.25 It is necessary to identify additional development allocations – and therefore to identify additional Green Belt releases – in order for the emerging Local Plan to be found sound. Peel recommends that the DLP allocate additional sites to meet this requirement.</p> <p>6. Proposed Development Opportunities</p> <p>6.1 As set out in the introduction to this document, Peel has continuously and historically engaged with the plan-making process for Rossendale. This has included the submission of detailed representations to the previous Core Strategy and the draft Lives and Landscapes DPD (since withdrawn), including Development Frameworks that set out the development potential at four sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden (allocated in part) • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall (allocated in part) • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield (allocated) • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield (not allocated) <p>6.2 Peel welcomes the progress which has been made on the emerging Local Plan and supports, in principle, the proposals for development within it. In particular, Peel strongly supports the allocation of land at Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden, Haslam Farm in Rawtenstall, and Blackburn Road in Edenfield, which include some or all of three of the sites previously put forward (as above).</p> <p>6.3 It is noted, however, that additional work is required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is capable of meeting the full development needs of the Borough. Additional land will need to be allocated for residential development, above that which has been identified in the DLP.</p> <p>6.4 This opportunity is being taken to make representations in relation to the sites previously identified by Peel as capable of accommodating development in the Borough that have not been put forward in the DLP for allocation and/or Green Belt release. Peel is preparing updated Development Frameworks which will promote and justify its landholdings within Rossendale. Matters addressed below and in the preceding chapter which directly affect its</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>landholdings will be discussion in detail in each Development Framework.</p> <p>Additional Site Allocations</p> <p>6.5 In the context of the need for the Rossendale DLP to allocate additional land for development, Peel wish to reiterate the development opportunities at each of the four sites previously identified, as well as proposing a further potential site at Rossendale Golf Club.</p> <p>6.6 These sites can each provide a deliverable housing development site in sustainable locations adjoining existing settlements. Initial reviews of site constraints and opportunities, landscape and highways have indicated that there are no significant barriers to development. Further site appraisals are being undertaken to inform updated Development Frameworks which will be provided to the Council in due course.</p> <p>6.7 The updated Development Frameworks will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide analysis of the site constraints and opportunities. • Where relevant provide details of the findings of further technical assessment (such as highways, flood risk, ground conditions). • Consider the key principles for development of the site. • Present a proposed site layout plan illustrating development parcels, access, landscaping, etc. • Comment on the economic benefits of development. • Address comments / observations made within the recently published evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. <p>Proposed Development Opportunities</p> <p>6.8 In advance of the full Development Frameworks, initial reviews of the development opportunities are submitted alongside this representation for each of the individual sites. Each Site Opportunity Representation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the site and its location • Details of the consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA)⁵⁴ • A review of the planning policy context including the Draft Local Plan • A Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review <p>6.9 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted here for residential development, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall • and at Blackburn Road, Edenfield • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield • Land at Rossendale Golf Course, Helmshore 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities		Not Applicable	<p>Allocations in Bacup, Stacksteads, Britainnia and Wear</p> <p>The draft Local Plan states that over 450 homes will be delivered in the first five years of the plan in the above area. Information on trajectory and build out rates would be required by United Utilities so the impact on our existing infrastructure can be assessed. As there are a large number of homes to be delivered in a relatively short period in the area, this information and contact between UU and the Local Planning Authority is encouraged.</p> <p>Allocations in Haslingden, Rawtenstall, Crawshawbooth, Goodshaw and Loveclough</p> <p>The draft Local Plan states that over 660 homes will be delivered in the first five years of the plan in the above area. Information on trajectory and build out rates would be required by United Utilities so the impact on our existing infrastructure can be assessed. As there are a large number of homes to be delivered in a relatively short period in the area, this information and contact between UU and the Local Planning Authority is encouraged.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Object	<p>Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations</p> <p>The following sites, shown on the adopted Policies Map, have been allocated for housing development:</p> <p>A. RCT object to HS2 and HS5 as a change from 2011 Core Strategy density targets, and note:-</p> <p>Table 1: Housing Site Allocations Total Potential Housing Number 3622.....When calculating the potential numbers of housing on each site a density of 30 dwellings per hectare has been used unless more detailed information is available.....</p> <p>- table includes extant planning permissions which have not started or are still being built out, and are not expected to be completed this financial year. However, some sites that are listed in the Council’s 5 Year Housing Land Supply Report (2017-2022) are nearing completion and are expected to be completed in the coming months. These include the former Orama Mill site in Whitworth, Stack Lane in Britannia and Whinberry View in Rawtenstall.</p> <p>- Most of the sites allocated are small in size and this reflects recommendations in the Government’s Housing White Paper1 that at least 10% of the sites allocated for residential development in a local plan should be sites of half a hectare or less.</p> <p>- Brownfield land has been utilised wherever possible - Green Belt releases have been avoided wherever possible - Rossendale’s Green Belt ‘Rossendale Green Belt Review (2016)</p> <p>B. RCT object to no mention of the 2013-14 Urban and Green Belt Boundary Review required by 2011 Core Strategy in response to developer’s views that there were insufficient good sized well located sites within the present boundaries. That they just happened to own sites outside these boundaries.....</p> <p>C. RCT object to no reference to “Report to Rossendale Borough Council by Roland Punshon BSc Hons, MRTPI an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government 10 October 2011”</p> <p>Appendix D: Monitoring and Implementation Strategy:-</p> <p>70% of all new residential development in Rawtenstall, Bacup, Haslingden and Whitworth to be built at 50 dwellings per hectare. 85% of all new residential development in all other areas to be built at 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>D. RCT object to uneven distribution of Site Allocations for 3622 dwellings:</p> <p>Rossendale West with good accessibility from M66/A56T - 836.</p> <p>Rossendale Central with fair but often congested access from A681 and A682 – 1276.</p> <p>Rossendale East with poor and often slow access from A681 and A671 – 1510. Hence the “rat run” along Newchurch Road, now proposed to serve an extra 300++ houses, and seen by one RCT Member: my own concerns are less wide-ranging and are chiefly centred on the proposals for the many housing sites on</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>or adjacent to Newchurch Road. Should all these eventually come to fruition there will be a considerable increase in traffic in both directions along Newchurch Road. This will be most apparent at the west end at the junction with Burnley Road (A682) and at the east end for those leaving Turnpike at the awkward junction with the B6283. The access and exit from Union Street, in Rawtenstall, already problematic, will inexorably become more difficult as Union Street is the only access to properties on Union Street, Green Street, Rose Bank, Hurst Lane, Hurst Crescent And Waingate Village. We have written to RBC (& LCC) on this matter several times over the years our representations seem to fall on deaf ears. They just don't seem to care but the situation will become intolerable if all these sites are made available for housing.</p> <p>E. Council object to lack of a policy for council owned land to retain its original purpose, kept for future generation's needs, and if proposed for housing, it should be offered on tender to RSL's. And given the often poor quality of unbuilt on land, there should be at least some trial holes to check its nature, stability and wetness before any changes of use are proposed.</p> <p>F. RCT in conclusion do not see HS2 meeting national needs: Fixing Our Broken Housing Market, Department for Communities and Local Government (February 2017). Its section on housing density that does not quite fit with 30/Ha.</p>		
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Object	<p>Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations</p> <p>17. We have shown above that because the housing requirement will be lower, as much as 26.5 hectares of land in countryside, specifically protected by Green Belt can be saved. The exceptional circumstance has been removed for Green Belt allocation and this will be strongly argued at examination. Housing land should be allocated on the basis of sustainability ranking. The least sustainable sites should be excluded from the local plan.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1790	David	Trivett			Object	<p>Policy HS2: Housing site Allocations.</p> <p>Using the table beginning on page 7 of the Draft in conjunction with the adopted Policies Map there are several sites earmarked for housing development where access is noted via Bankside Lane.</p> <p>The majority of which are "Greenfield" with some designated "Greenlands" Councillor Barnes stated in January 2017</p> <p>"By making sure we get our local plan right, we can now look these Government changes and see if they deliver on the promise of fewer homes for Rossendale. Protecting our green spaces and promoting business are key priorities for our council."</p> <p>Unless I have completely misunderstood the information sources I have used to research the proposed housing development sites for Bankside Lane there is conflicting information given in the Draft Local Plan and the detailed site analysis information contained in Appendix E – Site Assessments.</p> <p>The development area proposals shown on the adopted Policies Map are at odds with the information given in Appendix E – Site Assessments. – Dated June 2017</p> <p>Areas shown as "proposed greenbelt" on the Policies Map have Appendix E – Site Assessments for housing development.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>Whilst I understand the thought processes for each of the above proposed developments due to the connectivity with adjacent urban areas it is interesting to note that all but one of the sites with access via Bankside Lane are Greenfield sites with two sites designated Greenlands. The one variance on the list being SHLAA16075 HS2.11 Land at Huttock Fam Bacup which is predominately Greenfield.</p> <p>Councillor Barnes stated in January 2017</p> <p>"By making sure we get our local plan right, we can now look these Government changes and see if they deliver on the promise of fewer homes for Rossendale. Protecting our green spaces and promoting business are key priorities for our council."</p> <p>Appendix E Calculated Yield Numbers with land accessed via Bankside Lane is: 269 units</p> <p>Policies Map Calculated Yield Numbers with land accessed via Bankside Lane is 139 units</p> <p>The difference between the two numbers is due to:</p> <p>SHLAA16074 - Land to the rear of Highfield Bacup. Greenfield Greenlands 48 units</p> <p>Above proposed development not shown on the Policies Map.</p> <p>SHLAA16076 - Huttock Top Bacup. HS2.12 Greenfield Greenlands. 30 units</p> <p>Above proposed development unit number difference with Appendix E</p> <p>SHLAA16079 - Land off Newchurch Old Road Bacup. HS2.32</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>Greenfield. Designated Greenlands. 47 units</p> <p>Above proposed development unit number difference with Appendix E Assuming two vehicles per unit.</p> <p>Potential additional vehicles using Bankside Lane: Appendix E 38 vehicles</p> <p>Potential additional vehicles using Bankside Lane: Policies Map 78 vehicles</p> <p>Safe to assume the number of vehicles is likely to fall somewhere between these two figures which will increase proportionally by the anticipated number of visitors to the new properties.</p> <p>As clearly mentioned in the Appendix E- Site Assessment June 2017 "It is to be noted that Bankside Lane which is a mandatory access point is narrow and steep."</p> <p>Having lived on Bankside Lane Bacup now for almost 37 years, ignoring the deterioration to the road surface, we have seen the decline in the gritting service operated by Lancashire County Council during the winter. With particular regard to the frequency and amount of salt applied to the road surface when snow and ice occurs.</p> <p>The reduced coverage means Bankside Lane like many other roads in the area becomes a very dangerous place for residents in the winter.</p> <p>Parts of Bankside Lane are very steep and narrow; particularly at two, single lane width, pinch points with the higher, narrow section having restricted views for motorists climbing and descending the steep hill section at this point.</p> <p>The junction with Maden Way / Maden Road is also steep and has a restricted sightline to the right for motorists descending to join Bankside Lane.</p> <p>There is also a restricted vision point on the bend where Bankside Lane climbs again to Bankside close and Rooley View.</p> <p>All this combined with car parking issues for the length of the lane, particularly from The Square to Cuckoo Hall where residents frequently double park, effectively reducing the road to a truck width means Bankside Lane is already a busy and congested roadway.</p> <p>The double parking issues give me cause for concern for the problems created for emergency vehicles, particularly the Fire and Ambulance services with potential life threatening delays to access further up the lane.</p> <p>Notices have been fixed to street signs highlighting problems for access by the gritting teams.</p> <p>I have great difficulty in understanding why Rossendale Borough Council considers Bankside Lane a suitable, safe access route to the number and scale of the proposed developments.</p> <p>The road access and parking position for the full length of Bankside Lane combined with the very steep and narrow pinch points creates problems in normal weather. The winter period, with greatly reduced gritting, means there is serious risk of accident damage to vehicles and injury to pedestrians in these</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>areas already.</p> <p>The construction of more houses on the proposed developments with access to Bankside Lane and generation of additional traffic should not be allowed to proceed.</p> <p>All the proposed development areas listed should be removed from the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Greenfields and Greenlands should be preserved, particularly the areas planted with trees to mitigate flood risk at lower levels.</p> <p>The large number of empty homes across Rossendale should be offset against the proposed number of houses required.</p> <p>Why build on Greenfield sites when houses remain unsold?</p> <p>The focus of new development in the Borough should be weighted toward brownfield sites not the disproportionately high number of Greenfield sites as proposed for Bankside Lane.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Object	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the draft Local Plan for Rossendale. I apologise for the delay it has taken to submit our response to the consultation. We have reviewed the draft plan is so far as it relates to our remit and we would offer the following comments:-</p> <p>Policy HS2</p> <p>Issue: Several of the proposed residential allocations are subject to constraints that may impact on compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), delivery and yield.</p> <p>Impact: Proposed allocations for residential development may be non-complaint with NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) requirements.</p> <p>Suggested solution: Demonstrate that relevant environmental constraints have been taken into account when allocating residential sites.</p> <p>Commentary:</p> <p>Table 1 at Appendix 1 identifies where proposed residential allocations are adjacent to or partly within a Flood Zone (2 or 3), within 8 metres of a designated Main River watercourse or located on top of a historic landfill site (so may have contamination issues).</p> <p>1. Flood Zones: In relation to sites within a Flood Zone as defined on the EA Flood Map for Planning, it will be for the Council to demonstrate that any site allocated for development in a Flood Zone satisfies the requirements of the Sequential Test and, where necessary, the Exception test. We have identified all those sites where flood risk may be an issue (including sites that border an area considered to be at risk). We understand that you have completed your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and that this may provide sufficient evidence for these sites to come forward. Evidence to demonstrate that the Sequential Test and Exception Test have been satisfied for allocations in Flood Zones should be clearly cross-referenced in the Local Plan. Where site specific mitigation measures are necessary to make a development safe in planning terms, these should be specified at an appropriate point in the local plan, possibly as part of Policy ENV11. This may be in the form of excluding parts of the site from inappropriate development or identifying site specific measures that would be necessary to make residential development safe in that Flood Zone.</p> <p>2. Main Rivers: Development within 8 metres of the top of the bank or edge of the retaining wall of a designated Main River watercourse (or culverted watercourse) will require consent from the Environment Agency. Development that restricts access to a Main River watercourse and / or presents a risk of harm to the aquatic environment may not be acceptable. It is essential to ensure that any sites with Main River watercourses in an open channel or a culvert within the development site or within 8 metres of the site boundary take this into account. Where small sites require an easement on</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS02	Further comment
						<p>either side of a Main River watercourse that may be within the site, this could impact on the density of development that could be achieved. Development over culverted Main River watercourses will not be permitted.</p> <p>3. Historic Landfill sites: Proposals for development of historic landfill sites will need to be supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that the site is suitable for the proposed use without posing a risk to controlled waters. We have no evidence to suggest that these sites cannot be re-developed, but there may be a need for some remediation of contaminated sites.</p> <p>It is also noted that several of the proposed allocations on historic landfill sites are identified as Greenfield sites. Given the previous use, these may be more appropriately designated as Brownfield.</p> <p>Please see table in appendix.</p>		
Number of comments		HS02				65		
Reference	HS03	Edenfield						
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England		Not Applicable	<p>Policy HS3 Edenfield</p> <p>Whilst there is no objection to the inclusion of a design code for new development in Edenfield, any site allocations in this area (and any other areas in Rossendale) will be expected to demonstrate that they have undertaken an appropriate assessment of the impact they may have on the historic environment (more detail on this is contained in the section below on site allocations). This policy appears to reference that the setting on the Edenfield Parish Church (Grade II*) is to be affected, yet there appears to be no evidence to support this in the accompanying reports and mitigation measures within the policy and this need to be amended.</p>		
843	PAUL	DODD	RESIDENT		Object	<p>This part of the Draft Plan lacks any real details. It makes no mention of the fact that Edenfield over the past 20 years has lost many local amenities and necessary infrastructure: for example, a doctor's surgery, Post Office, various shops. There are very limited places in the local Primary schools and the secondary school. The local quarry has seen an increase in the numbers and scale of local traffic, leading to pollution in and around the main roads in Edenfield. Whilst the draft plan recognises the special needs of Edenfield, I believe the proposed large - scale increase in the house building programme in this small area will have a detrimental impact on the environment and living standards of all the residents. The short time scales for the building programmes will ensure that no amount of planning can fully accommodate the massive changes to this area.</p>		No
887	David	Hayhoe	-		Not Applicable	Not acceptable		-
1415	Simon	Parker	-	Edenfield	Object	This policy is not fit for purpose. The roads cannot hold the traffic as it is		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1506	Catherine	Blyfield	-		Object	Increased Flood Risk. - The recent Boxing day floods in 2016 and previous flooding was initially caused by run off and secondly by the river bursting its banks. If trees and vegetation above the river are replaced with concrete and tarmac then there will be no ground to soak up the rain water and so the flooding problem will become increasingly frequent and worse when it does happen. This not only impacts in the local area but properties further down the river. There is no point in building new homes if they make the existing properties inhabitable. - - Destruction of green sites. - There are plenty of disused mills, factories and brown sites in the area that could be developed for homes, many of which have been purchased and are currently eyesores. There is no point in destroying the countryside just so that the property developers have an easier time and can make more money.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1573	M	Hoyle			Object	<p>3. Policy H53 - Edenfield</p> <p>The proposal would have a major impact on the infrastructure of the area. There is a lack of any evidence in the Infrastructure Plan document to show how other authorities or service providers would support the introduction of 408 new dwellings in Edenfield. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states the Local Plan should give a clear indication of what is required in terms of infrastructure, who is going to fund it and provide it in the first 5 years of the plan. The document at present does not address any of these issues. It does, however state it is a 'living document', which will be updated, but from a residents view it does not provide sufficient evidence or information on infrastructure plans, or give details on when further updates will be available.</p> <p>The Council is going to make decision on Local Plan, which contains insufficient evidence to support the officers and consultant's recommendations. This is unacceptable, as the Local Plan has a massive impact on the residents of the borough for many years, all the information must be available to all interested parties before the Local Plan can be approved.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>The addition of 408 dwelling would result in over 1000 extra cars (Figures from East Transport Strategy) using the roads in Edenfield. Rossendale Council is unable to provide accurate figure and give details of the impact this would have on the area, as no strategic transport surveyor report has been made. The council has commissioned one but no date for publication has been given. The East Lancashire Transport Strategy (EL TS) does state that there is major congestion problems on the A56 around Edenfield and has come up with vision of junction 0 .To date the Highways agency has no plans to investigate the proposal in this or the next development plan. The ELTS has investigated improvements in public transport but no provision has been made to increase this due to government funding cuts. There is no public transport provision in Edenfield after 7pm and the X43 bus route to Manchester no longer runs through the village resulting in resident having to rely heavily on cars. The road network in Edenfield and the surrounding area could not cope with the large volume of traffic generated by large developments. Rossendale Council has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on the transport and traffic implications.</p> <p>Education</p> <p>The building of new dwellings in the Edenfield area would have a massive impact on the local education provision. Edenfield and Stubbins primary schools are currently over subscribed and at full capacity. If the permission is given to develop 408 houses in Edenfield it will have a major impact on the availability of places within the Edenfield / Stubbins area both at primary and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>secondary level. Rossendale Borough Council or Lancashire County Council has not addressed how it will provide education places. Although RBC states planning obligations will be sought for education places this is only a one off payment and does not cover future years. RBC could place a planning levy on new developments to fund further school places or building a new school but this would be limited to a one off payment and any further expenses would not be maintained by local LEA under government regulations, therefore it would not address the need for extra places within the area. Schools in neighbouring area (within 2 mile radius) are also working at full capacity; the borough currently has very little capacity at both primary and secondary level. This would result in lack of school places for all children living in the community and have an adverse impact on the community.</p> <p>Utilities – Electric / Water Water Although United Utilities have not commented on the proposed housing development in Edenfield in detail, they have raised concerns about impact the new developments will have in Rossendale. In Edenfield concerns have been raised about the sewage issues, wastewater and surface water flooding. Rossendale Council or partners have failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Electric United Utilities have clearly stated that in Rossendale a number of substations are currently working at full capacity and Edenfield will require a major enhancement before any housing development is undertaken. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Health The Infrastructure plan indicates GP practices in Rawtenstall (which serves Edenfield) will be full within first 5 years of the Local Plan. The Local Plan comments that GP services in Ramsbottom serve the residents of Edenfield. However, these services are currently not open to new patients from the Edenfield area. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed. The proposals made in the draft Local Plan have not been supported by significant evidence. Rossendale Council has failed to follow guidance from the NPPF and NPPG, which clearly states the Local Plan should provide a clear initial five year plan stating is required in terms of infrastructure requirements, who is going to fund it and provide it. Therefore Policy HS3 - Edenfield should be withdrawn from draft Local Plan until all the correct supporting evidence has been obtained and considered. I hope the Council and Councillor's will consider my objections to Local Plan</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						and Changes to Urban Boundary/Green Belt, as the current proposals would have a detrimental affect on communities in Edenfield and across the borough of Rossendale.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1577	Rebecca	Hoyle			Object	<p>3. Policy H53 - Edenfield</p> <p>The proposal would have a major impact on the infrastructure of the area. There is a lack of any evidence in the Infrastructure Plan document to show how other authorities or service providers would support the introduction of 408 new dwellings in Edenfield. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states the Local Plan should give a clear indication of what is required in terms of infrastructure, who is going to fund it and provide it in the first 5 years of the plan. The document at present does not address any of these issues. It does, however state it is a 'living document', which will be updated, but from a residents view it does not provide sufficient evidence or information on infrastructure plans, or give details on when further updates will be available.</p> <p>The Council is going to make decision on Local Plan, which contains insufficient evidence to support the officers and consultant's recommendations. This is unacceptable, as the Local Plan has a massive impact on the residents of the borough for many years, all the information must be available to all interested parties before the Local Plan can be approved.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>The addition of 408 dwelling would result in over 1000 extra cars (Figures from East Transport Strategy) using the roads in Edenfield. Rossendale Council is unable to provide accurate figure and give details of the impact this would have on the area, as no strategic transport surveyor report has been made. The council has commissioned one but no date for publication has been given. The East Lancashire Transport Strategy (EL TS) does state that there is major congestion problems on the A56 around Edenfield and has come up with vision of junction 0 .To date the Highways agency has no plans to investigate the proposal in this or the next development plan. The ELTS has investigated improvements in public transport but no provision has been made to increase this due to government funding cuts. There is no public transport provision in Edenfield after 7pm and the X43 bus route to Manchester no longer runs through the village resulting in resident having to rely heavily on cars.</p> <p>The road network in Edenfield and the surrounding area could not cope with the large volume of traffic generated by large developments. Rossendale Council has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on the transport and traffic implications.</p> <p>Education</p> <p>The building of new dwellings in the Edenfield area would have a massive impact on the local education provision. Edenfield and Stubbins primary schools are currently over subscribed and at full capacity. If the permission is given to develop 408 houses in Edenfield it will have a major impact on the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>availability of places within the Edenfield / Stubbins area both at primary and secondary level. Rossendale Borough Council or Lancashire County Council has not addressed how it will provide education places. Although RBC states planning obligations will be sought for education places this is only a one off payment and does not cover future years. RBC could place a planning levy on new developments to fund further school places or building a new school but this would be limited to a one off payment and any further expenses would not be maintained by local LEA under government regulations, therefore it would not address the need for extra places within the area. Schools in neighbouring area (within 2 mile radius) are also working at full capacity; the borough currently has very little capacity at both primary and secondary level. This would result in lack of school places for all children living in the community and have an adverse impact on the community.</p> <p>Utilities – Electric / Water</p> <p>Water</p> <p>Although United Utilities have not commented on the proposed housing development in Edenfield in detail, they have raised concerns about impact the new developments will have in Rossendale. In Edenfield concerns have been raised about the sewage issues, wastewater and surface water flooding. Rossendale Council or partners have failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Electric</p> <p>United Utilities have clearly stated that in Rossendale a number of substations are currently working at full capacity and Edenfield will require a major enhancement before any housing development is undertaken. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Health</p> <p>The Infrastructure plan indicates GP practices in Rawtenstall (which serves Edenfield) will be full within first 5 years of the Local Plan. The Local Plan comments that GP services in Ramsbottom serve the residents of Edenfield. However, these services are currently not open to new patients from the Edenfield area. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>The proposals made in the draft Local Plan have not been supported by significant evidence. Rossendale Council has failed to follow guidance from the NPPF and NPPG, which clearly states the Local Plan should provide a clear initial five year plan stating is required in terms of infrastructure requirements, who is going to fund it and provide it. Therefore Policy HS3 - Edenfield should be withdrawn from draft Local Plan until all the correct supporting evidence has been obtained and considered.</p> <p>I hope the Council and Councillor's will consider my objections to Local Plan and Changes to Urban Boundary/Green Belt, as the current proposals would</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	------	-----------------

have a detrimental affect on communities in Edenfield and across the borough of Rossendale.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1578	G P	Hoyle			Object	<p data-bbox="902 97 1742 140">3. Policy H53 - Edenfield</p> <p data-bbox="902 140 1742 491">The proposal would have a major impact on the infrastructure of the area. There is a lack of any evidence in the Infrastructure Plan document to show how other authorities or service providers would support the introduction of 408 new dwellings in Edenfield. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states the Local Plan should give a clear indication of what is required in terms of infrastructure, who is going to fund it and provide it in the first 5 years of the plan. The document at present does not address any of these issues. It does, however state it is a 'living document', which will be updated, but from a residents view it does not provide sufficient evidence or information on infrastructure plans, or give details on when further updates will be available.</p> <p data-bbox="902 491 1742 687">The Council is going to make decision on Local Plan, which contains insufficient evidence to support the officers and consultant's recommendations. This is unacceptable, as the Local Plan has a massive impact on the residents of the borough for many years, all the information must be available to all interested parties before the Local Plan can be approved.</p> <p data-bbox="902 687 1742 722">Transport</p> <p data-bbox="902 722 1742 847">The addition of 408 dwelling would result in over 1000 extra cars (Figures from East Transport Strategy) using the roads in Edenfield. Rossendale Council is unable to provide accurate figure and give details of the impact this would have on the area, as no strategic transport surveyor report has been made. The council has commissioned one but no date for publication has been given. The East Lancashire Transport Strategy (EL TS) does state that there is major congestion problems on the A56 around Edenfield and has come up with vision of junction 0 .To date the Highways agency has no plans to investigate the proposal in this or the next development plan. The ELTS has investigated improvements in public transport but no provision has been made to increase this due to government funding cuts. There is no public transport provision in Edenfield after 7pm and the X43 bus route to Manchester no longer runs through the village resulting in resident having to rely heavily on cars.</p> <p data-bbox="902 847 1742 1273">The road network in Edenfield and the surrounding area could not cope with the large volume of traffic generated by large developments. Rossendale Council has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on the transport and traffic implications.</p> <p data-bbox="902 1273 1742 1308">Education</p> <p data-bbox="902 1308 1742 1465">The building of new dwellings in the Edenfield area would have a massive impact on the local education provision. Edenfield and Stubbins primary schools are currently over subscribed and at full capacity. If the permission is given to develop 408 houses in Edenfield it will have a major impact on the availability of places within the Edenfield / Stubbins area both at primary and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>secondary level. Rossendale Borough Council or Lancashire County Council has not addressed how it will provide education places. Although RBC states planning obligations will be sought for education places this is only a one off payment and does not cover future years. RBC could place a planning levy on new developments to fund further school places or building a new school but this would be limited to a one off payment and any further expenses would not be maintained by local LEA under government regulations, therefore it would not address the need for extra places within the area. Schools in neighbouring area (within 2 mile radius) are also working at full capacity; the borough currently has very little capacity at both primary and secondary level. This would result in lack of school places for all children living in the community and have an adverse impact on the community.</p> <p>Utilities – Electric / Water</p> <p>Water</p> <p>Although United Utilities have not commented on the proposed housing development in Edenfield in detail, they have raised concerns about impact the new developments will have in Rossendale. In Edenfield concerns have been raised about the sewage issues, wastewater and surface water flooding. Rossendale Council or partners have failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Electric</p> <p>United Utilities have clearly stated that in Rossendale a number of substations are currently working at full capacity and Edenfield will require a major enhancement before any housing development is undertaken. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Health</p> <p>The Infrastructure plan indicates GP practices in Rawtenstall (which serves Edenfield) will be full within first 5 years of the Local Plan. The Local Plan comments that GP services in Ramsbottom serve the residents of Edenfield. However, these services are currently not open to new patients from the Edenfield area. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed. The proposals made in the draft Local Plan have not been supported by significant evidence. Rossendale Council has failed to follow guidance from the NPPF and NPPG, which clearly states the Local Plan should provide a clear initial five year plan stating is required in terms of infrastructure requirements, who is going to fund it and provide it. Therefore Policy HS3 - Edenfield should be withdrawn from draft Local Plan until all the correct supporting evidence has been obtained and considered.</p> <p>I hope the Council and Councillor's will consider my objections to Local Plan and Changes to Urban Boundary/Green Belt, as the current proposals would have a detrimental affect on communities in Edenfield and across the borough</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	------	-----------------

of Rossendale.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1579	C J	Hoyle			Object	<p>3. Policy H53 - Edenfield</p> <p>The proposal would have a major impact on the infrastructure of the area. There is a lack of any evidence in the Infrastructure Plan document to show how other authorities or service providers would support the introduction of 408 new dwellings in Edenfield. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states the Local Plan should give a clear indication of what is required in terms of infrastructure, who is going to fund it and provide it in the first 5 years of the plan. The document at present does not address any of these issues. It does, however state it is a 'living document', which will be updated, but from a residents view it does not provide sufficient evidence or information on infrastructure plans, or give details on when further updates will be available.</p> <p>The Council is going to make decision on Local Plan, which contains insufficient evidence to support the officers and consultant's recommendations. This is unacceptable, as the Local Plan has a massive impact on the residents of the borough for many years, all the information must be available to all interested parties before the Local Plan can be approved.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>The addition of 408 dwelling would result in over 1000 extra cars (Figures from East Transport Strategy) using the roads in Edenfield. Rossendale Council is unable to provide accurate figure and give details of the impact this would have on the area, as no strategic transport surveyor report has been made. The council has commissioned one but no date for publication has been given. The East Lancashire Transport Strategy (EL TS) does state that there is major congestion problems on the A56 around Edenfield and has come up with vision of junction 0 .To date the Highways agency has no plans to investigate the proposal in this or the next development plan. The ELTS has investigated improvements in public transport but no provision has been made to increase this due to government funding cuts. There is no public transport provision in Edenfield after 7pm and the X43 bus route to Manchester no longer runs through the village resulting in resident having to rely heavily on cars.</p> <p>The road network in Edenfield and the surrounding area could not cope with the large volume of traffic generated by large developments. Rossendale Council has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on the transport and traffic implications.</p> <p>Education</p> <p>The building of new dwellings in the Edenfield area would have a massive impact on the local education provision. Edenfield and Stubbins primary schools are currently over subscribed and at full capacity. If the permission is given to develop 408 houses in Edenfield it will have a major impact on the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>availability of places within the Edenfield / Stubbins area both at primary and secondary level.</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council or Lancashire County Council has not addressed how it will provide education places.</p> <p>Although RBC states planning obligations will be sought for education places this is only a one off payment and does not cover future years. RBC could place a planning levy on new developments to fund further school places or building a new school but this would be limited to a one off payment and any further expenses would not be maintained by local LEA under government regulations, therefore it would not address the need for extra places within the area. Schools in neighbouring area (within 2 mile radius) are also working at full capacity; the borough currently has very little capacity at both primary and secondary level. This would result in lack of school places for all children living in the community and have an adverse impact on the community.</p> <p>Utilities – Electric / Water</p> <p>Water</p> <p>Although United Utilities have not commented on the proposed housing development in Edenfield in detail, they have raised concerns about impact the new developments will have in Rossendale. In Edenfield concerns have been raised about the sewage issues, wastewater and surface water flooding. Rossendale Council or partners have failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Electric</p> <p>United Utilities have clearly stated that in Rossendale a number of substations are currently working at full capacity and Edenfield will require a major enhancement before any housing development is undertaken. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Health</p> <p>The Infrastructure plan indicates GP practices in Rawtenstall (which serves Edenfield) will be full within first 5 years of the Local Plan. The Local Plan comments that GP services in Ramsbottom serve the residents of Edenfield. However, these services are currently not open to new patients from the Edenfield area. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>The proposals made in the draft Local Plan have not been supported by significant evidence. Rossendale Council has failed to follow guidance from the NPPF and NPPG, which clearly states the Local Plan should provide a clear initial five year plan stating is required in terms of infrastructure requirements, who is going to fund it and provide it. Therefore Policy HS3 - Edenfield should be withdrawn from draft Local Plan until all the correct</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----------------

supporting evidence has been obtained and considered.
I hope the Council and Councillor's will consider my objections to Local Plan and Changes to Urban Boundary/Green Belt, as the current proposals would have a detrimental affect on communities in Edenfield and across the borough of Rossendale.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1580	R J	Barlow			Object	<p>3. Policy H53 - Edenfield</p> <p>The proposal would have a major impact on the infrastructure of the area. There is a lack of any evidence in the Infrastructure Plan document to show how other authorities or service providers would support the introduction of 408 new dwellings in Edenfield. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states the Local Plan should give a clear indication of what is required in terms of infrastructure, who is going to fund it and provide it in the first 5 years of the plan. The document at present does not address any of these issues. It does, however state it is a 'living document', which will be updated, but from a residents view it does not provide sufficient evidence or information on infrastructure plans, or give details on when further updates will be available.</p> <p>The Council is going to make decision on Local Plan, which contains insufficient evidence to support the officers and consultant's recommendations. This is unacceptable, as the Local Plan has a massive impact on the residents of the borough for many years, all the information must be available to all interested parties before the Local Plan can be approved.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>The addition of 408 dwelling would result in over 1000 extra cars (Figures from East Transport Strategy) using the roads in Edenfield. Rossendale Council is unable to provide accrue figure and give details of the impact this would have on the area, as no strategic transport surveyor report has been made. The council has commissioned one but no date for publication has been given. The East Lancashire Transport Strategy (EL TS) does state that there is major congestion problems on the A56 around Edenfield and has come up with vision of junction 0 .To date the Highways agency has no plans to investigate the proposal in this or the next development plan. The ELTS has investigated improvements in public transport but no provision has been made to increase this due to government funding cuts. There is no public transport provision in Edenfield after 7pm and the X43 bus route to Manchester no longer runs through the village resulting in resident having to rely heavily on cars. The road network in Edenfield and the surrounding area could not cope with the large volume of traffic generated by large developments. Rossendale Council has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on the transport and traffic implications.</p> <p>Education</p> <p>The building of new dwellings in the Edenfield area would have a massive impact on the local education provision. Edenfield and Stubbins primary schools are currently over subscribed and at full capacity. If the permission is given to develop 408 houses in Edenfield it will have a major impact on the availability of places within the Edenfield / Stubbins area both at primary and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>secondary level. Rossendale Borough Council or Lancashire County Council has not addressed how it will provide education places. Although RBC states planning obligations will be sought for education places this is only a one off payment and does not cover future years. RBC could place a planning levy on new developments to fund further school places or building a new school but this would be limited to a one off payment and any further expenses would not be maintained by local LEA under government regulations, therefore it would not address the need for extra places within the area. Schools in neighbouring area (within 2 mile radius) are also working at full capacity; the borough currently has very little capacity at both primary and secondary level. This would result in lack of school places for all children living in the community and have an adverse impact on the community.</p> <p>Utilities – Electric / Water Water Although United Utilities have not commented on the proposed housing development in Edenfield in detail, they have raised concerns about impact the new developments will have in Rossendale. In Edenfield concerns have been raised about the sewage issues, wastewater and surface water flooding. Rossendale Council or partners have failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Electric United Utilities have clearly stated that in Rossendale a number of substations are currently working at full capacity and Edenfield will require a major enhancement before any housing development is undertaken. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Health The Infrastructure plan indicates GP practices in Rawtenstall (which serves Edenfield) will be full within first 5 years of the Local Plan. The Local Plan comments that GP services in Ramsbottom serve the residents of Edenfield. However, these services are currently not open to new patients from the Edenfield area. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed. The proposals made in the draft Local Plan have not been supported by significant evidence. Rossendale Council has failed to follow guidance from the NPPF and NPPG, which clearly states the Local Plan should provide a clear initial five year plan stating is required in terms of infrastructure requirements, who is going to fund it and provide it. Therefore Policy HS3 - Edenfield should be withdrawn from draft Local Plan until all the correct supporting evidence has been obtained and considered.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						I hope the Council and Councillor's will consider my objections to Local Plan and Changes to Urban Boundary/Green Belt, as the current proposals would have a detrimental affect on communities in Edenfield and across the borough of Rossendale.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1581	H P	Barlow			Object	<p>3. Policy H53 - Edenfield</p> <p>The proposal would have a major impact on the infrastructure of the area. There is a lack of any evidence in the Infrastructure Plan document to show how other authorities or service providers would support the introduction of 408 new dwellings in Edenfield. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states the Local Plan should give a clear indication of what is required in terms of infrastructure, who is going to fund it and provide it in the first 5 years of the plan. The document at present does not address any of these issues. It does, however state it is a 'living document', which will be updated, but from a residents view it does not provide sufficient evidence or information on infrastructure plans, or give details on when further updates will be available.</p> <p>The Council is going to make decision on Local Plan, which contains insufficient evidence to support the officers and consultant's recommendations. This is unacceptable, as the Local Plan has a massive impact on the residents of the borough for many years, all the information must be available to all interested parties before the Local Plan can be approved.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>The addition of 408 dwelling would result in over 1000 extra cars (Figures from East Transport Strategy) using the roads in Edenfield. Rossendale Council is unable to provide accurate figure and give details of the impact this would have on the area, as no strategic transport surveyor report has been made. The council has commissioned one but no date for publication has been given. The East Lancashire Transport Strategy (EL TS) does state that there is major congestion problems on the A56 around Edenfield and has come up with vision of junction 0 .To date the Highways agency has no plans to investigate the proposal in this or the next development plan. The ELTS has investigated improvements in public transport but no provision has been made to increase this due to government funding cuts. There is no public transport provision in Edenfield after 7pm and the X43 bus route to Manchester no longer runs through the village resulting in resident having to rely heavily on cars.</p> <p>The road network in Edenfield and the surrounding area could not cope with the large volume of traffic generated by large developments. Rossendale Council has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on the transport and traffic implications.</p> <p>Education</p> <p>The building of new dwellings in the Edenfield area would have a massive impact on the local education provision. Edenfield and Stubbins primary schools are currently over subscribed and at full capacity. If the permission is given to develop 408 houses in Edenfield it will have a major impact on the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>availability of places within the Edenfield / Stubbins area both at primary and secondary level.</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council or Lancashire County Council has not addressed how it will provide education places.</p> <p>Although RBC states planning obligations will be sought for education places this is only a one off payment and does not cover future years. RBC could place a planning levy on new developments to fund further school places or building a new school but this would be limited to a one off payment and any further expenses would not be maintained by local LEA under government regulations, therefore it would not address the need for extra places within the area. Schools in neighbouring area (within 2 mile radius) are also working at full capacity; the borough currently has very little capacity at both primary and secondary level. This would result in lack of school places for all children living in the community and have an adverse impact on the community.</p> <p>Utilities – Electric / Water</p> <p>Water</p> <p>Although United Utilities have not commented on the proposed housing development in Edenfield in detail, they have raised concerns about impact the new developments will have in Rossendale. In Edenfield concerns have been raised about the sewage issues, wastewater and surface water flooding. Rossendale Council or partners have failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Electric</p> <p>United Utilities have clearly stated that in Rossendale a number of substations are currently working at full capacity and Edenfield will require a major enhancement before any housing development is undertaken. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Health</p> <p>The Infrastructure plan indicates GP practices in Rawtenstall (which serves Edenfield) will be full within first 5 years of the Local Plan. The Local Plan comments that GP services in Ramsbottom serve the residents of Edenfield. However, these services are currently not open to new patients from the Edenfield area. Again Rossendale Council or partners has failed to provide evidence required under NPPF and NPPG on how this will be addressed.</p> <p>The proposals made in the draft Local Plan have not been supported by significant evidence. Rossendale Council has failed to follow guidance from the NPPF and NPPG, which clearly states the Local Plan should provide a clear initial five year plan stating is required in terms of infrastructure requirements, who is going to fund it and provide it. Therefore Policy HS3 - Edenfield should be withdrawn from draft Local Plan until all the correct supporting evidence has been obtained and considered.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						I hope the Council and Councillor's will consider my objections to Local Plan and Changes to Urban Boundary/Green Belt, as the current proposals would have a detrimental affect on communities in Edenfield and across the borough of Rossendale.		
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>HS3: EDENFIELD</p> <p>An allocated residential site comprising 26 ha (gross) has been identified as potential for providing residential development. The Local Plan states that any scheme will need to be well designed so that it delivers a sufficient level of accessibility to the site and that there is connectivity to public transport. It is further stated that any development proposals will be subjected to a Scoping Study, Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.</p> <p>Key Points</p> <p>The Edenfield site is located in close proximity to the A56(T) and M66 and as a result of this, and the size of the site, it has the potential to have a significant traffic impact on the SRN. The inclusion of the site in the assessments undertaken as part of the highways evidence base which is required to underpin the Local Plan will allow for a better understanding of the impact of the site. The need for the site to be accessible via a range of travel modes, supported by a Travel Plan as part of a planning application, will be important in reducing the overall traffic impact on the SRN.</p> <p>The site lies above the level of the A56, resulting in an embankment between this land and the carriageways. At one location (Woodcliff Cutting), the embankment is unstable due to a gradual landslip that has been moving for a number of years. Whilst this is being monitored regularly, we would advise that this is factored-in to any allocation of this wider site and its subsequent promotion through the emerging Plan as there is a danger that the land-loading pressure of development on top of the embankment could further affect its stability. We would ask that a geotechnical assessment be carried out in this location to advise the Council as to how this issue should be managed.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>Response to the Requirements of Policy HS3: Edenfield</p> <p>3.7 Policy HS3 is a policy supporting the HS2.71 allocation at Edenfield, which covers 26 hectares of land across four individual sites, being promoted by four separate parties. The Taylor Wimpey site covers the largest site area, at the centre of the allocation. Policy HS3 states that new residential development will be permitted in this area subject to specific criteria and we address these in turn below.</p> <p>a) Comprehensive development of the entire site is demonstrated through a masterplan</p> <p>3.8 Policy HS3 outlines how the Council expect to see comprehensive development of the full allocation through a masterplan.</p> <p>3.9 Taylor Wimpey are committed to this process and have engaged with the other key landowners, as demonstrated in the Memorandum of Understanding and an initial Constraints and Opportunities Plan, which are attached at Appendix 2 and 3 accordingly.</p> <p>3.10 As part of this it was agreed that the next step should involve the interested parties meeting with the Council to discuss the consultation responses and feedback received at the public meetings, before working up a more formal draft masterplan.</p> <p>b) The implementation of development in accordance with an agreed Design Code</p> <p>3.11 We are in agreement with the general Design Code principles listed here, but reserve the right to make further, more detailed comments as these criteria are refined and as the masterplanning process progresses.</p> <p>3.12 We would also reiterate our earlier comments that Design Codes and other additional policy documents can add an additional layer of complexity and lead to delays in the delivery. In this instance, we agree that some form of design framework is necessary given the size of the site, albeit it is possible this could be secured through a detailed masterplan and could be controlled through a policy in the Local Plan rather than necessitating a separate document to be prepared and adopted by the Local Authority post adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>c) A phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule for the area</p> <p>3.13 We do not take issue with the infrastructure requirements and phasing considerations listed here; and confirm that these will be agreed and refined with the Council and adjoining landowners as the process progresses. However, we would ask that the Council clarify what format this schedule is intended to take and how it will be monitored and implemented, as again, if it has to go through any formal approval process it could add complexity and cause delays.</p> <p>3.14 Finally, any infrastructure requirements must be shown to be necessary and proportionate, and must take account of viability matters.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>d) An agreed programme of implementation in accordance with the masterplan</p> <p>3.15 We would reiterate our comments from part c above,</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Support	<p>Policy HS3: Edenfield</p> <p>3.17 As above, the DLP identifies a 26ha (64 acre) parcel of land to the north and west of Edenfield for release from Green Belt and allocation for housing development. Policy HS3: Edenfield sets out the requirements for the development of this site which includes a comprehensive masterplan being developed for the entire site, implementation in accordance with an agreed Design Code, an agreed phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule, and a programme of implementation – all to be progressed as part of the evolving Local Plan process.</p> <p>3.18 This Draft Land Allocation comprises a number of separate land ownerships. The major landowners collectively support the draft HS3 allocation and have put forward their individual sites (parcels of said allocation) for consideration as part of the preparation of the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>3.19 In compliance with the draft policy, the landowners are committed to working together to enable the entire HS3 allocation to be delivered. An initial meeting has been held and it is agreed that a joined up approach to development of a masterplan will be taken, in partnership with Rossendale Borough Council and other relevant stakeholders, including the local community in and around Edenfield.</p> <p>3.20 A Constraints and Opportunities Plan for the entire allocation has been prepared jointly on behalf of the major landowners and is included at Appendix 1.</p> <p>3.21 As infrastructure requirements are defined and specified for the allocation as a whole, the landowners with the Council and other relevant Stakeholders will work together to ensure that necessary requirements are incorporated into the masterplan and the phasing and delivery programme. Likewise, where technical assessments are needed, a joined up allocation wide approach will be sought. In particular, the following matters will be collectively addressed, so far as possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate buffers adjacent to the A56 will be included to ensure that new homes are protected from unacceptable levels of noise • Key views across the site to the Rossendale Valley will be protected and maintained, where appropriate. • Design and layout will consider the setting of Edenfield Parish Church, Market Street/ Horse and Jockey, and the amenity of existing housing. • A movement framework will identify key access points and circulation within the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians. • Key principles will be developed for contextual design, architectural styles and materials. • Ecological and nature conservation, flood risk and drainage considerations will be investigated further and mitigation identified. • Requirements for open space and play areas will be identified together with 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>a strategy for delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport implications of the cumulative development. <p>3.22 Individual representations have been produced and submitted to illustrate the suitability and deliverability of each specific parcel of land within the wider allocation as well as echoing support for the wider DLP allocation. This statement however, should be taken as reassurance that going forward the major landowners are committed to working together to deliver this strategically important development in Edenfield, in accordance with the aspirations of Policy HS:3 and will seek to engage with the Council and other relevant Stakeholders.</p>		
1771	Mohammed Ali	Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>Site Allocations</p> <p>Policy HS3 Edenfield identifies the 4 allocated housing sites as per Policy HS2 Housing Allocations, (sites HS2.71) as a large housing site which will require a masterplan to be prepared. The overall site is expected to provide 451 housing units. The masterplan is to be prepared to a design code and is to be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule and other assessments including a transport assessment and travel plan.</p> <p>The Edenfield housing sites will cover a 15ha area of existing greenfield, within the ward of Eden. Policy HS3 identifies the overall Edenfield site gross area as 26ha. Given that this is significant strategic housing site area for Rossendale, which is expected to have a strategic impact on the local area, it has the potential to have positive and negative health impacts, to the immediate locality and also to neighbouring wards. The design code principles listed in the policy do not include reference to cycling and walking provision, air quality or road safety considerations, although we would expect that these aspects would be considered in a transport assessment and travel plan for the site. Given the size of the overall site area, no reference is given either to the provision of any of the site for specialist housing accommodation.</p> <p>Revise Policy HS3: Edenfield, to require a Health Impact Assessment to be prepared as part of the policy criteria. In addition the design code principles should be reviewed to require the incorporation of good quality and accessible cycling and walking provision within the development and a requirement for electric vehicle charging points. Design and layout considerations should also consider road safety, particularly for the most vulnerable people (i.e. children, elderly and the disabled). Consideration should also be given to the inclusion for a percentage requirement for the provision of specialised housing if a need is identified, with the site correspondingly allocated in Policy HS17: Specialised Housing.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities		Not Applicable	Policy HS3 - Edenfield United Utilities are pleased to see that the policy encourages development proposals to achieve high standards of sustainable design and construction through (amongst other things) incorporating drainage masterplanning and seeking to reduce water consumption and minimise surface water run-off. United Utilities encourages masterplanning on this large allocation. As the site is greenfield, there may need to be infrastructure improvements to accommodate such development. United Utilities would require early consultation with regard to the masterplanning documents produced in relation to this site.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS3: Edenfield</p> <p>Within the area defined on the Policies Map at Edenfield (Housing Allocation HS2.71) new residential development will be permitted subject to the following:</p> <p>a) Comprehensive development of the entire site is demonstrated through a masterplan;</p> <p>b) The implementation of development in accordance with an agreed Design Code. The Design Code shall include the design principles for the whole of the site and will incorporate, amongst other elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Specific character areas incorporating detailing design requirements b. A highway hierarchy and design considerations c. A greenspace and landscape structure d. A movement framework e. Layout considerations f. Parking and garaging g. Appropriate building and hard surfacing materials h. Maximising energy efficiency in design i. Details of appropriate boundary treatments j. Lighting k. Details of the laying of services, drainage and cables l. Bin storage and rubbish collection m. Ecology and nature conservation n. Design and layout considerations in respect of the setting of the Grade II* Listed Edenfield Parish Church o. Design and Layout considerations in respect of the existing housing within the allocation p. The relationship with the adjacent retained recreation ground q. The relationship to Market Street, in particular the Horse and Jockey r. Noise mitigation in respect of the adjacent A56 <p>c) A phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule for the area. The schedule shall include, amongst other elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Foul drainage b. On site Affordable Housing c. Surface water drainage strategy including details of Sustainable Urban Drainage d. Nature conservation and enhancement works e. Provision and layout of public open space (including the provision of a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Plan NEAP) f. Provision of footpath and cycle links g. Tree works and tree protection measures d) An agreed programme of implementation in accordance with the masterplan 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS03	Further comment
						<p>A. RCT support HS3 and note its: area comprising 26 ha (gross site area) has been identified as potential for providing residential development, subject to national policy in the Framework and other relevant policies of this Local Plan e.g. policy on affordable housing. - will require a well designed scheme that responds to the sites context, makes the most of environmental, heritage and leisure assets and delivers the necessary sustainability, transport, connectivity, accessibility (including public transport) and infrastructure requirements –</p> <p>B. RCT advise that to make sense, to justify the ambition of a Masterplan, we should have a representative community involvement to look at the overall area of Edenfield – not just what’s in ownership of a potential developer. To look at the potential ways that it could become an example of how to do well an expanded village in the Green Belt. Including, a maybe unwelcome to some, development along a Local Distributor or Spine Road from the areas of Horncliffe Mansions on Burnley Road, past the Cricket Ground, link to Plunge Road, a Dearden Clough Lake, and on to Rochdale Road. Look for example at how another part of the A56 helped to create the valued areas around Lymm Dam in north Cheshire.</p>		
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Object	<p>Policy HS3: Edenfield</p> <p>18. The allocation could be deleted from the local plan as, set out above, it is no longer necessary. The site is very open in character and allows views of the surrounding hills and moors.</p> <p>19. If the Council concludes this site is needed, even when considering the reduced housing requirement, CPRE agrees (without prejudice) that it should be well designed and subject to a Masterplan.</p>		
1794			The Methodist Church		Support	<p>Policy HS3: Edenfield</p> <p>2.18 The Methodist Church are fully supportive of this policy and the requirements as they relate to Housing Allocation HS2.71, within which Land at Exchange Street sits. A Joint Statement has been produced by the landowners that make up this allocation, namely The Methodist Church, Taylor Wimpey and Peel Holdings, which confirms their commitment to work together and ensure that a combined approach is taken in respect of this wider allocation. This Statement, along with an initial Opportunities and Constraints Plan, is provided at Appendix C to this representation and should be read as our response to this policy.</p>		
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Support	<p>We support the requirement for a phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule. From a strategic perspective, the management of surface and foul water should ideally be designed for the site as a whole rather than individual development plots. The cumulative impacts of multiple foul and surface water discharges from different sites will be more effectively managed when considered as a whole.</p>		

Number of comments HS03

20

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS04	Further comment
Reference		HS04		Affordable Housing				
6	Christopher	McManus	Park Royal Development s (NW) Ltd		Object	- This same argument would be made for Policy HS4 b) "On any rural exception sites including those in the Green Belt there will be a requirement of 100% on-site affordable housing." It has been recognised that larger more desirable houses are wanted but no Private Developer is going to want to build them if they are all affordable as there is little margin in them for Small/Medium size Developers. This could be considered preferential treatment for Developers of affordable housing schemes, who incidentally already have an advantage on the open market as they can borrow funds for construction as less than half the market rate from Local and National Governments. - - Finally I would point out that the 30% figure was arrived at in the RBC's Affordable Housing Economic Viability Assessment in 2010. The data used in this report was compiled in 2008 and 2009 a period in which housing, land and build costs were much cheaper following the economic downturn in 2007. A more up to date assessment should be carried out in regards to affordable housing as it is unlikely that 30% will be considered workable by most Developers.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS04	Further comment
677	Phil	Ramsden	Lindon Park Development s Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>"Policy HS4: Affordable Housing - - This policy requires that new housing developments of 10 or more dwellings (0.35 hectares or part thereof) will be required to provide on-site affordable housing as follows: a) requirement of 30% on-site affordable housing from market housing schemes, subject to site and development considerations (such as financial viability); b) on any rural exception sites including those in the Green Belt there will be a requirement of 100% on-site affordable housing; c) affordable housing shall be provided in line with identified needs of tenure, size and type as set out in the latest available information on housing needs; d) within larger housing developments, the affordable housing will be evenly distributed throughout the development. Where a site has been divided and brought forward in phases, the Council will consider the site as a whole for the purposes of calculating the appropriate level of affordable housing provision. - - The policy goes on to confirm that where robustly justified, off-site provision or financial contributions of a broadly equivalent value instead of on-site provision, will be acceptable where the site or location is unsustainable for affordable housing. - - The Representor does not oppose this policy, indeed its origins lie in national planning policy guidance and as such the Council is correct to include a policy of this nature, however the Representor it is of the view that the policy should be more specific about viability related issues which provision of affordable housing inevitably raise. By this we mean that the policy should make it clearer that while the provision of affordable is a key policy aspiration, the Council recognises that delivery of the full policy target can render many developments unviable, a key issue in Rossendale given the nature of the local topography which raises a considerable number of site related issues which can be costly to address when sites are being promoted for development. The policy should categorically confirm at the outset that this is recognised and is a key consideration. - - In addition, the Representor is also of the view that in some instances better and more effective affordable provision can be provided if monies are collected, pooled and provision provided off site. Indeed, such an approach lends itself to smaller sites and sites that might be better promoted as mixed-use developments, where, for example, there might be scope for residential above retail units. - - Based on the above, the policy could be redrafted to say as follows: - - Policy HS4: Affordable Housing - - ""New housing developments through the listed allocations forming part of Policy HS2 will be expected to provide an element of affordable housing unless it can be unequivocally demonstrated that the target provision would render the overall development unviable. In this scenario, the Council will either accept that no affordable units need be provided or will seek a lesser provision in line with the viability of the scheme or alternatively will collect contributions towards provision off site. - - Relevant sites that will be required to provide affordable units are new</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS04	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>housing developments of 10 or more dwellings (0.35 hectares or part thereof). They will be required to provide on-site affordable housing as follows: - - a)As per current wording of the policy)" - "</p> <p>Meeting the Need for Affordable Housing</p> <p>4.42 As highlighted earlier, there is a sizeable need for affordable housing in Rossendale, which will require a significant short-term uplift in delivery to even clear the backlog of households with unmet needs on the Housing Register. The DLP recognises the importance of tackling this issue 'to prevent the problem becoming more acute', proposing the delivery of affordable housing as part of market housing-led developments.</p> <p>4.43 The DLP acknowledges the need to 'balance the delivery of affordable housing against viability of delivery'. In spatially distributing development in the Borough, allocations in stronger, higher value market areas will be important in securing both the quality of housing sought through policy and the viable delivery of affordable housing, in response to the evidence of substantial need. A standalone representation on development viability is included at Appendix 1.</p> <p>New Housing Requirements</p> <p>7.2 Policy HS4 sets out requirements for provision of affordable housing within new developments at 30% where more than 10 units are proposed, subject to site and development considerations (such as financial viability) and at 100% on rural exception sites. The evidence base supporting the Local Plan includes an economic viability study of the Site Allocations and DM DPD55 which concludes that this may be achievable in some higher value areas within the Borough, particularly for greenfield sites and where higher densities are appropriate, but will not be viable in other areas with a number of sites assessed only capable of achieving 10% affordable.</p> <p>7.3 It is considered that this is not sufficient evidence upon which to apply a blanket 30% requirement for sites over 10 units, and is overly onerous on developers in terms of the detailed justification that would be needed where this is not viable. Our client requests that the policy should refer to a requirement determined on a site by site basis.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS04	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	Affordable Housing The provision of affordable housing is plays an important role in enabling people, including those on lower incomes, to access a range of housing tenures and localities. Policy HS4: Affordable Housing, requires new housing developments of 10 or more dwellings (or 0.35 hectares or part thereof) to provide on-site affordable housing in line with stated criteria. There is a requirement for 30% on-site affordable housing to be provided on market housing schemes and 100% on-site affordable housing provision on rural exception sites. In the policy explanation reference is made to the Council's SHMA which recommends that at least 158 affordable dwellings to be provided in the district per year, and potentially 321 affordable dwellings per year. Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations calculates a potential housing unit yield of 3622 for the local plan period, even if 30% of this total yield was provided as on-site affordable housing that would result in an affordable housing provision of 1086, which is 1,284 less that the 15 year local plan period amount of 2,370, if the minimum recommended amount of 158units were provided per year. Given that not all of the allocated sites are over 10 units and other housing sites may be subject to constraints, it appears that the SHMA recommended level may not be achievable. Review Policy HS4: Affordable Housing, to consider how the SHMA recommended annual amount of on-site affordable housing provision can be realistically achieved during the local plan period and whether a higher level of provision should be required on larger housing site allocations.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS04	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS4: Affordable Housing</p> <p>New housing developments of 10 or more dwellings (0.35 hectares or part thereof) will be required to provide on-site affordable housing as follows:</p> <p>a) A requirement of 30% on-site affordable housing from market housing schemes subject to site and development considerations (such as financial viability).</p> <p>b) On any rural exception sites including those in the Green Belt there will be a requirement of 100% on-site affordable housing.</p> <p>c) The affordable housing shall be provided in line with identified needs of tenure, size and type as set out in the latest available information on housing needs.</p> <p>d) Within larger housing developments, the affordable housing will be evenly distributed throughout the development. Where a site has been divided and brought forward in phases, the Council will consider the site as a whole for the purposes of calculating the appropriate level of affordable housing provision. Where robustly justified, off-site provision or financial contributions of a broadly equivalent value instead of on-site provision will be acceptable where the site or location is unsustainable for affordable housing.</p> <p>The size of the development should not be artificially reduced to decrease or eliminate the affordable housing requirement, for example, by sub-dividing sites or reducing the density of all or part of a site. The Council will consider the site as a whole for the purposes of calculating the appropriate level of affordable housing provision.</p> <p>A. RCT supports HS4 subject to inclusion of a policy to identify sites for affordable and social housing to be purchased by the Council for use by RSLs for shared ownership and general let housing in order to meet: The Council's SHMA has demonstrated that there is considerable need for affordable housing in Rossendale and it states that the issue must be tackled to prevent the problem from becoming more acute. The study recommends that there is a need for at least 158 affordable dwellings to be provided in Rossendale per year in addition to market housing and potentially that there is a need for up to 321 affordable dwellings per year.</p> <p>B. RCT notes loss on sites, such as Whinberry View from claims of unforeseen site problems.</p> <p>C. RCT note that in 1977 Rossendale had c7230 LA dwellings, 29.3% of c24680 total housing stock. In 2009 RSLs had 3503 self contained units and 1022 supported bedspaces to total 4525, or 14.8% of 30544 total housing stock. In 2016 Rossendale had 80 La owned buildings, RSL's 4680 (14.8%), private sector 26950, Total 31710. From 2011 to 2016, gain 860 houses, of which 184 or 20% are social, but NOTE Together Housing Group had 66 sales from Right to Buy and Right to Acquire. Was 150 from 2006-2011.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS04	Further comment
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Support	<p>Policy HS4: Affordable Housing</p> <p>20. CPRE is supportive of this policy. It is right that sites in excess of ten dwellings should provide an 'on-site' affordable housing contribution. We agree 100% of exception sites should be affordable.</p> <p>21. We broadly agree with the remaining housing policies. Gardens ought not to be grabbed for speculative housing development as it can harm the character of residential neighbourhoods.</p>		

Number of comments HS04

6

Reference HS05 Housing Density

677	Phil	Ramsden	Lindon Park Developments Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>Policy HS5: Housing Density - - This deals with the proposed density of new housing development and requires it to be in keeping with local areas and to ensure that it does not have a detrimental impact on the amenity, character, appearance, distinctiveness and environmental quality of an area. - - Although the Representor does not object to the policy as such, indeed it recognises what the policy is trying to achieve, it does raise the issue as to whether the policy is too prescriptive given it applies throughout the Borough as opposed to just areas where landscape quality might be high and/or there are heritage related designations. In addition, there might be possible issues regarding whether the policy clashes with Policy HS2 which allocates sites for development as this includes a target number of units (based on density calculations) and Policy HS4 on provision of affordable housing. This is influenced by viability considerations, which in turn are heavily influenced by the layout, design and density of proposed schemes. - - Accordingly, the Representor is of the view that it would be more appropriate for the policy to be pitched more generally and to deal mainly with design, for example: - - Policy HS5: Design of Housing Developments - - "The Council will require the design of new development, which also covers layout and related matters including density considerations, to be of a high quality and appropriate to the site and its location so as to ensure that the proposed development is appropriate to its surroundings and does not have a detrimental impact on existing amenity." -</p>		
-----	------	---------	------------------------------	--	----------------	--	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS05	Further comment
1619	Michael	Onley	Planning Sense NW		Object	<p>The geographical challenge of 4000+ new-build houses in a tightly constrained post-industrial landscape has obliged Rossendale BC to abandon its target of 65% of new housing on previously developed land [Rossendale Core Strategy policy 2, RBC 2011] and to adopt an unsustainable target of 20% of all new dwellings on previously developed land [Rossendale Draft Local Plan policy HS1, RBC 2017]</p> <p>Clients fear cherry-picking of the most desirable sites. This is reflected in the abandonment of density target of 50+ dwellings per hectare appropriate to urban renewal [Rossendale Core Strategy policy 2, RBC 2011] in favour of a suburban 30+ figure [Rossendale Draft Local Plan policy HS5, RBC 2017].</p> <p>Clients oppose planning blight upon precious greenfield sites such as achingly lovely meadows east of Johnny Barn (variously identified as HS2.53 and duplicated as HS2.54), and cinematic quality, rail-side pasture at Haslam Farm (HS2.60). Access and road safety concerns have been raised in respect of allocation HS2.86 (St Peter's School) - photos attached.</p> <p>(...) •Draft policy HS5 in respect of low residential density target(...)</p>		
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Support	<p>Policy HS5: Housing Density</p> <p>2.51 We agree with Policy HS5 as drafted, as it allows for sufficient flexibility and variation in density, based on the characteristics of the individual site; rather than a blanket prescriptive requirement.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS05	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Object	<p>Policy HS5: Housing Density</p> <p>The density of the development should be in keeping with local areas and have no detrimental impact on the amenity, character, appearance, distinctiveness and environmental quality of an area.</p> <p>A. RCT object to HS5 and it's Explanation: The Government's Housing White Paper 'Fixing our broken housing market' (2017) encourages better use of land for housing by encouraging higher densities where appropriate, such as in urban locations where there is high housing demand.</p> <p>Densities in excess of 30 dwellings per hectare will be expected to be delivered in sustainable locations within Rossendale. Sustainable locations include urban areas and areas around public transport nodes. The figure of 30 dwellings per hectare is reflective of historic housing densities in some parts of Rossendale. It is recognised that housing densities will be lower in other areas of the Borough because of physical constraints, for example, topography, areas at risk of flooding and landscape.</p> <p>B. RCT note present 2011 Core Strategy was adopted after: "Report to Rossendale Borough Council by Roland Punshon BSc Hons, MRTPI an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government 10 October 2011"</p> <p>Appendix D: Monitoring and Implementation Strategy:-</p> <p>70% of all new residential development in Rawtenstall, Bacup, Haslingden and Whitworth to be built at 50 dwellings per hectare. 85% of all new residential development in all other areas to be built at 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>C. RCT have noted in a July 2014 RBC Annual Monitoring Report:-</p> <p>Progress towards Targets</p> <p>In 2013/2014 only 3.5% of dwellings built in Rawtenstall, Bacup, Haslingden and Whitworth were built at 50 dwellings per hectare. Although the cumulative three year figure is slightly higher at 9.8%, this figure also falls well below the target and trigger.</p> <p>The results are significantly underperforming against the target despite the Council working with partners and developers to encourage higher density housing developments. It may be necessary to review this policy or investigate why high densities are not being achieved, and consider how this can be resolved.</p> <p>For areas outside Rawtenstall, Bacup, Haslingden and Whitworth, the density of new residential development being built at 30 dwellings per ha or above was 92.5% in 2013/2014 which is above the target. Over the cumulative three years the figure stands at 67% which is marginally below the trigger</p> <p>The results are significantly underperforming against the target despite the Council working with partners and developers to encourage higher density housing developments</p> <p>D. RCT suggest this example, to maybe illustrate how choices made by RBC</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS05	Further comment
						<p>lead to their not achieving their Core Strategy Policy 2 targets. Look at the 2015 Local Plan's withdrawn consultation: Tier 1 site H16 Whinberry View, detailed in Site Allocations as 29 houses on 0.6Ha at 48/Ha. But on this area it was actually 23 houses at 38/Ha. The developer purchased 166 Bacup Road to get 29 houses on 0.72Ha and so 40/Ha. Now the northern part of this site is in an area of sloping Greenlands, and there's now permission, for 28 – 39/Ha, to cut into this with sheet piling and retaining walls close to a densely tree planted boundary with Rossendale BC's H13 Greenlands. RCT's representations suggested the exclusion of the site's Greenland and a simple 3 row layout of 31 terraced houses on 0.6Ha at 52/HA.</p> <p>E. RCT do not see this proposal, to come down from 50 to 30/Ha, meeting the aims of this White Paper, where it talks about:-</p> <p>A.67 Local planning authorities decide what sort of density is appropriate for their areas. A locally led approach is important to ensure that development reflects the character and opportunities presented by each area. At the same time, authorities and applicants need to be ambitious about what sites can offer, especially in areas where demand is high and land is scarce, and where there are opportunities to make effective use of brownfield land given the strong economic and environmental benefits.</p> <p>A.68 To help ensure that effective use is made of land, and building on its previous consultations,¹⁰⁵ the Government proposes to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to make it clear that plans and individual development proposals should:</p> <p>make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs</p> <p>ensure that the density and form of development reflect the character, accessibility and infrastructure capacity of an area, and the nature of local housing needs (which may, for example, mean terraced houses.</p> <p>F. RCT therefore suggest this alternative to HS5:-</p> <p>Residential development should seek to achieve the maximum density compatible with good design, the protection of heritage assets, local amenity, the character and quality of the local environment, and the safety and convenience of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>70% of all new residential development in Rawtenstall, Bacup, Haslingden and Whitworth to be built at 50 dwellings per hectare. 85% of all new residential development in all other areas to be built at 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>Housing type densities:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low cost Market Housing: 3 bed / 4 person and 3 bed / 5 person mostly in linked pairs and short terraces at about 40 - 60 / Ha. 2. So called "Aspirational" Market Housing: 4 bed / 6 person and 5 bed / 7 person detached at about 20 – 40 / Ha. 3. Apartment Housing both Social and Market: at 100 – 200 / Ha. 4. Social "General Let" Housing: 3 bed / 4 person, 3 bed / 5 person and 4 bed 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS05	Further comment
						/ 6-8 person in terraces at about 70 – 90 / Ha. 5. Category 1 Social Housing for old persons: 1 bed 2 person and 2 bed / 3 person single storey in terraces at about 50 – 70 / Ha. Standard definition of Housing Density, as DOE Circular 88/71 26 November 1971. Housing Density (bed spaces) per hectare.		

Number of comments HS05

4

Reference HS06 Housing Standards

677	Phil	Ramsden	Lindon Park Development s Ltd		Not Applicable	For the same reasons as given in relation to Policy HS4 covered earlier, the Representor does not oppose the principles this policy introduces, rather it suggests that such matters need to be considered in the round, including in the context of impacts on viability, and that such matters will be taken into account should a development not be able to deliver the full requirements of the policy, as per the current draft of it.		
-----	------	---------	-------------------------------	--	----------------	--	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS06	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Object	<p>Policy HS6: Housing Standards</p> <p>2.52 Policy HS6 indicates that the Council intend to introduce accessibility standards (at least 30% of housing to be wheelchair adaptable) and national internal space standards and we comment on these in turn.</p> <p>a) Access- meeting the needs of elderly or disabled residents</p> <p>2.53 Whilst Taylor Wimpey are committed as a responsible house builder to deliver accessible forms of housing if required, this must be based on a demonstrable need, and therefore we would request that evidence and clarification is provided on this matter.</p> <p>2.54 Part A requires at least 30% of any new housing development to meet the needs of elderly or disabled residents, or be easily adaptable; subject to site-specific factors and viability.</p> <p>2.55 Whilst we welcome the flexibility provided within this policy, and would highlight that site specific factors such as topography are a major issue in Rossendale, we do raise concerns with the 30% starting point.</p> <p>2.56 The explanatory text to this policy indicates that the SHMA highlights a considerable growth in the number of elderly households, as well as a high percentage of households containing one or more adults with some form of disability.</p> <p>2.57 This reflects the aging population trend which can be seen nation-wide. Paragraph 10.74 of the SHMA also confirms that 18.5% of households in Rossendale contain one or more adults with some form of disability. However, whilst the SHMA provides a starting point in establishing demographic trends, it does not provide enough evidence to translate this into a policy threshold for housing to be adapted to these specific groups and certainly not one set at 30%.</p> <p>2.58 Firstly, neither the SHMA nor wider evidence base confirms the proportion of these groups who will require dedicated, and wheelchair adaptable new housing, as many may wish to stay put and adapt their own homes. Furthermore, whilst the Viability Assessment states that it has factored these requirements in, these are insufficiently evidenced and justified in the report, which gives no detailed breakdown of the costs involved.</p> <p>2.59 It is worth reiterating Section 56 of the NPPG, which confirms that the introduction of new enhanced standards on water efficiency, accessibility and spaces are optional, and must be justified by specific evidence on need and viability before they can be implemented. The evidence in this instance falls well short of demonstrating the need or viability of a 30% target.</p> <p>b) Internal Space- National space standards</p> <p>2.60 As with the elderly housing requirement, we have concerns with the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS06	Further comment
						<p>application of the National Space Standards on the basis that the need and viability for this has not been sufficiently demonstrated within the evidence to meet the requirements of the NPPG (paragraph 56-020-20150327). The SHMA does not consider housing size in this context, and whilst the Viability Assessment states that it has factored these standards in, the implications are not properly articulated.</p> <p>2.61 In respect of the space standards, the NPPG also requires that transitional arrangements are considered following adoption to enable developers to factor the associated costs into future land acquisitions, and there has been no discussion of this in the Draft Plan or evidence.</p> <p>2.62 As such we would request that this requirement is removed or that additional evidence and clarification is provided.</p>		
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Object	<p>7.4 Policy HS6 requires at least 30% of any new housing development to be tailored to meet the needs of elderly or disabled residents, or be easily adaptable. The explanatory text refers to the SHMA showing 'a high percentage of households containing one or more adults with some form of disability (15.8%)', this is again not sufficiently evidenced. Whilst the policy states that this standard will be applied flexibly where necessary, considering site conditions, the expected percentage is unduly high. New development should not be required to meet the shortcomings of existing housing stock. Opportunities for improving and adapting existing stock should contribute to meeting the demand in the Borough. Our client requests that this policy is revised accordingly.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS06	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>Policy HS6: Housing Standards, addresses the national regime of optional technical standards for housing which are to be adopted for new housing developments. Policy HS6 requires for Access, that at least 30% of new housing provided on sites should be specifically tailored to meet the needs of elderly and disabled residents, or be easily adaptable, unless evidence is provided on specific factors that could affect a developer's ability to provide this provision. In terms of Internal space the nationally described spaces standards should be the minimum provision.</p> <p>The inclusion of Policy HS6 in the local plan is welcomed. Some clarification is required as to how the 30% adaptable housing requirement, will exceed the minimum requirements as set out in the access requirements of Building Regulations M4 (2) Category 2 Acceptable and adaptable dwellings. The policy could be enhanced further by requiring the design of new housing development to conform to the Design Council's Building for Life 12 industry standard.</p> <p>Revise Policy HS6: Housing Standards, to clarify that 30% of new housing will be required to be adaptable with access requirements exceeding those of the Building Regulation M4 (2) Category 2. The policy should also require that all new developments to take account of Building for Life 12 industry code.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS06	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS6: Housing Standards</p> <p>In accordance with the national regime of optional technical standards for housing, the Council will adopt the following local standards for new housing developments, in line with the National Planning Practice Guidance:</p> <p>a) Access - at least 30% of any new housing provided on a site should be specifically tailored to meet the needs of elderly or disabled residents, or be easily adaptable. In this regard the Council will adopt a flexible approach where necessary, taking into consideration specific factors, such as site topography and vulnerability to flooding, along with evidence on the economic viability of individual developments; and</p> <p>b) Internal space – the nationally described space standards should be the minimum with more generous provision provided where possible.</p> <p>The Council will expect submitted information to demonstrate how points a) and b) have been achieved.</p> <p>RCT support HS6 and note that: The SHMA also shows that there is a high percentage of households containing one or more adults with some form of disability (15.8%) and found that households containing a disabled resident were more likely to consider that their home is unsuitable than the Borough-wide average. Note Part M Building Regulations, which from mid 80s aimed to help “care in the community” to ensure that most people are able to access and use buildings and their facilities. It applies to all housing – so what’s the extra guidance for at least 30%??? Is it to avoid repeats of all purpose Kitchen Dining Lounges to allow wheelchair space in Bathrooms and Bedrooms??? To avoid “cheapskate” aims to achieve wheelchair housing at “Parker Morris” areas???</p>		
Number of comments			HS06	5				
Reference		HS07	Private Residential Garden Development					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS07	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS7: Private Residential Garden Development</p> <p>Within the urban boundary applications to provide additional dwellings within private residential gardens on sites not allocated for housing will only be supported where:</p> <p>It would not result in a cramped form of development or have a detrimental impact on the character of the area or the street scene;</p> <p>It would not result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity to neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking, loss of light, increased noise or an overbearing impact;</p> <p>It is designed to a high standard using appropriate materials to enhance local character and distinctiveness;</p> <p>Appropriate outdoor amenity space is provided for both the existing buildings and proposed dwelling(s);</p> <p>It would not have a severe adverse impact on highway safety or the operation of the highway network;</p> <p>The vehicular access and car parking arrangements would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbours in terms of visual amenity, noise or light;</p> <p>Important landscape features and boundary treatments which contribute to the character, appearance or biodiversity of the area would be retained and where possible enhanced; and</p> <p>When assessing applications for garden sites, the Council will also have regard to sustainability, such as access to public transport, schools, businesses and local services and facilities.</p> <p>Proposals which significantly undermine amenity and harm the distinctive character of an area will be refused.</p> <p>RCT support HS7.</p>		
Number of comments		HS07		1				
Reference		HS08		Open Space Requirements in New Housing Developments				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS08	Further comment
1036	L	Bower	c/o agent		Object	The policy states: - "An update to the existing accompanying Supplementary Planning Document will establish the following: - i. The minimum local standards and how they will be applied. - ii. Accessibility and qualitative assessments, to determine the amount of new open space provision required as part of a residential development or - iii. Appropriate financial contributions required from new residential developments." - Such wording would give the SPD the status of a policy which must be complied with to meet the development plan. However an SPD can only provide supplementary guidance, and will not be subject to independent scrutiny at examination in the same way that the development plan is. We therefore consider that the sentence should be deleted from the policy. An additional sentence could be inserted within the supporting text to clarify that regard should be had to the SPD / Open Space Strategy. - We note that a number of other policies within the plan require compliance with an SPD, and our comments would apply equally to those policies.		-
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	Policy HS8: Open Space Requirements in New Housing Developments 2.63 This Policy confirms that the existing SPD on Open Space will be updated to discuss minimum local standards and appropriate financial contributions. We therefore reserve the right to comment on these local standards and financial contributions as and when the SPD is updated and consulted on.		
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	Open Space, Gardens and Playing Pitches 7.8 Public open space and private garden requirements for new housing developments are set out in policies HS8 and HS10 respectively. 7.9 HS8 sets out a requirement for provision of open space and recreation facilities, where there are identified local deficiencies in quantity accessibility and quality / value. The policy states that an updated SPD will set out minimum local standards, accessibility and qualitative assessments and appropriate financial contributions. Peel reserves the right to comment further when the SPD is under review. It is considered that the SPD update should take place as soon as possible to give clarity to development. A degree of flexibility is needed where standards are set in order to reflect site context, local provision and overall viability measures. Precise open space requirements should be capable of being agreed on a site by site basis.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS08	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>Open Space Provision</p> <p>The provision of, and access to, greenspace for recreational, fitness and mental wellbeing plays an important role in enabling people to be physically active and sociable.</p> <p>Policy HS8: Playing Pitch Requirements in New Housing Developments, requires that housing sites of 10 or more new units (0.35 hectares or part thereof) will be required to pay a financial contribution towards improvements to existing playing pitches in the Borough. This is in line with the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) which identifies a number of deficiencies in provision in Rossendale against Sport England's requirements. Policy HS8 is only focused on the provision of playing pitches and does not represent a general requirement for public open space provision. No reference is given to housing sites of 10 or more units being required to provide public open space in accordance with Fields in Trust standards, whereby 2.4hectares of public open space per 1,000 population is recommended to be provided.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Clarification should be given on whether Policy HS8: Playing Pitch Requirement in New Housing Developments is intended to only meet the requirements of the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy. If it is also the mechanism for delivering the recommended public open space provision as per the Fields in Trust standard, the policy needs to be amended to reflect this. If not it is important that the provision of public open space by new housing developments is also addressed through local plan policy. All forms of public open space including amenity open space and children's play areas also need to be provided (or existing facilities enhanced) as appropriate provided either on or off site (depending on site thresholds), to enable all residents to have access to greenspace to aid health and wellbeing.</p>		
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities		Not Applicable	<p>Policy HS8: Open Space Requirements in New Housing Developments</p> <p>In support of the proposed policy, United Utilities would recommend the inclusion of the following paragraph as part of the proposed policy:</p> <p>“Where the proposal is identified at risk of flooding and / or will result in an increase in surface water run-off, a developer may be required to accommodate an element of open space for the discharge of surface water through the incorporation of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). The preference will be for no surface water to discharge to the public sewer, directly or indirectly, if more sustainable alternatives are available and can be achieved.”</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS08	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS8: Open Space Requirements in New Housing Developments</p> <p>Housing developments of 10 or more new dwellings (0.35 hectares or part thereof) will be required to make provision for open space and recreation facilities, where there are identified local deficiencies in the quantity, accessibility or quality and/or value of open space and recreation facilities. Where there is an identified local deficiency in quantity and/or accessibility to open space, provision will be required. This should be on-site for housing schemes of 100 or more dwellings. For smaller schemes or where this is not appropriate, payment of a financial contribution towards off-site provision or improvements to existing open spaces and recreation facilities will be required. Where there is existing provision but an identified local deficiency in the quality and/or value of these open spaces and recreation facilities, a financial contribution towards improving these sites will be required.</p> <p>The size of development should not be artificially reduced to decrease or eliminate the open space requirement, for example, by sub-dividing sites or reducing the density of all or part of a site. The Council will consider the site as a whole for the purposes of calculating the appropriate level of open space provision.</p> <p>An update to the existing accompanying Supplementary Planning Document will establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The minimum local standards and how they will be applied. ii. Accessibility and qualitative assessments, to determine the amount of new open space provision required as part of a residential development or iii. Appropriate financial contributions required from new residential developments. <p>RCT support HS8 subject to inclusion of a reference to Sport England guidance, which no doubt will be in the SPD. RCT also note need to ensure that open spaces, which can include unadopted parking and their access areas, need to have accountable and insured management, and in passing note that this is often why they have been planned out of areas. RCT note the Street Manager provisions for frontagers to such areas in the 1991 New Roads and Streetworks Act.</p>		
	Number of comments	HS08			6			
	Reference	HS09				Playing Pitch Requirements in New Housing Developments		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS09	Further comment
1614	Helen	Ledger	Sports England		Not Applicable	<p>2. Policy HS9 – beware contributions from new development cannot resolve deficits that already exist and can only contribute to the impact on future population growth. It is interesting you wish to defer to a future SPD on contributions, will this be one specifically on open space & sport, or dealing with developer contributions?</p> <p>Sport England do not support a standards approach, any demand for pitches will change over time and from place to place. Standards can be an over simplification of the likely actual newly arising need for pitches. You can instead use the playing pitch calculator to quantify contributions from major sites over a threshold and/or develop CIL to capture contributions for larger schemes.</p>		
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>Policy HS9: Playing Pitch Requirements in New Housing Developments</p> <p>2.64 Again, it is stated that an accompanying SPD will be produced to establish minimum local standards and appropriate financial contributions from new residential development. We reserve the right to comment on this matter further as and when the SPD is produced and consulted on.</p>		
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Object	<p>7.11 Policy HS9 requires financial contributions to be made from developments of over 10 dwellings to improvements in existing playing pitches in the Borough. An SPD will set out minimum local standards and appropriate contributions.</p> <p>7.12 Peel objects to the inflexible application of a requirement for financial contributions in this respect. There are clear policy and legal tests for planning obligations and contributions should only be required where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. As such, rather than establishing an upfront and one-size-fits-all expectation that new development will fund playing pitch improvements, the requirement for contributions should be determined on a site-by-site basis having regard to the relevant legal and policy parameters set out in the NPPF (paragraph 204) and The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). Policy HS9 should be updated accordingly in this respect.</p> <p>7.13 As with open space requirements, it is considered that the SPD update should take place as soon as possible to give clarity to development. Our client reserves the right to comment further when the SPD is under review.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS09	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS9: Playing Pitch Requirements in New Housing Developments</p> <p>Housing developments of 10 or more new dwellings (0.35 hectares or part thereof) will be required to pay a financial contribution towards improvements to existing playing pitches in the Borough.</p> <p>The size of development should not be artificially reduced to minimise or eliminate the contribution to the playing pitch requirement, for example, by sub-dividing sites or reducing the density of all or part of a site. The Council will consider the site as a whole for the purposes of calculating the appropriate level of playing pitch/open space provision.</p> <p>An accompanying Supplementary Planning Document will establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The minimum local standards and how they will be applied. ii. Appropriate financial contributions required from new residential developments. <p>RCT support HS9 subject to inclusion of a reference to Sport England guidance on needs that might require new facilities, and note: Poor condition pitches include those at Haslingden Sports Centre and Maden Recreation Ground, Bacup. The main reason for pitches performing poorly was inadequate drainage. The Study recommends that investment in pitch quality and maintenance should be a priority.</p>		

Number of comments HS09

4

Reference	HS10	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
-----------	------	-------------------------------

1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>7.10 Our client is supportive of the intentions of Policy HS10 to ensure that new developments include adequate private outdoor amenity space. It is considered however, that it is too specific and overly prescriptive to require the size of such spaces to be determined by 'garden sizes of nearby properties'. The housing stock in Rossendale is significantly varied with some existing properties having overly large gardens and some having no garden areas. Local Plan Policy ENV1 sets out the need to take account of the local character and appearance, and sufficiently covers the appropriate design considerations that new development proposals will be required to address.</p>		
------	--	--	---------------------------------------	--	----------------	--	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS10	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS10: Private Outdoor amenity space</p> <p>All new residential development should provide adequate private outdoor amenity space.</p> <p>This should be in the form of gardens unless the applicant can demonstrate why this is not achievable and proposes a suitable alternative.</p> <p>In determining the appropriate size for outdoor amenity space for individual dwellings regard will be had to:</p> <p>The size and type of dwelling(s) proposed; and</p> <p>The character of the development and the garden sizes of nearby properties.</p> <p>Amenity space for individual dwellings should be useable and have an adequate level of privacy. All boundary treatments should be appropriate to the character of the area.</p> <p>RCT support HS10.</p>		
Number of comments		HS10				2		

Reference	HS11	House Extensions
------------------	-------------	-------------------------

1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS11: House Extensions</p> <p>Permission will be granted for the extension of dwellings provided that the following criteria are satisfied:</p> <p>a) The extension respects the existing house and the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, size, design, fenestration and materials, without innovative and original design features being stifled;</p> <p>b) There is no unacceptable adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties through overlooking, loss of privacy or reduction of daylight;</p> <p>c) The proposal does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety; and</p> <p>d) In the case of the Green Belt or the Countryside, the proposed extension should not result in a disproportionate increase in the volume of the original dwelling. Increases of up to 30% (volume) are not considered disproportionate.</p> <p>RCT support HS11 subject to inclusion of a presumption against roof extensions, such as wall to wall "box dormers" that do not respect their locations.</p>		
------	--	--	------------------------	--	---------	---	--	--

Number of comments	HS11			1
---------------------------	-------------	--	--	---

Reference	HS12	Replacement Dwellings
------------------	-------------	------------------------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS12	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS12: Replacement Dwellings</p> <p>Permission will be granted for the replacement of dwellings provided that the following criteria are satisfied:</p> <p>a) The proposed replacement dwelling respects the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, size, design and facing materials, without innovative and original design features being stifled;</p> <p>b) There is no unacceptable adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties through overlooking, loss of privacy or reduction of daylight; and</p> <p>c) Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved.</p> <p>And in the case of the Green Belt or countryside:</p> <p>d) The proposed replacement dwelling would not detract from the openness to a greater extent than the original dwelling; and</p> <p>e) The proposed replacement dwelling would not be materially larger than the dwelling it replaces nor involves enlarging the residential curtilage. Increases of up to 30% (volume) are not considered to be materially larger.</p> <p>RCT support HS12.</p>		

Number of comments HS12

1

Reference HS13 Rural Affordable Housing - Rural Exception Sites

1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS13: Rural Affordable Housing – Rural Exception Sites</p> <p>A limited number of dwellings exclusively to meet a local need for affordable housing may be allowed adjoining the urban areas providing all of the following criteria are met:</p> <p>a) There is no suitable site available within the urban boundary;</p> <p>b) The scale and nature of the development would be in character with the settlement;</p> <p>c) The development would significantly contribute to the solution of a local housing problem that cannot be solved in any other way;</p> <p>d) The occupancy of the dwellings would be limited to people with a close local connection and who are unable to afford market housing; and</p> <p>e) The development is managed by a Registered Provider, similar body or a Starter Home.</p> <p>RCT support HS13 subject to plan/s to relate it to The Housing (Right to Enfranchise) (Designated Protected Areas) (England) Order 2009 No. 2098, and that Council has no proposals to remove such areas from within the present Urban and Green Belt Boundaries – in particular where social housing has been built.</p>		
------	--	--	---------------------------	--	---------	--	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS13	Further comment
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Support	Policy HS13: Rural Affordable Housing – Rural Exception Sites 22. We broadly agree with the policy for rural affordable housing. CPRE is supportive of well-planned development that helps reconcile the needs of our rural communities. Major development for market housing in remote places fuel unsustainable travel patterns, with local infrastructure put under considerable strain, these must be discouraged in policy, and decisions thereafter.		
Number of comments		HS13				2		
Reference		HS14		Conversion and Re-Use of Rural Buidlings in the Countryside				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS14	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS14: Conversion and Re-Use of Rural Buildings in the Countryside</p> <p>Proposals for the conversion of an existing building in the countryside will be permitted where:</p> <p>The proposal does not have a materially greater impact on the openness of the area and the proposal will not harm the character of the countryside;</p> <p>The building is of a permanent and substantial construction, structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for more than 30% reconstruction;</p> <p>The conversion works and facing materials to be introduced would be in keeping with the original building, and important architectural and historical features would be retained. Particular attention will be given to curtilage formation, including appropriate boundary treatments and landscaping, which should be drawn tightly around the building footprint and the requirement for outbuildings, which should be minimal;</p> <p>The proposals would serve to preserve or enhance the setting of any nearby Listed Buildings or Conservation Area they are within, or the amenity of nearby residents;</p> <p>The building and site has a satisfactory access to the highways network and the proposal would not have a severe impact on the local highway network;</p> <p>Satisfactory off-street parking, bin storage and bin collection points can be provided without adversely impacting on rural character and mains services are available for connection into the scheme;</p> <p>The development does not require the removal of, or damage to, significant or prominent trees, hedges, watercourses, ponds or any other natural landscape features;</p> <p>The development would not have an unacceptable impact on nature conservation interests or any protected species present;</p> <p>If an agricultural building, it is not one substantially completed within ten years of the date of the application;</p> <p>The proposal would not harm the agricultural or other enterprise occupying the land or buildings in the vicinity; and</p> <p>The re-use of the building must not be likely to result in additional farm buildings which would have a harmful effect on the openness of the area.</p> <p>All applications should accord with guidance set out within the latest version of the "Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside" Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>RCT support HS14.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS14	Further comment
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Not Applicable	<p>Policy HS14: Conversion and Re-Use of Rural Buildings in the Countryside</p> <p>23. We have concern over the Government relaxation of planning controls to enable occupiers to more easily change agricultural buildings to other uses without planning permission though the prior approval process, subject to meeting certain criteria. We therefore urge Rossendale Council to everything it can to ensure farms are supported to diversify whilst ensuring that works do not result in a substantial rebuild of structures and ensure that conversions which involve external alterations and / or other associated development e.g. hardstanding, boundary treatment etc. are sympathetic to the character of the building and the rural setting of the building. It is good that the Council has Supplementary Planning Document on Converting and Re-using Buildings in the Countryside.</p> <p>24. CPRE also seeks good planning policies for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural policies to guard against unnecessary encroachment and built intrusion, by protecting and enhancing Rossendale’s countryside and rural landscapes, especially Green Belt designated land. • Developer contributions must be adequate for affordable housing, particularly in rural places as there are huge issues with affordability in rural settlements. Other community infrastructure required to make places sustainable are required. • Sustainable travel should be promoted before the private car. Rossendale requires safe walking and cycling routes to promote healthy modes of travel. Public services should be prioritised over car based development due to the problem of emissions for climate change and air quality, and increase traffic congestion. • Energy and waste demand minimisation should be planned. The energy needs and waste arising from developments should be reduced by embracing new technologies and sustainable development principles. • Green Infrastructure policies should encourage natural capital to be planned into new development for climate change resilience, flood risk, promotion of biodiversity, green lung function and residential amenity. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS14	Further comment	
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Object	<p>Issue: Development proposals to convert and re-use rural buildings in the countryside are often in locations with limited sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact: Development in areas with little or no sewerage infrastructure can increase the risk of pollution to controlled waters without a suitable method of foul drainage.</p> <p>Suggested solution: Expand the policy to ensure that development schemes include sewerage infrastructure proposals that will not increase the risk of pollution to controlled waters</p> <p>Commentary:</p> <p>Government guidance on non-mains drainage in NPPF paragraphs 109 and 120, and national Planning Practice Guidance (Water supply, wastewater and water quality – considerations for planning applications, paragraph 020) stresses that the first presumption must be to provide a system of foul drainage discharging into a public sewer. Only where having taken into account the cost and / or practicability it can be shown to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that connection to a public sewer is not feasible, should non-mains foul sewage disposal solutions be considered. When considering non-mains drainage systems, the first presumption should be for the use of a package treatment plant and only where this is demonstrated not to be feasible should septic tanks be considered. Making reference to the use of an appropriate system of foul drainage in Policy HS14 adds weight to need for developers to identify an appropriate solution in these instances.</p>			
Number of comments		HS14				3			
Reference	HS15		Rural Workers Dwellings						

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS15	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS15: Rural Workers Dwellings</p> <p>Proposals for permanent residential accommodation, outside of the urban boundary in well established agricultural enterprises, where it is required to enable agriculture, horticulture, forestry (or other rural based enterprise) workers to live at, or in the immediate vicinity of, their place of work will be supported where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There is a clearly established functional need; ii. The functional need relates to a full time worker or one primarily employed in agriculture, forestry or rural based enterprise activities; iii. The unit and the agricultural or forestry activity concerned have been established for at least three years, have been profitable for at least one of them, are currently financially sound, and have a clear prospect of remaining so; iv. The functional need could not be fulfilled by another dwelling on the unit or any other existing accommodation in the area which is suitable and available; v. The dwelling achieves a high standard of design and its siting is well related to the existing farm buildings or its impact on the landscape could be minimised; and vi. The dwelling is of a size and scale commensurate with the established functional requirement of the rural enterprise. Dwellings that are unduly large in relation to the needs of the rural enterprise will not be permitted. <p>If a new dwelling is essential to support a new farming or forestry activity on an established unit or on a new agricultural unit, an application should be made for temporary accommodation. The application should satisfy all the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There is clear evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the new enterprise concerned; ii. a functional need relating to the enterprise; iii. There is clear evidence that the new activity has been planned on a sound financial basis; iv. the functional need could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling on the unit or any other v. existing accommodation in the area which is suitable for and available for occupation by the workers concerned; vi. the proposal would not give rise to significant environmental damage, particularly in relation to its vii. impact on the landscape; viii. satisfactory vehicular access and parking can be achieved within the site; and ix. satisfactory infrastructure including drainage facilities are available. <p>Where existing dwellings are subject to conditions restricting occupancy,</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS15	Further comment
						<p>applications to remove such conditions will not be permitted unless the applicant can demonstrate that there is no longer any realistic agricultural or forestry need both from the enterprise and the locality for the restriction to be maintained by meeting all the following criteria:</p> <p>i. the essential need which originally required the dwelling to be permitted no longer applies in relation to the farm unit and that the dwelling will not be required similarly in the longer term;</p> <p>ii. the property has been actively marketed in specialist and local press and estate agents at least once a month for a minimum of 12 months;</p> <p>iii. the advertised selling price is realistic given the age, size, condition and location of the property; and</p> <p>iv. following marketing that meets criteria c) ii) and iii) above, no realistic offers have been made to the vendors from people eligible to occupy the dwelling meeting the terms of the planning condition concerned.</p> <p>RCT support HS15.</p>		

Number of comments HS15

1

Reference HS16 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

631	Sue	Eveleigh	-		Support	I am pleased the council is helping to accommodate travellers and gypsies and hope it succeeds in this.		-
1781			Rosendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS16: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</p> <p>A Transit site accommodating a minimum of four pitches will be provided on a site at Little Tooter Quarry, Sharneyford shown on the Policies Map as HS16.1. Four additional pitches will be provided by intensification on two existing private sites (at Tong Lane, Bacup and Cobland View, Stacksteads) subject to obtaining any relevant permission for siting and infrastructure.</p> <p>Two additional pitches may be required towards the end of the Plan period. The following factors will be considered as part of the consideration of any planning application:</p> <p>Access to the road network;</p> <p>Access to schools and services;</p> <p>Availability of water and infrastructure services;</p> <p>Proximity to existing development and the settled community particularly with respect to noise and light; and</p> <p>Adequacy of landscaping and boundary treatments.</p> <p>RCT support HS16, should it also include access to employment.</p>		

Number of comments HS16

2

Reference HS17 Specialist Housing

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS17	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>HS17: SPECIALIST HOUSING</p> <p>The Policy relating to Specialist Housing states: 'Development proposals for specialist forms of housing will be supported provided that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development is well located so that shops, public transport, community facilities and other infrastructure and services are accessible for those without a car, as appropriate to the needs and the level of mobility of potential residents, as well as visitors and staff' <p>Key Points</p> <p>As mentioned previously in this review, the need for sites to be accessible via a range of travel modes, supported by a Travel Plan as part of a planning application, will be important in reducing the overall traffic impact of any residential development.</p> <p>n terms of specific sites, the Policy identifies three sites for specialist accommodation. These are all small in scale and would be unlikely to have a significant traffic impact in isolation.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS17	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>Housing is a significant determinant of health and poor housing conditions contribute to many preventable diseases and injuries, including respiratory, nervous system and cardiovascular diseases and cancer.</p> <p>Housing types and standards</p> <p>Rossendale has an oversupply of high density terraced housing and this can be an issue for older residents and those with a disability, as terraced properties can be difficult to adapt to suit changing needs. In order to maintain independent living, adaptations such as creating ground floor bathrooms and bedrooms are frequently necessary but this type of housing does not often offer scope for such changes.</p> <p>Figure 5 below shows the Index of Multiple Deprivation, Living Environment domain of deprivation, by ward and decile. It illustrates that all but one of Rossendale's wards fall within the bottom 50% nationally for this domain.</p> <p>When separating the domain into its separate indoor and outdoor subdomains, it is clear that Rossendale rates poorly in the indoor domain. The indoor domain is concerned with housing quality, the information for which comes from Census data and the English Housing Survey. As shown in Figure 6 below, around half of the borough sits within the bottom 30% nationally.</p> <p>Figure 7 below shows Age Structure and 2025 Population Projections (Office for National Statistics (ONS). The projected shift in the sizes of age groups as a proportion of the population is common throughout Lancashire and England.</p> <p>Figure 8: Age Group Split Population Projections 2016-2025 (ONS) demonstrates, between now and 2025 in Rossendale, the 60-79 age group (as a proportion over the overall population) is only projected to increase by 2% and the 80+ age group is projected to increase by 1%.</p> <p>These population projects provide an alternative age forecast, using a different population project time period (2016-2025) to those presented in the Rossendale Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) report, which projects to 2034.</p> <p>In the HS17: Specialist Accommodation policy explanation, it is stated that "In relation to supported housing for older people, the SHMA indicates that the number of residents aged over 65 in Rossendale is projected to increase by 6,336 (52.9%) by 2034, in contrast to the overall growth in population of just 5,915 residents (8.6%)."</p> <p>The SHMA population projects to 2034 therefore predict a different age range split to the current ONS projections to 2025. It is recommended that longer term projections (as given in the SHMA) should be treated with a degree of caution, as they can be viewed to be less reliable estimates of future trends. However, whichever population projection timeframe is used, the projections demonstrate that there will be growth in the 65+ and 80+ age groups. It is important to take account of the expected growth and to plan for the provision of specialist housing accordingly. The Rossendale draft plan has two</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS17	Further comment
						<p>housing policies of interest Policy HS6: Housing Standards and Policy HS17: Specialist accommodation.</p> <p>Policy HS17: Specialist Accommodation is also welcomed. The policy supports the provision of specialist housing, including retirement accommodation, extra care accommodation and supported accommodation services, subject to criteria relating to location, accessibility and amenity being provided. The policy also allocates 3 specific sites for specialist housing accommodation, in the 3 localities of Bacup (HS2.19), Waterfoot (HS2.90) and Whitworth (HS2.103). These sites are expected to provide 70 specialist housing units. There is no explanation as to why these sites have been allocated and why no further sites are allocated in the other main urban areas of the local plan area. It is also unclear if 70 specialist housing units will meet the expected needs for this type of housing provision for the whole local plan period, taking account of the population and age range projections previously referred to above.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Future housing developments will need to cater for Rossendale's aging population and provide appropriate facilities for Rossendale residents across the age groups.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to allocating other housing sites (as listed in Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations), under Policy HS17 as specialist housing, subject to evidence of a defined need for specialist housing, in other urban areas located within the local plan area, in addition to the 3 allocated sites. Please see appendix for figures</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS17	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS17: Specialist Housing</p> <p>Development proposals for specialist forms of housing, including retirement accommodation, extra care accommodation and supported accommodation services, will be supported provided that:</p> <p>The development is well located so that shops, public transport, community facilities and other infrastructure and services are accessible for those without a car, as appropriate to the needs and level of mobility of potential residents, as well as visitors and staff;</p> <p>The development contains appropriate external amenity space of an acceptable quantity and quality;</p> <p>Adequate provision is made for refuse storage and disposal facilities; and</p> <p>It would not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area or the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The following sites are allocated on the Policies Map specifically for specialist accommodation:</p> <p>HS2.19- Former Bacup Health Centre</p> <p>HS2.90- Waterfoot Primary School</p> <p>HS2.103- Land Behind Buxton Street</p> <p>RCT support HS17 provided it recognises a distinction between Circular 82/69 Category 1 and 2 housing for old people who are mostly able bodied and in retirement and other extra care CQC regulated accommodation proposed for these 3 sites.</p>		
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Object	<p>Issue: Sites HS2.19 & HS2.90 are allocated for specialist housing but are located within Flood Zones and are constrained by the presence of Main River watercourses.</p> <p>Impact: These constraints may affect the suitability of these sites for specialist housing as proposed.</p> <p>Suggested solution: Review the suitability of these sites for specialist housing and consider whether or not the proposed densities take account of the site constraints to demonstrate why they are suitable as proposed.</p> <p>Commentary:</p> <p>There is no evidence presented to show that these sites are sequentially appropriate in relation to flood risk. The presence of Main Rivers through and adjacent to the sites may also impact upon the proposed density of development, particularly in relation to HS2.19 as development over a culverted Main River watercourse will not be permitted.</p>		
Number of comments						4	HS17	
Reference			HS18		Self Build and Custom Built Houses			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	HS18	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>Policy HS18: Self Build and Custom Built Homes</p> <p>2.65 Taylor Wimpey welcome the Council's identification of suitable land to accommodate self-build and custom built houses. Indeed, seven housing allocations have been identified specifically for this type of housing and we fully agree with this approach.</p> <p>2.66 In light of this, we are unsure why the policy then also requires developers to make at least 10% of plots available for sale for self/custom build. Whilst this policy suggests that this will be encouraged as opposed to required, it is considered that the appropriate mechanism to deliver selfbuild and custom-built homes is through specific allocations, as proposed here, rather than a prescriptive requirement for each and every allocated site in the Local Plan.</p> <p>2.67 Requiring private developers to provide service plots available for sale within every housing scheme will place and unnecessary constraints and burdens on those housebuilders, and could potentially lead to delays in delivery while those plots are being marketed; particularly where there may be little market demand. Indeed, the explanatory text to Policy HS18 explains that evidence from the SHMA indicates that the level of demand for self-build plots is currently low in Rossendale.</p> <p>2.68 As such we would request that the allocations remain, but the 10% requirement be removed. Then through preparation of a self-build and custom build housing register, the Council can continue to effectively monitor demand for self-build and custom homes through the process and identify additional sites for this purpose if necessary.</p>		
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy HS18: Self Build and Custom Built Houses</p> <p>The Council will support individuals who wish to build their own dwelling by identifying suitable serviced plots of land. To ensure a variety of housing provision, where possible, developers will be encouraged to make at least 10% of plots available for sale to small builders or individuals or groups who wish to custom build their own homes.</p> <p>The following housing sites allocated under Policy HS2 are identified specifically for selfbuild and custom build housing:</p> <p>HS2.28- Booth Road/Woodland Mount, Brandwood</p> <p>HS2.34- Land Rear of Highfield Nursing Home</p> <p>HS2.48- Land south of 1293 Burnley Road, Loveclough</p> <p>HS2.57- Land at Conway Road</p> <p>HS2.59- Land to the north side of Hall Carr Road</p> <p>HS2.58- Land At Higher Cloughfold</p> <p>HS2.92- Field at Scout Road, Whitewell Bottom</p> <p>RCT support HS18</p>		
Number of comments					HS18	2		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP1	Further comment
Chapter 2: Employment Growth and Employment								
Reference	EMP1	Provision for Employment						
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	EMP1: PROVISION FOR EMPLOYMENT Policy EMP1 states: 'The Council, together with developers and other partners, will seek to provide sufficient employment land to meet the Borough's requirement of 27 hectares for business, general industrial or storage and distribution for the period up to 2034'. The explanatory section of the Policy states that the Council's Employment Land Review (ELR) (2017) identified a lack of small to medium sized premises for B2 and B8 use classes, and that demand for such premises is highest in the west of the Borough due to the accessibility to the A56(T) and M66. The ELR also highlighted that there is currently an oversupply of B1a office space, in which such premises are generally focused in and around Rawtenstall and Haslingden. The stated required provision of 27 hectares of employment use represents the intermediate figure between a lower figure of 22 hectares (the previous delivery of employment land) and an upper figure of 32 hectares (the maximum possible delivery). The provision of 27 hectares is stated as being aligned with the Housing Objectively Assessed Need (based on a labour supply of 220 dwellings per year). Key Point As would be expected for land uses of this type, the demand for employment sites is greatest in areas where the SRN is more easily accessible, i.e. the west of the borough. In particular, distribution-type land uses are reliant on the use of the SRN and a significant proportion of traffic generated by these developments would be expected to use the SRN.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP1	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy EMP1: Provision for Employment</p> <p>The Council, together with developers and other partners, will seek to provide sufficient employment land to meet the Borough's requirement of 27 hectares for business, general industrial or storage and distribution (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8) for the period up to 2034.</p> <p>RCT support EMP1 and note: The Council's Employment Land Review (ELR) (2017) identifies an overall lack of good quality small to medium-sized industrial premises for industrial and manufacturing (B2 and B8), which is suppressing demand. The high levels of manufacturing and industrial uses, and the need to export products, means that the need for industrial premises is greatest in the west of the Borough where there is ready access to the A56 and M66.</p> <p>In terms of office uses, activity is generally focused to the west of the Borough around Rawtenstall and Haslingden. Whilst there is a current oversupply in the short term the ELR evidences a need for new office accommodation (B1a) in the longer term to meet the forecast growth in the service sector, and suggests that this could be located in Rawtenstall. RCT note a need to appreciate, that as with comparison goods, Rossendale neighbours are more likely to be chosen for larger office users. The LCC involved development at Rising Bridge remained vacant, and became mostly occupied by LCC.</p>		

Number of comments EMP1

2

Reference EMP2 Employment Site Allocations

493	J K	Walsmley			Object	<p>Some ten years ago it was decided an area of waste land at Rising Bridge had to be built upon. There was an obvious sham consultation with residents who wanted bungalows/houses thereon. Our views were ignored and we had to have a paint factory. When that scheme fell through we were again ignored and we had to have offices, which were ready for occupation on 1st July 2010. Some still remain unoccupied.</p> <p>Now it has been decreed land at Rising Bridge MUST be built upon. At a time when the Country is crying out for more houses (and it is proving impossible to re-obtain planning permission for a plot on Roundhill lane) it is proposed to visit industrial units upon us. I would much rather the land was left undeveloped but if we are yet again to be ignored I can see no reason whatsoever why a quiet residential area should be turned into a industrial complex.</p> <p>There is already far too much traffic for the adjacent roads. More would bring additional danger therefrom to children at the infants school.</p>		
-----	-----	----------	--	--	--------	---	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2	Further comment
589	Stephen	Langridge			Not Applicable	6. Industrial Development, the plan indicates a massive imbalance between Haslingden and Rawtenstall in the provision of industrial development land, also a similar reversed imbalance in the provision of residential land. Surely a more equitable balance would reduce the need to for people to commute from one town to the next.		
1478	N/A	N/A	Winfields Holdings Ltd and Winfield's Ltd	- Site at Hud Hey	Object	The allocation does not recognise that all of the Britannia Mill component of the wider site has an extant consent for retail use, which has been confirmed as having been lawfully commenced (2008/0753). Table 2, therefore, needs to be amended to refer to the lawful retail use of this building and surrounding land. - - Separate representations with respect to Policy HS2 also consider the background to the site and demonstrate that its allocation should be revised in order that it makes a meaningful contribution to the competing objectives of policy. Please see other the representations submitted on behalf of Winfield's Limited with respect to the site specific allocation.		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>The Council is seeking to allocate 27 ha of B-class employment land in Rossendale over the Local Plan period. The Local Plan states that much of committed employment land supply sites are considered to be of poor quality and do not therefore meet the needs of modern businesses.</p> <p>The Council further states that, as mentioned previously, that there is a need for new sites in the west of Borough where there is good access to both the A56(T) and M66.</p> <p>The new employment sites which have been identified are shown in the figure below: Figure 2-1 – New Employment Site Allocations</p> <p>Of the new sites identified, EMP 2.12 is located west of the A56(T) and east of the B6527. The nearest SRN junction is the A56(T) / A680 / B6527 / Broadway roundabout. There is the possibility of some increased traffic at this roundabout, and at M66 Junction 1, but the majority of development trips generated by this site are likely to impact on the local network without travelling on the SRN.</p> <p>EMP 2.23 and EMP 2.15 are located north of Haslingden at Hud Hey and may have a potential impact on the A56(T) / A680 Rising Bridge roundabout along with the A56(T) / B6232 junction and the A56 / Todd Hall Road junction. These sites are therefore likely to have a significant localised impact on the SRN at these junctions.</p> <p>EMP 2.26 and EMP 2.34 are located in New Hall Hey, in close proximity to the A56(T) / A682 junction, thereby potentially having a significant impact on this junction.</p> <p>EMP 2.35 and EMP 2.38 are located in Rising Bridge and have the potential to impact on the A56(T) / A680 Rising Bridge roundabout. The impact of the development of these sites upon the roundabout junction would need to be assessed by a developer at pre-application stage and impacts and resulting need for mitigation measures discussed with Highways England as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Key Point</p> <p>There are 7 new allocated employment sites, all of which are in excess of 2ha in terms of developable area, and therefore have the potential to create a significant increase in the number of trips accessing the SRN.</p> <p>Each SRN junction may be impacted by developments on more than one allocated site. The cumulative impact of all of the sites is therefore an important consideration and this should be reflected in the highways evidence base required to underpin the Local Plan.</p> <p>No details are provided of the proposed vehicular access to the sites. The main access point from these sites should be from local roads, which is inherently safer than having a reliance on direct access to and from a high-speed trunk road like the A56. Access points and junctions on busy, high speed roads generate weaving and turning manoeuvres by drivers, impacting on safety and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2	Further comment
						<p>the reliability of journeys. As a consequence, developers of sites such as these should access their proposals via the local road network or existing junctions on the SRN where they may be capable of catering for increased usage without a severer traffic impact or a reduction in safety.</p> <p>Please see appendix for table</p>		
1771	Mohammed Ali	Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>There is strong evidence that work is good for health and unemployment is bad for itviii. Work and health is central to the story of people and place and helping people with health issues to obtain or retain work and be productive at work is a crucial part of economic success and wellbeing of every community.</p> <p>Figure 9 below illustrates that the majority of wards in Rossendale are within the 30% most deprived wards nationally for employment deprivation, with two wards Bacup and Stacksteads within the 10% most deprived wards.</p> <p>Figure 9ix: Index of Multiple Deprivation, Employment Deprivation Domain by ward and decile</p> <p>Employment Site Allocations</p> <p>Policy EM2: Employment Site Allocations identifies a total potential employment allocation of 193.64 hectares gross area and 29.17 hectares area available for development. The sites appear to be located throughout the borough. The allocated sites include 7 new site allocations and range in gross site size from 2.76 to 5.67 hectares. The new allocations are located primarily in the Worsley and Longholme wards. Worsley ward is ranked with the top 20 most deprived wards in England as per the Index of Multiple Deprivation.</p> <p>In addition, like new major housing sites, new employment sites (and mixed use sites) have the potential for both positive and negative health impacts, which could affect the immediate locality and neighbouring areas. It is important that any potential health impacts are taken into account during masterplan preparation and through the agreement of a site design code.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Consideration should be given in the local plan to how planning policy can be used to create accessible and meaningful employment for the resident populations of Stacksteads (decile 1), Irwell (decile 2) and Worsley (decile 2) wards.</p> <p>We would also recommend the inclusion in the Employment chapter of a specific reference that economic growth can be used as a means of helping to address deprivation and inequalities in income and health outcomes.</p> <p>Consider the provision of detailed guidance/requirements for all new employment site allocations and mixed use allocations, similar to those provided in Policies EMP7 and EMP6.</p> <p>Please see appendix for figures.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy EMP2: Employment Site Allocations</p> <p>The following sites shown on the Policies Map are allocated and protected for business, general industrial or storage and distribution (Use Classes B1, B2 or B8 respectively) in the period 2019- 2034. Rossendale Council will require a masterplan or development brief on sites identified with an *.</p> <p>RCT provisionally support EMP2, subject to more detail consideration of sites listed.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2	Further comment
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Object	<p>Issue: Several of the proposed new employment allocations are subject to constraints that may impact on compliance with the NPPF, delivery and yield. Impact: Proposed allocations for employment development are non-complaint with NPPF and NPPG requirements.</p> <p>Suggested solution Demonstrate that relevant environmental constraints have been taken into account when allocating residential sites.</p> <p>Commentary: Table 2 at Appendix 1 identifies where proposed employment allocations are adjacent to or partly within a Flood Zone (2 or 3), within 8 metres of a designated Main River watercourse or located on top of a historic landfill site (so may have contamination issues).</p> <p>1. Flood Zones: In relation to sites within a Flood Zone as defined on the EA Flood Map for Planning, it will be for the Council to demonstrate that any site allocated for development in a Flood Zone satisfies the requirements of the Sequential Test and, where necessary, the Exception test. We have identified all those sites where flood risk may be an issue (including sites that border an area considered to be at risk). We understand that you have completed your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and that this may provide sufficient evidence for these sites to come forward. Evidence to demonstrate that the Sequential Test and Exception Test have been satisfied for allocations in Flood Zones should be clearly cross-referenced in the Local Plan. Where site specific mitigation measures are necessary to make a development safe in planning terms, these should be specified at an appropriate point in the local plan, possibly as part of Policy ENV11. This may be in the form of excluding parts of the site from inappropriate or unacceptable development or identifying site specific measures that would be necessary for specific allocated sites to make the development safe in a Flood Zone without increasing risk elsewhere.</p> <p>2. Main Rivers: Development within 8 metres of the top of the bank or edge of the retaining wall of a designated Main River watercourse (or culverted watercourse) will require consent from the Environment Agency. Development that restricts access to a Main River watercourse and / or presents a risk of harm to the aquatic environment may not be acceptable. It is essential to ensure that any sites with Main River watercourses in an open channel or a culvert within the development site or within 8 metres of the site boundary take this into account. Where small sites require an easement on either side of a Main River watercourse that may be within the site, this could impact on the density of development that could be achieved. Development over culverted Main River watercourses will not be permitted.</p> <p>3. Historic Landfill sites: Proposals for development of historic landfill sites will need to be supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that the site is suitable for the proposed use without posing a risk to controlled waters. We have no evidence to suggest that these sites cannot be re-developed, but</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP2	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	------	-----------------

there may be a need for some remediation of contaminated sites.

Please see table in appendix

Number of comments	EMP2	7
---------------------------	-------------	---

Reference	EMP3	Employment Site and Premises
-----------	------	------------------------------

731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England	Object	Policy EMP3 Employment Site and Premises The policy makes reference to significant heritage assets. It is unclear what this means – is this the grade of the asset or the significance of the asset. The policy only makes reference to one of the tests that need to be used to assess the appropriateness of a proposal affecting the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and excludes the rest. As a result the policy as drafted would not provide the appropriate framework to conserve and enhance the Borough's heritage assets.
-----	-------	--------	------------------	--------	--

1478	N/A	N/A	Winfields Holdings Ltd and Winfield's Ltd	Object	Whilst the policy is supported, It would be appropriate to incorporate some flexibility into criteria (g) as some sites have been long term vacant with no interest arising since their allocation by the 1995 plan (or earlier). They may also have other constraints (such as highways, subsequent consents, and the changing status of buildings within or adjoining them) which require a different approach. - - It may be that a marketing exercise is required, but not necessarily in all cases. The approach for any site should, however, be agreed with the Council, and on this basis a minor amendment is proposed to criteria (g) to the effect; - - “convincing evidence of lack of demand likely to be through a rigorous and active 12 month marketing period.....”
------	-----	-----	---	--------	--

1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England	Not Applicable	EMP3: EMPLOYMENT SITE AND PREMISES Policy EMP3 states that: 'All existing employment premises and sites last used for employment will be protected for employment use' Notwithstanding the above statement, any change of development use classes from employment to residential, if located in proximity to the SRN, may require assessment of the traffic impacts, bearing in mind that the changing of use classes may increase demand on the SRN during peak periods.
------	--------	--------	------------------	----------------	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP3	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy EMP3: Employment Site and Premises</p> <p>All existing employment premises and sites last used for employment will be protected for employment use. Proposals on all employment sites/premises for re-use or redevelopment other than B use class employment uses will be assessed under the following criteria:</p> <p>(a) whether there would not be an unacceptable reduction on the quantity of employment land supply;</p> <p>(b) The proposal does not result in a net loss of jobs;</p> <p>(c) the relative suitability of the site for employment and an assessment of the existing provision of the proposed use which clearly identifies a need;</p> <p>(d) the location of the site and its relationship to other uses;</p> <p>(e) whether the ability to accommodate smaller scale requirements would be compromised;</p> <p>(f) there would be a net improvement in amenity;</p> <p>(g) the site and/ or buildings are significant heritage assets and their re-use or development is the most appropriate means to secure and maintain an acceptable and viable use that is consistent with their conservation; and</p> <p>(h) The site has an adequate access and its redevelopment would not create a traffic hazard.</p> <p>Any proposals for housing use on all employment sites/premises will need to accommodate criteria (a)-(h) above and also be subject to:</p> <p>(g) convincing evidence of lack of demand through a rigorous and active 12 month marketing period, a strategy for which has previously been agreed by the Council, for employment reuse and employment redevelopment;</p> <p>(h) an assessment of the viability of employment development including employment re-use and employment redevelopment; and</p> <p>(i) where the existing buildings make a positive contribution to the local area a structural survey and assessment of the building to demonstrate the feasibility of retaining and converting the building as part of the residential development. Where an existing building will be lost as part of the development there will the requirement to consider the re-use of the existing materials within the new development.</p> <p>An accompanying Supplementary Planning Document will be produced which will set out the balanced criteria based approach, including marketing and an assessment of the viability of employment use, under which all proposals for re-use will be assessed. The SPD will ensure the maintenance and creation of employment opportunities in Rossendale and set out the marketing requirements.</p> <p>RCT support EMP3</p>		

Number of comments EMP3

4

Reference EMP4

Development Criteria for Employment Generating Development

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP4	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	As stated within the Draft Local Plan, Rossendale Borough Council is keen to reduce the number of individuals who wish to travel to other neighbouring areas for work. Additionally, increasing the amount of medium size enterprises may be achieved through allowing existing small enterprises to easily expand through a streamlined planning process. Within the criteria set by EMP4, is a condition that a proposal should be supported if: 'The traffic generated does not have a severe adverse impact on local amenity, highway safety or the operation or operation of the highways network' The above statement is welcomed and evidently should apply to the strategic as well as the local highway network.		
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	Policy EMP4: Development Criteria for Employment Generating Development Proposals for new employment generating development, including extensions to existing premises, which provides for or assists with the creation of new employment opportunities, inward investment and/or secures the retention of existing employment within the Borough will be supported provided that: The scale, bulk and appearance of the development is compatible with the character of its surroundings; There is no significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring land uses and the character of the area by virtue of increased levels of noise, odour, emissions, or dust and light impacts, surface water, drainage or sewerage related pollution problems; The site has an adequate access that would not create a traffic hazard or have an undue environmental impact; The traffic generated does not have a severe adverse impact on local amenity, highway safety or the operation of the highways network; and Appropriate provision is made for on-site servicing and space for waiting goods vehicles. Adequate screening is provided where necessary to any unsightly feature of the development and security fencing is located to the internal edge of any perimeter landscaping; On the edges of industrial areas, where sites adjoin residential areas or open countryside, developers will be required to provide substantial peripheral landscaping; Open storage areas should be designed to minimise visual intrusion; and The proposal will be served by public transport and provide pedestrian and cycle links to adjacent areas. RCT support EMP4		
Number of comments		EMP4		2				
Reference		EMP5		Employment Development in non -allocated employment areas				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP5	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	EMP5: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT IN NON-ALLOCATED EMPLOYMENT AREAS The Draft Local Plan states that new, scale small development will be permitted in areas where employment is not the principal designated land use and there would be no detriment to the environment in which such development would be located. Whilst such individual small scale development may not have a significant impact on the SRN, an accumulation of said units may have a noticeable impact upon the network and therefore planning of such sites should be carefully considered.		
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	Policy EMP5: Employment Development in non-allocated employment areas New small scale employment development (Use Classes B1, B2, B8, and A2 (A2 limited to under 100m2 of new floorspace)), will be permitted in areas where employment is not the principal land use provided there would be no detriment to the amenity of the area in terms of scale, character, noise, nuisance, disturbance, environment and car parking. RCT support EMP5		
Number of comments		EMP5				2		
Reference		EMP6		Futures Park				
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	This 4.6 ha site is located in the eastern part of the Borough in Bacup and therefore any trips associated with the development would be unlikely to result in a severe impact on the SRN in the west of the Borough, with trips likely to disperse throughout the local highway network.		
1771	Mohammed Ali Ahmed		Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	It is unclear why the other new site allocations, EMP2.12, EMP2.15, EMP2.23, EMP2.35 and EMP2.38 are not subject to similar policies and requirements. It is also noted that Policy EMP6: Futures Park also requires a masterplan, phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule and agreed programme of implementation. No reference is given to requiring an agreed design code for the site It is also unclear why the other mixed use site allocations of EMP2.22, EMP2.28 and EMP2.52 are also not subject to specific policy requirements similar to Policy EMP6		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP6	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy EMP6: Futures Park</p> <p>Within the area defined on the Policies Map at Futures Park (EMP2.5) new high quality development will be permitted subject to the following:</p> <p>a) Comprehensive development of the site is demonstrated through a masterplan;</p> <p>b) A phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule for the area; and</p> <p>c) An agreed programme of implementation in accordance with the masterplan.</p> <p>The following uses are considered to be acceptable:</p> <p>i. Employment uses comprising B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage or Distribution);</p> <p>ii. Hotel (Use Class C1), Restaurants and cafes (Use Class A3) and drinking establishments (Use Class A4);</p> <p>iii. Leisure uses (Use Class D2);</p> <p>iv. Retail (Use Class A1);</p> <p>v. Pedestrian and cycle route – “Valley of Stone” Greenway and link to Lee Quarry</p> <p>RCT support EMP6 and note it as: An area comprising 4.6 hectares at Futures Park, Bacup has been identified as having the potential to accommodate a flexible mixed use scheme, subject to national policy in the Framework and other relevant policies of this Local Plan. The area will require a well designed scheme that responds to the sites context, makes the most of environmental and leisure assets, takes account of the nearby Leisure facility at Lee Quarry and delivers the necessary sustainability, transport, connectivity, accessibility (including public transport) and infrastructure requirements. Rossendale Council therefore requires a Masterplan for the development of this site. RCT note the mixed use aims, which need noting in other Policies, such as Retail R1, as a competitor to other centres.</p>		
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Support	We support the requirement for a Masterplan for the site given the presence of the River Irwell and the need to incorporate it in to the development as a positive feature while still ensuring protections from the development as proposed.		
							4	
Number of comments		EMP6						
Reference		EMP7		New Hall Hay				
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England		Not Applicable	<p>Policy EMP7 New Hall Hey</p> <p>Whilst we welcome the inclusion of a master plan for the site, the supporting text to the policy includes reference to heritage yet the policy does not mention it. The heritage assessments also do not provide the evidence to support the policy or provide the framework and mitigation/enhancements that would be required for the site. See comments on site allocations below for further information.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP7	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>An area comprising 6 hectares to the south of the A682, sites EMP2.26 and EMP2.34, has been allocated in the Policies Map as being suitable for employment development. The site is stated within the Local Plan as being within a highly accessible part of the Borough and that any development proposals will be, as with site HS2.71 at Edenfield, will be subjected to a Scoping Study, a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.</p> <p>Key Point</p> <p>☒ This area is located in close proximity to the A56(T) and as a result, it has the potential to have a significant traffic impact on the SRN. The inclusion of the sites in the assessments undertaken as part of the highways evidence base which is required to underpin the Local Plan will allow for a better understanding of the impact of the site. The Edenfield housing site is located in close proximity and the highways evidence base will also allow a better understanding of the combined impact of these sites.</p> <p>☒ The need for the sites to be accessible via a range of travel modes, supported by a Travel Plan as part of a planning application, will be important in reducing the overall traffic impact on the SRN.</p>		
1771	Mohammed Ali Ahmed		Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>Of the new site allocations only 2 sites EMP2.26 and EMP2.34, with a combined site area of 6 hectares, are subject to a separate policy – Policy EMP7: New Hall Hey. Policy EMP7 requires a site masterplan, an agreed development design code and a phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule. These requirements will also be supported by the provision of a transport assessment and travel plan. The design code provided for Policy EMP7 does include a requirement for the provision of cycling and footpath routes but could be strengthened further by requirements to consider air quality impacts and road safety impacts. We would expect these aspects to also be considered in a transport assessment and travel plan for the EMP7 site.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Revise Policy EMP7: New Hall Hey, to require a Health Impact Assessment to be prepared as part of the policy criteria. In addition the design code principles should be reviewed to consider additional requirements for electric vehicle charging points. Design and layout considerations should also consider road safety, particularly for the most vulnerable people (i.e. children, elderly and the disabled).</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP7	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy EMP7: New Hall Hey</p> <p>Within the area defined on the Policies Map at New Hall Hey (EMP2.26 and EMP2.34) new high quality development will be permitted subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Comprehensive development of the site is demonstrated through a masterplan; b) The implementation of development in accordance with an agreed design code. The Design Code shall include the design principles for the whole of the site and will incorporate, amongst other elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A greenspace and landscape structure b. A movement framework c. Layout considerations d. Parking and garaging e. Appropriate building and hardsurfacing materials f. Maximising energy efficiency in design g. Details of appropriate boundary treatments h. Lighting i. Details of the laying of services, drainage and cables j. Bin storage and rubbish collection k. Ecology and nature conservation l. The relationship with the adjacent Irwell Sculpture Trail m. The relationship with the River Irwell c) A phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule for the area. The schedule shall include, amongst other elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Highway hierarchy b. Bridge over the River Irwell c. Foul and surface water drainage including flood risk mitigation d. Surface water drainage strategy including details of Sustainable Urban Drainage e. Nature conservation and enhancement works f. Provision of footpath and cycle links g. Tree works and tree protection measures d) An agreed programme of implementation in accordance with the masterplan. <p>The following uses are considered to be acceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Employment uses comprising B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage or Distribution). <p>RCT support EMP7 and note it as: An area comprising 6 hectares to the south of the A682 is a highly accessible part of the Borough and includes 2 distinct sites (the land between the A682 and the River Irwell: A- EMP2.34) and the land between the River Irwell and the East Lancashire Railway (Area</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	EMP7	Further comment
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Support	B- EMP2.26)) that are divided by the River Irwell. We support the requirement for a Masterplan for the site given the presence of the River Irwell and the need to incorporate it in to the development as a positive feature while still ensuring protections from the development as proposed.		
Number of comments					EMP7	5		

Chapter 3: Retail

Reference	R1	Retail and Other Town Centre Uses						
1026	sheila whipp	-	the square	Not Applicable	One would hope that the RBC would take the trouble to investigate the use of areas on main roads, e.e. Bacup Road, where Burnley Road East meets Booth Road (where all the factories, Boys properties) etc. all of which have enough derelict properties and boarded up shops, and neglected areas which could be refurbished to provide affordable housing as has been done with Ilex Mill etc. - - I was upset to note your deadlines for comments as I have only just , today, found out about the consultation with Rossendale residents. I read the Free Press, etc. etc. but had no idea what was going on and feel that you, RBC, could have done much more to let residents know about your proposals. - - I am worried that we should not be changing the character of Rossendale..... especially the town centre area which ought to remain an open space. I was never in favour of the development at New Hall Hey because it sucks the character out of the centre of Rawtenstall..... and so it has done. In view of the fact that the steam train service brings tourists into Rawtenstall, we should be making our centre as interesting and in keeping with that of our neighbour, Ramsbottom. It should be noted that tourists are not interested in out of town shopping areas as they are everywhere. We need to be unique, that means, we should be seen as a cotton spinning, shoe manufacturing, heritage place not another shopping mall. - - We should be mindful of our duty to future generations. Already there has been damage done including damage to the Town Hall, a beautiful stone building. We do not want our valley further damaging by eyesores like the former police station RBC built on Kay Street, Rawtenstall. Breeze block!!!!!!	I would have liked the time to think all this through, and I am wondering how many others are in my position and are not even aware of your draft plan. - - I am disappointed that RBC assume that people can fill forms on computers and are computer literate. - - I haven't heard of one public meeting to attend.... and I can say that I am astute person, who is usually well informed on local matters, I read the papers and listen to local radio and I have heard nothing until someone urged me to respond quickly today. I have had no thinking time and not studied the plans in detail as I've not been informed of any consultation venues or meetings.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R1	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>The Local Plan states that it is expected that major proposals will be directed towards the town centre of Rawtenstall with other large schemes being encouraged to locate in district centres such as Bacup and Haslingden. Retail proposals will be directed to identified Primary Shopping Centres (PSA). It is stated that impact assessment will be required where the floorspace exceeds the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Rawtenstall Town Centre 400 square metres ☑ Bacup and Haslingden District Centres 300 square metres ☑ Crawshawbooth, Waterfoot, Whitworth Local Centres 200 square metres <p>The Local Plan states that Rossendale Borough Council intend to both further improve and enhance centralised retail locations. The Local Plan proposes that major retail developments will be encouraged to be delivered in the town centre of Rawtenstall. The Town Centre is easily accessible from the SRN. Therefore, any encouragement of delivering major retail projects in Rawtenstall Town Centre should be carefully considered to limit any potential impact on the SRN.</p> <p>Policy R1 states that any proposals that will result in the loss of A1 use in the PSA of the town, district and local centres will only be supported where: ‘There would be no significant adverse impacts on the character of the area, the amenity of local residents, road safety, car parking or traffic flows’</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R1	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy R1: Retail and Other Town Centre Uses</p> <p>Retail development, together with other town centre uses, including offices, leisure, arts, culture and tourist facilities, will be focused within the defined centres, in accordance with the Retail hierarchy set out below (the boundaries of which are identified on the Policies Map):</p> <p>Town Centre : Rawtenstall</p> <p>District Centres : Bacup, Haslingden</p> <p>Local Centres : Crawshawbooth, Waterfoot, Whitworth</p> <p>Neighbourhood Parade : Stacksteads, Helmshore, Edenfield and Facit</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to maintain or strengthen the retail offer and vitality and viability of town, district, local and neighbourhood parades.</p> <p>Major proposals will be directed to Rawtenstall with other large schemes encouraged to locate in the district centres of Bacup and Haslingden, with ancillary local retail in the other centres. Retail proposals will be directed to the Primary Shopping Areas (PSA). Proposals for non-retail uses appropriate to town centres will be considered favourably within the town centre boundary, which encompasses but extends beyond the PSA.</p> <p>The existing markets at Bacup, Haslingden and Rawtenstall will be retained. Consideration will only be given to relocation where:</p> <p>this forms part of a wider regeneration initiative and it positively reinforces the role of the market</p> <p>Where retail, leisure and office development is proposed outside of the defined centre boundaries, an impact assessment will be required where the floorspace exceeds:</p> <p>Rawtenstall Town Centre : 400 sq.m</p> <p>Bacup and Haslingden District Centres : 300 sq.m</p> <p>Crawshawbooth, Waterfoot, Whitworth Local Centres : 200 sq.m</p> <p>Proposals that require planning permission which would result in the loss of A1 uses in the PSA of the town, district and local centres will only be supported where:</p> <p>It would make a positive contribution to the vitality and viability of the relevant centre;</p> <p>It would not result in a significant break in retail frontage or lead to the loss of retail floorspace at a scale that would be harmful to the shopping function of the centre or which would reduce the ability of local communities to meet their day-to-day needs within the centre;</p> <p>It is compatible with a retail area and would maintain an active frontage and be immediately accessible to the public from the street; and</p> <p>There would be no significant adverse impacts on the character of the area, the amenity of local residents, road safety, car parking or traffic flows.</p> <p>RCT give qualified support to R1, but Note:</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R1	Further comment
						<p>A. Lower Cloughfold, alongside Bacup Road, is not identified as a neighbourhood centre or parade. Nor are large standalones: Musbury Fabrics in Helmshore, Winfields at Rising Bridge, Tesco at Sykeside, Rossendale Interiors in Stacksteads, and New Hall Hey's 3 Retail Parks.</p> <p>B. NOTE so far not located gross retail areas to compare, BUT the WYG study does tend to confirm Planning Inspector's "is Rossendale shopped out" comment during Core Strategy Hearings in Public 2011. Also come to view that comparison shopping might be better viewed over-all Rossendale, rather than for each centre.</p> <p>C. RCT note in particular these Sections from White Young Green's April 2017 Rossendale Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study. NOTE use of Primary and Secondary Shopping Area boundaries from 2011 Core Strategy, which include more area and longer walks in Rawtenstall than Bacup and Haslingden, and so should be treated with some caution, eg: that the new Morrisons foodstore has not been accounted for as it falls outside the centre's current boundary. If this 2,231 sq.m was included in our analysis, then the proportion of convenience floorspace would be higher than the national average.</p> <p>7.86 One reason for this is that whilst Rawtenstall town centre benefits from a very strong independent comparison goods retail offer, representation by national multiple operators is considered to be low for a centre of this size. An important factor is that Rossendale is surrounded by larger, higher order centres such as Bury, Burnley, Rochdale and Accrington which already accommodate these national multiples. As such, the commercial demand to gain representation in Rossendale as well is more limited, particularly as Rossendale residents are already likely to be travelling to these higher order centres (and retailers) to undertake their comparison goods shopping.</p> <p>7.87 The other key reason is that Rawtenstall is considered to historically have had units of insufficient scale and format to accommodate the business models of many comparison goods focussed national multiples. However, this position is changing with the introduction of New Hall Hey Retail Park, the first phase of which involves a terrace of four large format units, whilst the second (which is under construction) involves a further three and an accompanying restaurant.</p> <p>7.88 It should be noted that comparison goods retailer TK Maxx, which forms part of Phase I of the New Hall Hey scheme, opened following the undertaking of the household shopper survey in February 2016 and as such the influence of this new addition to the Borough's retail offer is not reflected in our results. Given that TK Maxx represents the largest fashion focussed retail unit in Rossendale, it is anticipated that it has had some positive impact on the Borough's ability to retain such comparison goods shopping trips. It has also evidently improved local consumer choice within this goods sector.</p> <p>7.89 With some 1,493 sq.m (GIA) of modern, comparison goods floorspace</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R1	Further comment
						<p>remaining unlet as part of Phase I of the New Hall Hey scheme and a further 743 sq.m (GIA) available as part of the forthcoming Phase II, it is not considered that the planning authority needs to take any urgent action through their forthcoming plan to address a qualitative need for an improved comparison goods offer in the Borough. The existing and future floorspace proposed at New Hall Hey is considered to have the potential to attract the type of national multiples which are capable of improving the Borough's market share over the short to medium-term.</p> <p>7.90 In terms of future comparison goods provision above and beyond that already approved and constructed at New Hall Hey; where need does arise, in the first instance this should be provided within Rawtenstall town centre's Primary Shopping Area, in accordance with the requirements of national planning policy.</p> <p>D. RCT note that past actions have present consequences, and that New Hall Hey Retail Park was built against Officers advice to Members in their reporting on Application 2005/617 to DEVCON of 5 April 2006, in which they gave this:- Recommendation</p> <p>That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The applicant has failed to demonstrate that a need presently exists for the proposed development of a non-food retail park at this out of centre site of New Hall Hey which is contrary to PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. 2) The proposal fails the sequential approach to site selection in that there exist better located town centre and edge of centre opportunities for comparison shopping development that would better support the existing town centre shopping function and are therefore contrary to PPS6: Planning for Town Centres and Policy 16 (Retail, Entertainment and Leisure Development) of the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan 2001-2016. 3) The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposals would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of Rawtenstall town centre which is contrary to PPS6: Planning for Town Centres. <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That members of the Committee be minded to approve the application as a refusal would be detrimental to the future of Rossendale and that the Chief Executive in consultation with the Officers and the Chair be given delegated authority to determine the conditions to be attached to the consent together with the Heads of Terms in respect of a Section 106 Agreement and to issue a decision notice if the application is not called in by the Government Office.</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>Having taken into account all relevant material planning considerations, this committee considers that planning permission for this proposed development should be resolved to be granted (subject to a Section 106 agreement relating to sustainable transport initiatives and highway works) because in our</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R1	Further comment
						<p>judgement its positive impacts in terms of the wider economic, environmental, social and physical regeneration opportunities and benefits which the scheme will bring to the local community and to the town, are all key issues which, when weighed in the balance with other factors, should be given conclusive weight in this case. In addition, the approval of this application will have very positive and significant sustainable development benefits resulting from the reduction in car-borne journeys made by many people who currently travel out of the Valley to do their non-food shopping and to access leisure facilities that are not available locally. Taken together, it is the view of Committee that these positive regeneration and other benefits plainly outweigh any perceived objections to the development including those based upon retail capacity, need, or potential negative impacts on the town centre's future vitality and viability.</p> <p>E. RCT note, with New Hall Hey Retail Park, these particular Representations, 23/05/2016, on Major Application 2016/0129: Erection of 3no. Retail Units (A1) and a Restaurant/Refreshment Unit (A1/A3/A5) with associated access, car parking, and landscaping. Land off Swanney Lodge Road, Rawtenstall, Rossendale.</p> <p>1. Design and Access Statement submitted by the Applicant shows proposals for 3557 sq.m gross retail area, to add to New Hall Hey Retail Park's existing 6182 sq.m, of which 3,817 sq.m gross is at ground floor level, to give this Out of Centre Retail Park a new gross retail area of 9739 sq.m, and to increase its car parking from 157 to 381 spaces.</p> <p>2. Rawtenstall Town Centre estimated net Primary Shopping Area is 5911 sq.m and its Secondary is 6543 sq.m. Its public car parking for shoppers, workers, commuters and residents is 281 Long Stay + 171 Short Stay = 452 + On-street c118 = Total c570 Spaces.</p> <p>3. Rossendale Local Plan Core Strategy 2011. This was subject to Hearings in Public before a Planning Inspector, who considered it in relation to the new National Planning Policy Framework, and, as adopted by Rossendale Borough Council, it does not support food sales at New Hall Hey:-</p> <p>AVP 4: Strategy for Rawtenstall, Crawshawbooth, Goodshaw and Loveclough New Hall Hey will be safeguarded for bulky goods retail and business use. An extension for business use of land to the south of Hardman's Mill will be favourably considered subject to flood risk issues being fully addressed.</p> <p>4. National Policy on retail locations. RCT note NPPF's S2 Ensuring the vitality of town centres, where the definition of Edge of Centre, shows this as within 300m of a Primary Shopping Area. New Hall Hey is far Out of Centre at c.800m.</p> <p>5. RCT would remind Members that, having given Planning Approval 2007/030 for the erection of 3 retail units measuring 3358 sq.m, 1412 sq.m and 1412 sq.m, these units were constructed by August 2010; and then remained vacant until Members were persuaded in 2014 to allow a variation of the conditions, attached to this 2007 planning permission, so that 1,162 sq.m of the gross</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R1	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	----	-----------------

floor space (Unit A1) can sell all Class A1 goods, including food, drink and clothing, along with ancillary uses. In order, it appears to RCT, to bring a M&S Simply Food to Rossendale; a decision that looks to have “trumped” both local and national planning policies and their intentions to ensure the vitality of town centres.

6. Rawtenstall Town Centre Retail Growth and Potential. RCT suggest that if a need was not evident in 2006, it certainly isn't now. Did Rawtenstall, or Rossendale, really need this Out of Centre's M&S's 1162sq.m of Simply Food sales, when it had a new Asda, Lidl, Tesco, B&M's 340sqm of food sales in the 3543 sqm ex Focus DIY, the Valley Centre cleared for redevelopment, and the vacated New Hall Hey Station Court: 2181sqm gross, c150 car spaces.

RCT estimate net retail, from VOA data, shows Rawtenstall Town Centre's:- Primary 5911sq.m, Secondary 6543sq.m, Edge 20203sqm to total 32657sqm. The real change for Rawtenstall was Asda's 10986sqm nett, 13106sqm gross. F. RCT note LCC's Lancashire Profiles, which shows gross retail area in Rossendale: 974 - 90,000sqm, 1998 - 92,000sqm, 2008 - 119,000sqm or 29% Lancashire's No 1 for growth in retail space to Hyndburn's 16.6%, and Burnley's 13.5%.

Town	Population	Gross Retail sqm	sqm/head
Chorley	104,000	173,000	1.65
Rossendale	7,300	119,000	1.77
Blackburn+Darwen	140,700	312,000	2.22
Hyndburn	81,600	196,000	2.40
Preston	132,000	257,000	3.46

Does this show the effects of being close to larger centres?

Maybe, but then take the situation of a large town, close to both other large towns, and also city centres. We see Warrington, where a main high street Boots has moved into a Debenhams expanded Golden Square, and its site is now proposed for a smaller Retail Market. Where a population growth from 122,300 in 1968 to 202,228 in 2011, relates to a 55% reduction of town centre shopping floorspace to 4.8 sqft per person – 0.45 sqm/p, but its gross retail of c296,000 sqm is only 1.46 sqm/p.

Or are we also seeing the effects of the change to larger retail units with more efficient use of space: better ratios of net to gross areas: 49-51 Bank Street ex Woolworths' 49% to Asda St Mary's Way's 84%?

So note Rossendale's recent growth: Tesco x 2, a new Asda, a Lidl, Bacup's 2022sqm Morrisons, and a B&M with Planning Permission for 340sqm of food sales in the 3543 sqm ex Focus DIY. Did Rawtenstall or Rossendale need an Out of Centre 1162sqm of food sales in M&S? And now an Aldi as part of 3557 sq.m gross retail area, added to New Hall Hey Retail Park's existing 6182 sq.m.

Number of comments R1

3

Reference R2 Rawtenstall Town Centre Uses

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R2	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	The Rawtenstall Town Centre redevelopment project involves removal of the former Valley Centre from the PSA and reassigned as a 'Future Primary Shopping Area Extension'. The new extension is expected to accommodate a mixed-use scheme of employment, retail and residential use classes. The mixed-use scheme will generate a varied pattern of traffic associated with the developments and requires careful consideration due to the close proximity of the Town Centre to the SRN. Key Points ☑ Improvement and addition to retail centres that lie in close proximity to the SRN such as Rawtenstall and Haslingden should be carefully considered in order to ensure that any impacts are properly mitigated.		
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	Policy R2: Rawtenstall Town Centre Extension Within the area defined on the Policies Map within Rawtenstall Town Centre shown as an extension to the Primary Shopping Area, redevelopment will be permitted subject to the following: a) Comprehensive development of the site is demonstrated through a masterplan; b) The implementation of development in accordance with an agreed design code; and c) An agreed programme of implementation in accordance with the masterplan. The following mixes of uses are considered to be appropriate: i. Retail (Use Class A1); ii. Hotel (Use Class C1); iii. Restaurants and cafes (Use Class A3); iv. Drinking establishments (Use Class A4); v. Leisure uses (Use Class D2); vi. Employment uses comprising B1 (Business) vii. Residential units above ground floor level. RCT support the hopes in R2.		
Number of comments		R2			2			
Reference		R3	Development and Change of Use in Ditsrict and Local Centres					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R3	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy R3: Development and Change of Use in District and Local Centres</p> <p>The boundaries of the District and Local Centres are defined on the Policies Map. The following criteria apply for change of use and development in District and Local Centres:</p> <p>a) Planning permission will be granted for A1, A2, A3, and A4 uses which support the role and function of District and Local Centres.</p> <p>b) A5 uses (hot food takeaways) will be permitted where the proposal would not adversely impact, either individually or cumulatively, on the function, vitality and viability of the centre, subject to other policies in this Plan.</p> <p>c) Planning permission will be not be granted for non-retail uses (including the loss of A1 use) unless it can be shown that there is no demand for retail or commercial use or the property was last occupied by a non-retail/non-commercial use. This will need to be demonstrated through an active 12 month marketing process showing that the property has been offered for sale or rent on the open market at a realistic price and that no reasonable offers have been refused.</p> <p>The provision of flats on the upper floors of the building will be encouraged but this will not apply where the applicant can demonstrate that the whole building will be fully utilised for retail/commercial purposes.</p> <p>RCT support R3.</p>		

Number of comments R3

1

Reference	R4	Existing Local Shops
-----------	----	----------------------

1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy R4: Existing Local shops</p> <p>Development proposing the change of use or loss of any premises or land currently or last used as a local shop (Use Class A1) outside of the defined town centre; district or local centre boundaries will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) The use is not financially viable; and</p> <p>b) There is sufficient provision in the local area</p> <p>RCT support R4.</p>		
------	--	--	------------------------	--	---------	--	--	--

Number of comments R4

1

Reference	R5	Hot Food Takeaways
-----------	----	--------------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R5	Further comment
485			East Lancs CCG		Not Applicable	View of East Lancashire CCG:- "Both in my role at East Lancashire CCG and more importantly as a local GP, I'm becoming increasingly aware of the impact that fast food outlets are having on the health of the population and many of my fellow health professionals see it as one of the most important health challenges around. The Health profile in Rossendale is very similar to that of the national position, where over a quarter of adults and a third of nine year olds are overweight or obese, many of whom either have or are at risk of developing Diabetes" GP Partner – Dr Mackenzie and Partners and Rossendale Locality GP Lead		
1510	Chris	Holmes	Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Limited	Policy R5 bullet points 3 and 4	Object	Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Limited (KFC) is committed to working in partnership with government to increase the availability of healthy diet and exercise choices. It agrees with reasonable and fair strategies to increase the availability of healthy diet and exercise choices, but cannot agree with measures, which may be unlawful and simply restrict choice for all members of the public without good evidence of effectiveness. - - The draft policy is not based on any objectively assessed development requirement. It effectively assesses the requirement for hot food takeaways in certain areas as zero, but without regard to baseline levels or any level or distance at which the alleged contribution to obesity is supposed to occur. There is no assessment of how many applications would be refused or the environmental or economic impact of longer journeys and lost jobs. - - There is no evidence of a distance at which the alleged harm will occur or indeed that it necessarily will occur at all, as there is no evidence that hot food takeaways contribute to obesity more than any other land use at which it is possible to purchase or consume food and drink, including coffee shops, bakeries (or, simply, supermarkets) in Class A1, restaurants and cafes in Class A3 or drinking establishments within Class A4. - - The inclusion of primary schools is particularly problematic, as it is clear that children at primary schools are not permitted to leave the premises unaccompanied. Indeed, no account is taken of secondary schools that operate "locked gates" policies at lunchtimes. We suggest that it would be better to focus on ensuring good and broadly equal access to open space, sport and recreation opportunities and on a balanced retail offer.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R5	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>Healthy Weight and Hot Food Takeaways</p> <p>Policy R5: Hot Food Takeaways makes reference in the policy criteria to a percentage rate for Year 6 pupils that are classified by Public Health England as obese. It is also important to consider the data for the reception year pupils, as this data can give an indication of the current and future healthy weight levels for young children</p> <p>Figures 10 and 11 below provide detail on the prevalence of overweight (including obese) children in for Rossendale when compared to the national average and also obesity levels for reception year children within Rossendale at ward level.</p> <p>Figure 10 shows that the number of reception children with excess weight (including obese) in Rossendale is significantly worse than the England average. Figure 11 shows that Rossendale has 4 wards in the top Quintile (10.8% to 20.1%) for obesity in reception year children with Worsley at 13.0%, Irwell at 12.9%, Greensclough at 12.1% and Greenfield at 11.7%.</p> <p>Whilst we commend many elements of Policy R5: Hot Food Takeaways. Figures 10 and 11 display that Rossendale has a particular issue with obesity in reception year children, whereas the policy is based on obesity in year 6 children.</p> <p>Public Health England has determined that Rossendale has seen a 27% increase in fast food outlets (which includes the A3 use) between 2012 and 2016 and has a fast food takeaway density that is now significantly above the England average.</p> <p>Recommendation: Consider reviewing Policy R5 to include a criteria regarding the obesity in wards where more than 22% of the reception year pupils are classified by Public Health England as obese. Please see appendix for figures</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R5	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy R5: Hot Food Takeaways</p> <p>The development of hot food takeaways will be supported provided the following criteria are met and subject to other policies of this plan:</p> <p>the development is located within a town or district centre and it would adversely impact the vitality and viability of the area;</p> <p>where the proposed development would be located outside of the primary shopping area of the town or district centre it is of no more than 100 square metres (gross) floorspace and it would not give rise to an over-concentration of hot food takeaways that adversely impacts the vitality and viability of the area;</p> <p>where the proposed development is located within 400m of a primary school and/or secondary school that lies outside of designated town and district shopping centres, takeaway opening hours are restricted at lunchtimes and school closing times;</p> <p>development for A5 use would not adversely contribute to obesity in wards where more than 22% of the year 6 pupils are classified by Public Health England as obese;</p> <p>where a new shopfront is proposed it is of a high quality design that is in scale and keeping with the area;</p> <p>provision is made for the control and management of litter both on site and on the public highway;</p> <p>provision is made for the treatment and management of cooking odours and any external flue/means of extraction would not cause harm to visual or residential amenity, and;</p> <p>The development would not give rise to unacceptable adverse impacts on local amenity, privacy or highway safety.</p> <p>RCT support R5 subject to retention of: The development of hot food takeaways (use class A5) will be considered against the latest guidance published by the Council, currently the "Interim Statement on Hot Food Takeaways". The development of hot food takeaways will not be permitted on sites located within 250 metres of a school entrance, youth-centred facility or a park boundary.</p>		
Number of comments						R5	4	
Reference			R6	Shopfronts				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	R6	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy R6: Shopfronts</p> <p>The Council will seek the retention of shopfronts and commercial frontages with features of architectural or historic interest (particularly those in Conservation Areas), unless the replacement or significant alteration of these shopfronts would better preserve or enhance the character of the building and the wider area.</p> <p>Proposals for new shopfronts and commercial frontages and the improvement of existing frontages should reflect the character of the area. All proposals will be assessed against the policies set out in the "Shopfront design" Supplementary Planning Document including any subsequent updates.</p> <p>RCT support R6.</p>		

Number of comments R6

1

Chapter 4: Environment

Reference	ENV01	High Quality Development in the Borough						
-----------	-------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England		Not Applicable	<p>We welcome that the Council recognises the importance of the historic environment in the Borough. However, as drafted the policy does not provide an appropriate framework to ensure that development does not harm heritage assets and their setting. Reference should be made to for example, to ensuring that there is no unacceptable harm to heritage assets and their setting which would be more consistent with the requirements of the NPPF, whilst the policy would also benefit from a specific reference (separate bullet point) to townscape and local distinctiveness.</p>		
1201	Stephen	Anderson	N/A	ENV 1, 2, 3, & 4	Support	<p>I am fully in support of the robust design and heritage policies, whilst recognising the challenges associated with implementing such policies. - - These policies will need to be supported by a robustly implemented validation checklist and other guidance. - - I believe there is also a role for a local design review panel to support the Council's decision making on matters of design and heritage. - - With respect to the proposed Conservation Areas, I am fully in support although hope that this will represent the beginning of review and refinement of existing Conservation Areas, implementation of management plans including potential Article 4 Directions and considering future Conservation Areas, such as Waterfoot. -</p>		On balance, the Draft Local Plan is the best and most well balanced option.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV01	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	POLICY ENV1: HIGH QUALITY DEVELOPMENT IN THE BOROUGH An identified criteria within the Local Plan is the desire for new developments to demonstrate how they will connect to the wider area via public transport, walking and cycling. The Policies Map 2017 indicates that a significant majority of the allocated residential sites are sporadically located around the Borough and that due to both their location and size, it is assumed that they not have significant impacts on the SRN. The allocated residential site at Edenfield, however, is located immediately adjacent to the A56(T). Due consideration should be given to providing a high level of accessibility to the site, which has the potential to significantly reduce the number of vehicle trips.		
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	Policy ENV1: High Quality Development in the Borough 2.69 We support the general principles outlined in Policy ENV1, which are all important factors in delivering high quality development in the Borough. 2.70 Whilst acknowledging the important role that Development Briefs or Design Codes (point m) can play in delivering high quality development, they can sometimes add an additional administrative burden leading to delays to housing delivery. In order to overcome this, if Design Codes or Development Briefs are to be introduced, this process should involve early engagement with Developers on Masterplan concepts. Frontloading such work will save delays down the line, and provide a high quality design framework which both the Council and Developer are happy with. It should be noted, that Taylor Wimpey have already undertaken such engagement with the Council on the development proposals for Grane Village. 2.71 Additionally, Design Codes can sometimes impose constraints on the sale of land to specific housebuilders, if certain standards are outlined which not every housebuilder could deliver. This is something that should be considered as part of dialogue between the Council and developers/landowners for each individual site. 2.72 The above points should be seriously considered given the Council is unable to currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing and will be under pressure to have this requirement secured upon adoption of the Plan. Necessitating Development Briefs or Design Codes for each allocated site will simply push back delivery rates.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV01	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Object	Design		
						<p>7.14 Policy ENV1 sets out various expectations (items a-q) for design and layout of new development. Peel is committed to high quality design and has previously demonstrated this commitment through the Development Frameworks provided for the proposed development sites in Rossendale. These frameworks are in the process of being updated and will be provided to the Council in due course. In addition, Peel is committed to working with the other landowners to take forward a coordinated approach to design at Edenfield (in accordance with Policy HS3).</p> <p>7.15 Peel considers that the following points in Policy ENV1 are unnecessarily prescriptive. Item m) requires a 'Development Brief or Design Code (as appropriate)', item n) states that where appropriate applications shall be accompanied by an 'independent Design Stage Review', and item j) requires public art. Whilst these tools will be appropriate in some circumstances, it is not considered necessary in all circumstances. These should not be included. Item p) requires consideration of sustainable construction 'including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)'. The use of SuDs is adequately covered in policy ENV11, and is therefore considered an overly detailed point to include in this policy.</p> <p>7.16 Criterion m) sets out a requirement for a design codes/development briefs in some cases. It is unclear what the reference to "size of development" means and therefore when a design code may be required. The policy should be redrafted such that it is precise and its requirements of developers are clear.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV01	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>Recommendations: Due to Rossendale's deprivation in the area of indoor living environments, housing quality should be a key concern for Rossendale. Any options to upgrade the existing housing stock should be explored.</p> <p>Design Policy ENV1: High Quality Development in the Borough, requires that all new development takes account of the character and appearance of the local plan area and provides criteria to be considered, including aspects relating to urban design, public realm, amenity, movement patterns, sustainable travel, crime, landscaping, flood risk and design codes. The requirements of the policy are welcomed but could be strengthened further by requiring development proposals ensure that there is no adverse health impacts with regard to air quality and road safety, and where possible the developments should help address existing hotspots. Consideration should also be given to requiring Health Impact Assessments to be required where appropriate for major planning applications and to consider the use of Section 106 agreements or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to deliver measures to improve the health impacts of development.</p> <p>Outdoor Living Environment and Crime The Index of Multiple Deprivation, Living Environment domain, has an Outdoor Living Environment subdomain, which measures air quality and traffic accidents. Figure 12 below shows that for the Outdoor Living Environment subdomain, that for Rossendale, the Greenfield ward is one of the 10% most deprived wards nationally and that a number of other wards in the borough are within the 30% most deprived category, with no wards classified as least deprived. Figure 12: Index of Multiple Deprivation, Outdoor Living Environment Subdomain by ward and decile Figure 13 below, shows that from the most recent available data, Rossendale is significantly above the national average for violent crime (including sexual violence). We therefore commend that Policy ENV1: High Quality Development in the Borough states the aim of "Minimising opportunity for crime, and maximising natural surveillance." Figure 13xiii: Violent crime (including sexual violence) hospital admissions for violence</p> <p>Recommendations: Policy ENV1 should be revised to include criteria requiring that requires development proposals ensure that there is no adverse health impacts with regard to air quality and road safety, and where possible development should help to alleviate existing poor air quality and road accident hotspots. This will help to address the relatively high levels of outdoor environment, living environment deprivation in the Borough</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV01	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV1: High Quality Development in the Borough</p> <p>All proposals for new development in the Borough will be expected to take account of the character and appearance of the local area, including the following:</p> <p>a) Siting, layout, massing, scale, design, materials, lighting, building to plot ratio and landscaping.</p> <p>b) Safeguarding and enhancing the built and historic environment.</p> <p>c) Being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers, and avoiding demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area.</p> <p>d) The scheme will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring development by virtue of it being over-bearing or oppressive, overlooking, or resulting in an unacceptable loss of light.</p> <p>e) Ensuring that the amenities of occupiers of the new development will not be adversely affected by neighbouring uses and vice versa.</p> <p>f) Linking in with surrounding movement patterns and not prejudicing the development of neighbouring land, including the creation of landlocked sites.</p> <p>g) Demonstration of how the new development will connect to the wider area via public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>h) Minimising opportunity for crime, and maximising natural surveillance.</p> <p>i) Providing landscaping as an integral part of the development, protecting existing landscape features and natural assets, habitat creation, providing open space, appropriate boundary treatments and enhancing the public realm.</p> <p>j) Including public art in appropriate circumstances.</p> <p>k) There is no adverse impact to the natural environment, biodiversity and green infrastructure unless suitable mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>l) That proposals do not increase the risk of flooding on the site or elsewhere, where possible reducing the risk of flooding overall, having regard to the surface water drainage hierarchy.</p> <p>m) A Development Brief or Design Code (as appropriate) will be required to support new development (this document will be proportionate to the size of the development) setting out the design principles, the appropriateness of the development in the context of the area and consideration of innovative design.</p> <p>n) Where appropriate applications shall be accompanied by an independent Design Stage Review.</p> <p>o) Making provision for the needs of special groups in the community such as the elderly and those with disabilities.</p> <p>p) Designs that will be adaptable to climate change, incorporate energy efficiency principles and adopting principles of sustainable construction including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS); and</p> <p>q) Ensuring that contaminated land, land stability and other risks associated with coal mining are considered and, where necessary, addressed through appropriate remediation and mitigation measures.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV01	Further comment
						RCT support ENV1.		
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Object	<p>Issue: While the draft policy wording seeks to protect existing landscape features and natural assets, there is no support for seeking any enhancement to existing features.</p> <p>Impact: Opportunities to improve existing natural assets as a result of proposed development may be lost.</p> <p>Suggested solution: Revise the wording of the proposed policy as follows:-</p> <p>i) Providing landscaping as an integral part of the development, protecting and enhancing existing landscape features and natural assets, habitat creation, providing open space, appropriate boundary treatments and enhancing the public realm</p> <p>Commentary:</p> <p>In addition to protecting landscapes and natural assets, paragraph 109 and 118 of the NPPF seeks to ensure the planning system enhances such features. This should be reflected in the proposed policy to ensure that high quality development includes an expectation that existing features of value will be improved.</p> <p>Issue: There is no reference to the need to ensure high quality development must not increase risks of pollution to the environment.</p> <p>Impact: High quality development proposals are assessed against a policy that does not take account of the risks of pollution to air, land or water leading to harm to the environment.</p> <p>Suggested solution: Revise the wording of the proposed policy as follows:-</p> <p>r) The scheme will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the environment by virtue of pollution to water, land or air</p> <p>Commentary:</p> <p>Paragraph 120 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that planning policies and decisions avoid unacceptable risks of pollution by ensuring that development is in an appropriate location. This should be reflected in the proposed policy to ensure that high quality development includes an expectation that it will not contribute to an increased risk of pollution to water, land or air.</p>		

Number of comments ENV01

9

Reference	ENV02	Heritage Assets
589	Stephen Langridge	<p>Not Applicable</p> <p>7. Haslingden Centre Conservation Area, Whilst Haslingden may no longer be the main centre of the valley (when everyting to the east was a royal deer park and therefore deviod of habitataion)), it is a town with a rich history dating back to medieval times, through the industrial revolution and up to the present day. Any plans to create an area of conservation and interest should include reference to and identify that history.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England		Object	<p>Historic England is concerned that the policy proposed (and the Plan as a whole) does not provide an appropriate framework to manage the Borough's heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to just rely on the provisions of the NPPF to determine all applications affecting the historic environment. The NPPF makes it clear that Local Plans are expected to include detailed policies, which will enable a decision maker to determine a planning application. The policy as drafted does not do this.</p> <p>Key issues to be considered include undesignated and designated heritage assets (including significance of, setting, extensions, demolition, alterations, change of use, etc), archaeology including remains of less than national importance, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens, heritage at risk as well as information to accompany an application.</p> <p>The Policy should be clear on what relates to a particular heritage asset – for example the list included in section B of the policy; character and appearance relates to conservation areas and not all types of heritage assets and this appears to be the same within the other bulleted parts of the policy. The policy needs to be amended and structured to ensure that it is clear how the policy will relate to a particular heritage asset.</p> <p>In addition to the above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The policy attempts to determine the significance of heritage assets by listing them. · Shop fronts in conservation areas will be subject to separate tests than for example, scheduled monuments. Yet the policy appears to put them on the same footing. · Bullet II – what does this mean and how is it applied? · Bullet III – this appears to refer to local character and distinctiveness and not the historic environment. The implementation of this bullet would mean that if the proposal fits in with the wider setting then it would be acceptable. This would not meet the tests in terms of heritage assets. · Bullet VI – Surely any work that has been made to a heritage asset that is harmful would most likely not have had Listed Building Consent and would be subject to enforcement. This part of the policy also attempts to define these works – and these relate to built structures but what about other heritage assets. · A design solution that reinforces local distinctiveness may not always be appropriate for a heritage asset but Bullet vii appears to suggest this. · The final paragraph of the policy refers to the demolition or removal of heritage assets or its parts. This is confusing and needs amending. · How does the policy deal with the different levels of harm to heritage assets? · How will the policy deal with different types of assets such as archaeology of national significance? 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
						· How is the policy locally specific to Rossendale? The Policy overall needs to be rewritten in view of some of the suggestions above and the requirements of the NPPF and the 1990 Act.		
1201	Stephen	Anderson	N/A		Support	I am fully in support of the robust design and heritage policies, whilst recognising the challenges associated with implementing such policies. - - These policies will need to be supported by a robustly implemented validation checklist and other guidance. - - I believe there is also a role for a local design review panel to support the Council's decision making on matters of design and heritage. - - With respect to the proposed Conservation Areas, I am fully in support although hope that this will represent the beginning of review and refinement of existing Conservation Areas, implementation of management plans including potential Article 4 Directions and considering future Conservation Areas, such as Waterfoot. -		On balance, the Draft Local Plan is the best and most well balanced option.
1323	Rachael	Gildert	Valley Heritage	There isn't a number stated on the documents	Support	I am very supportive of the creation of a Conservation area for Newchurch. Although the village was extensively remodelled in the 1960s, there is a still a lot of history left in the fabric of the remaining buildings both externally and internally and the Conservation Area would help to retain this and prevent inappropriate development and alterations of these buildings. - I also think the proposed boundary is suitable too and includes grounds and gardens where appropriate. Valley Heritage thinks the creation of new Conservation Areas within Rossendale is a very positive move towards protecting our historic environment. And it supports the extension to Chatterton and Strongstry Conservation Area boundary as a well justified proposal. - - We suggest the Helmshore site boundary might need to be adjusted slightly to make better reference to existing physical and ownership boundaries - - We also suggest that Haslingden boundaries be extended to incorporate areas of industrial mill workers housing (such as Beaconsfield Street, Park Street and Greenfield Street) and larger houses to the south. It also omits Coal Hey Weavers cottages and back to back properties - the proposed boundary falls a few metres short of incorporating these properties along the western site boundary - - The use of Article 4 Directions in many of these areas is important, as are removing permitted development rights on signage in commercial areas. - - Valley Heritage feel that no significant improvement in most of these areas in terms of loss of heritage features (windows, doors, gutters, roof materials, boundary treatments, shop fronts etc.) are likely to come forward without some kind of grant scheme being introduced, alongside a significant effort on education and enforcement.		With regards to Conservation Areas, it was a shame Waterfoot Centre was not put forward. The town is slowly starting to regenerate and additional protection could help to prevent unsuitable shop fronts, UPVC windows and other inappropriate development

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Object	Heritage 7.17 It is considered that Policy ENV2 is unnecessarily prescriptive. It sets out a requirement for new development proposals to have regard to Conservation Area Appraisals and to the significance, appearance, character and setting of nearby heritage assets. It is considered unnecessary to include criterions i) to vii), which specify an unnecessary level of detail regarding the features which new development assess. The majority of the requirements of these criteria are already enshrined in national policy such that it is unnecessary to repeat them in the local plan. If necessary, the guidance they provide should be set out in the explanatory text rather than in the policy itself.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV2: Heritage Assets</p> <p>a) Applications affecting a Heritage Asset or its setting will be granted where it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is in accordance with the Framework and relevant Historic England guidance; ii. Where appropriate, takes full account of the findings and recommendations in the Council’s Conservation Area Appraisals; iii. Is accompanied by a robust and thorough Heritage Statement and; <p>b) Applications will be granted where they sustain, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of the heritage asset itself and the surrounding historic environment and where they show consideration for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The conservation of features and elements that contribute to the heritage asset's significance and character. This may include: chimneys, windows and doors, boundary treatments, original roof coverings, earthworks or buried remains, shop fronts or elements of shop fronts in conservation areas, as well as internal features such as fireplaces, plaster cornices, doors, architraves, panelling and any walls in listed buildings; ii. The use of appropriate materials and design features which respect the asset; iii. A high standard of design that has regards to the positive aspects of the surrounding built form and its wider setting, in terms of design, siting, scale, height and materials used; iv. The reinstatement of features and elements that contribute to the heritage asset's significance which have been lost or damaged; v. The conservation and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the setting of heritage assets; vi. The removal of additions or modifications that are considered harmful to the significance of any heritage asset. This may include the removal of pebbledash, paint from brickwork, non-original style windows, doors, satellite dishes or other equipment; vii. The use of the Heritage Asset should be compatible with the conservation of its significance. Whilst the original use of a building is usually the most appropriate one it is recognised that continuance of this use is not always possible. Sensitive and creative adaptation to enable an alternative use can be achieved and truly innovative design solutions that reinforces local distinctiveness will be positively encouraged; <p>Development involving the demolition or removal of significant heritage assets or parts thereof will be granted only in exceptional circumstances which have been clearly and convincingly demonstrated to be in accordance with the requirements of the Framework and demonstrates that the public benefits achieved by the proposal outweighs the significance of the heritage assets(s).</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
						<p>RCT supports ENV2 and welcomes the proposals to add to the nine conservation areas: Haslingden, Crawshawbooth, Helmshore and Newchurch, and to extend Chatterton Strongstry. And would hope that the Management Proposals Plans are to be developed, and where necessary, brought back to Council for specific approval for their incremental implementation as resources allow, including the re-designation of Conservation Area boundaries. THE CABINET Wednesday 26th October 2011.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
1790	David	Trivett			Not Applicable	<p>Bacup Townscape Heritage Initiative.</p> <p>From the Bacup Public Realm Proposals Update 25/08/2017 – Councillor Andy MacNae</p> <p>“The existing scheme is then stopped. Whilst this decision may be popular with those who have opposed change I believe that the great majority of people in Bacup will be deeply disappointed that our chance to deliver transformational change to the town centre has been lost because of this opposition.”</p> <p>“County officers will now work closely with our THI team to develop a new public realm plan that can be delivered within the THI timescales.”</p> <p>Although unable to attend the public meeting in July to voice my opinion on the, thankfully now defunct, twin island, shared space proposal I was in opposition to the scheme. Not because I “oppose change” but because I considered it was a badly conceived plan which would have caused severe traffic disruption to the town with, I believe, no benefit to residents or businesses.</p> <p>Bacup town centre is fundamentally a complex, offset junction at the crossing point of the A681 and A671 combined with Lane Head Lane emerging as a blind exit in respect of traffic from the Todmorden Road direction. Ignoring the heritage, retained fountain, discussion completely, I believe the current road layout scheme in place is the best functioning solution for the junction. The traffic flows well in all directions; unless a driver accidently, or deliberately decides to block the single car space entry point to the island from the Todmorden Road. Traffic flow around the island is also restricted if a large vehicle enters the island from the Todmorden Road.</p> <p>Other than under those circumstances the existing traffic system works, as can be seen daily and should remain unaltered. There are adequate street signs and road markings to direct the traffic properly. Two lanes from the Burnley Road direction for left and right turns. Three lanes from Rochdale for turn left to Rawtenstall, straight ahead for Burnley and turn right for Todmorden.</p> <p>The twin roundabout with five pedestrian crossings scheme was nonsensical in the extreme and would have resulted in considerable traffic build up at this junction. Eight pedestrian crossings in close proximity and traffic flow restricted to one lane only in all directions would not be a suitable, or efficient “transformational change” for Bacup in my opinion.</p> <p>The aerial CGI provided in support of the scheme was laughable and not real world Bacup. Bicycles, pedestrians, street furniture, widened pavements, two food vendor vans and only six cars visible. Not a bus or lorry of any description in sight.</p> <p>See recent images. Friday 06/10/17 12.00</p> <p>Tourist - Todmorden to Rawtenstall Rawtenstall to Rochdale Todmorden to Rochdale Todmorden to Burnley</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
						<p>Todmorden to Burnley using left lane negotiating the island with the bus to Accrington</p> <p>Shared space, for events, centred at the junction of two busy A roads is a complete nonsense.</p> <p>Bacup evolved without a town or market square. Why try now to make something more pedestrian friendly and create, yet another, Rossendale traffic pinch point.</p> <p>Comparing Bacup with Poynton in Cheshire is ridiculous. Two A roads A5149 and A523 T junction with Park Lane. Totally different demographics with a different road layout, different weather in Cheshire so more scope for Al Fresco cafe scene. There is more disposable income in Poynton. I regularly experienced traffic delays travelling from Macclesfield to negotiate this constricting junction road scheme. There are no clearly defined pedestrian crossings visible.</p> <p>Ben Hamilton-Baillie's design to create a village centre with informal "pedestrian desire lines" and repaving to the areas in front of the shops to "enhance the pedestrian environment" cost circa £3 million.</p> <p>The shared space concept being; to slow traffic, using gateways demarking the transition from highway to village centre. From personal experience the scheme is badly lit at night, pedestrian desire lines and highway boundary lines are difficult to identify in the dark and rain and become invisible in snow. Ignoring the cost aspect the road layout is a confusing mess and free for all with the traffic. Pedestrians rely on the goodwill, awareness and due care and attention required from drivers to safely cross the roads.</p> <p>26000 vehicles per day through Poynton!</p> <p>The gateways channel traffic into single lanes resulting in long, slow moving queues in all directions which arrive at two "circles" defined in the roadway using different coloured blocks and then negotiate the junction with no clearly defined right of way other than the instructions in the Highway Code. I understand the instruction for roundabouts is they are to be driven around, not over.</p> <p>Independent assessment of the Poynton junction at the following link. https://aseasyasridingabike.wordpress.com/2014/06/16/poynton/ Accidents by Design: The Holmes Report on "shared space" in the United Kingdom Lord Holmes of Richmond MBE – July 2015 http://www.theihe.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Holmes-Report-on-Shared-Space-.pdf Executive Summary Shared Space described by users as: "Lethally dangerous" (Pedestrian) "Absolute nightmare that I avoid if I can." (Driver) "Shared space is a false promise with poor delivery" (Cyclist)</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-------	-----------------

Key findings:

- People’s experiences of shared space schemes are overwhelmingly negative.
- Overzealous councils are risking public safety with fashionable ‘simplified’ street design.
- Over a third of people actively avoid shared space schemes.
- 63 per cent of people who have used shared space schemes rated their experience as poor.
- Significant under-reporting of accidents in shared space.

Key recommendations:

- Immediate moratorium on shared space schemes while impact assessments are conducted.
- Urgent need for accessibility audits of all shared space schemes and a central record of accident data including “courtesy crossings”, which must be defined and monitored.
- Department for Transport must update their guidance so that Local Authorities better understand their responsibilities under the Equalities Act. Bacup is a crossroads town which people, other than residents, pass through on their way to somewhere else. This is something a shared space scheme will not rectify, particularly if the scheme creates the issues noted in the Holmes Report.

Most residents already travel elsewhere to work and shop.

Bacup is not a bad place to live but is not, nor is it likely to be, a tourist destination.

No canal, no railway, no real attractions or restaurants; just a few bike trails in a couple of redundant quarries.

Nothing of interest for “tourists”. I can’t see the street cafe scene working in the town.

Irwell Terrace is the closest to a town centre public space. If more public space is considered necessary; maybe relocate the bus stands. Exchange a couple of car parking spaces in front of the shops for the Accrington bus stop.

More public realm “shared space” will give the local idiots more places to play at night perhaps?

Forgot; no police station in Bacup or Stacksteads!

Maybe combine the police and fire service facilities at Bacup fire station for more efficient use by both services. This will give a faster police response time, instead of the current, blue light and siren charge up the valley from Waterfoot, Rawtenstall, or across from Burnley.

It will be very interesting to see what the next Bacup THI proposal for consultation looks like.

Changes should only be made to the current road layout if they make improvements.

I don’t think the retention of a heritage fountain is the main reason Bacup residents opposed the shared space scheme so strongly. The reports I read of

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV02	Further comment
						<p>the public meeting in July suggests the majority of those attending considered it is neither a practical or beneficial solution for the town.</p> <p>Changes to the road layout purely made to secure the heritage grant aid should not be pursued. Leave the junction as it is now.</p> <p>It is already difficult enough to turn right from Bankside Lane towards Rawtenstall. Why make it worse?</p> <p>I am not opposed to change. I have witnessed the enormous changes to Bacup since we came to live here in December 1980. Many shops and businesses have disappeared. A sad situation reflected in other towns across the country.</p> <p>Please see appendix for photographs.</p>		
Number of comments					ENV02	7		
Reference	ENV03	Local List						
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England		Not Applicable	<p>Policy ENV3 Local List</p> <p>Whilst we welcome the inclusion of a policy for locally listed heritage assets, the policy appears to provide a more robust policy and framework for these types of assets than the Policy which deals with designated assets. Should the policy be titled as Locally Listed Buildings rather than Local List? The Policy would benefit from making it clear which assets relate to this policy, as a local heritage asset is not just those which are designated on a list., it is very much a fluid process.</p>		
1201	Stephen	Anderson	N/A		Support	<p>I am fully in support of the robust design and heritage policies, whilst recognising the challenges associated with implementing such policies. - - These policies will need to be supported by a robustly implemented validation checklist and other guidance. - - I believe there is also a role for a local design review panel to support the Council's decision making on matters of design and heritage. - - With respect to the proposed Conservation Areas, I am fully in support although hope that this will represent the beginning of review and refinement of existing Conservation Areas, implementation of management plans including potential Article 4 Directions and considering future Conservation Areas, such as Waterfoot. -</p>		On balance, the Draft Local Plan is the best and most well balanced option.
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>Policy ENV3: Local List</p> <p>2.73 We have no comments on this policy other than to request that the list is well publicised, in order for interested parties to monitor listed sites that affect them. We would also request that the methodology selection criteria for including sites are made clear.</p>		
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Object	<p>7.18 Policy ENV3 refers to the requirement to demonstrate "exceptional circumstances" to justify the loss of a heritage asset. This is unnecessarily prescriptive and is inconsistent with the NPPF, which sets out a requirement to demonstrate that the benefits outweigh the harms in such cases. The words "exceptional circumstances" should be removed from the policy.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV03	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV3: Local List</p> <p>Development proposals which would result in the total or partial loss of a locally listed heritage asset, and which require planning permission, will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the harm.</p> <p>Extensions and alterations to locally listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets should demonstrate that the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Preserves and enhances local identity, character, and the setting of non-designated heritage assets; and ☑ Is of appropriate design, scale and materials. <p>Where it can be demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances to justify the loss of a locally listed building or non-designated heritage asset, the following may be required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Any replacement building(s) is to be of comparable quality and design; ☑ An appropriate level of survey and recording is carried out prior to demolition which may include archaeological excavation. <p>RCT support ENV3 and welcome the news that the Council are developing a local list of non-designated heritage assets which include buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes of significance. These heritage assets don't meet national standards for designation but make a significant contribution to Rossendale's landscape and merit consideration in planning decisions. The identification of heritage assets on the list plays an important role in ensuring the proper validation and recording of Rossendale's local heritage assets and in protecting the Borough's individual character and distinctiveness. Assets on the list have been carefully selected in accordance with guidance on Local Heritage Listing from Historic England. RCT assume that this present list is that produced in 1996, and updated in 2006 by the Rossendale Heritage Network Group, and that it will now be reviewed with further community involvement into a SPD.</p>		

Number of comments ENV03

5

Reference	ENV04	Landscape Character and Quality
-----------	-------	---------------------------------

1201	Stephen Anderson	N/A	Support	<p>I am fully in support of the robust design and heritage policies, whilst recognising the challenges associated with implementing such policies. - - These policies will need to be supported by a robustly implemented validation checklist and other guidance. - - I believe there is also a role for a local design review panel to support the Council's decision making on matters of design and heritage. - - With respect to the proposed Conservation Areas, I am fully in support although hope that this will represent the beginning of review and refinement of existing Conservation Areas, implementation of management plans including potential Article 4 Directions and considering future Conservation Areas, such as Waterfoot. -</p>	On balance, the Draft Local Plan is the best and most well balanced option.
------	------------------	-----	---------	--	---

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV04	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Support	Policy ENV4: Landscape Character and Quality and Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks 2.74 We support the wording of these policies, which is sufficiently flexible and in line with the provisions of the NPPF.		
1775	Tom	Whitehead	16 different groups		Object	<p>Draft Policy ENV4</p> <p>We object in the strongest terms to draft policy ENV4 as presently worded. The policy wording in itself recognises the value of the landscape, and is to be commended. However, the supporting text (which forms a functional role in interpreting the policy) and the illustration at 'Figure 1' are seriously flawed. The decision of the Secretary of State on the Scout Moor extension proposals, clearly demonstrates that a tipping point has been reached where the landscape along the M66 corridor can no-longer accommodate additional turbines. The Julie Martin study referred to dates back to 2014, is out of date, and has been discredited through the Scout Moor call-in process. Indeed, the council's own landscape consultee to that planning application (as recorded in the officer's report to committee) recommended that the landscape impacts of additional turbines would be unacceptable. Given policies elsewhere in the Plan deal with wind turbines, all reference to turbines in Policy ENV4 should be deleted. Figure 1 should not illustrate turbines as this implies they sit comfortably in the landscape; instead they are regarded as alien in the landscape, contrary to all commentary in the GMSF and Natural England guidelines to this very landscape, and we do not accept that they are an established baseline to be recorded.</p> <p>Signed on behalf of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rooley Moor Neighbourhood Forum • Holcombe Society • Bury Rural Inequalities Forum • Ramsbottom Heritage Society • Prickshaw & Broadley Fold Area Community Group • Rossendale Harriers club • Friends of Rooley Moor • Whitworth Residents • Turn Village Residents • Townsend Fold Residents • Affetside Society • Lane Head residents group • Edenfield Village Residents Association • Rochdale & Bury Bridleways Association committee • Rural Rossendale Trust Accommodation Providers • Norden Area Forum 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV04	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV4: Landscape Character and Quality</p> <p>The Council will expect development proposals to conserve and, where possible, enhance the natural and built environment, its immediate and wider environment and take opportunities for improving the distinctive qualities of the area and the way it functions.</p> <p>Development proposals which are in scale and keeping with the landscape character and which are appropriate to its surroundings in terms of siting, design, density, materials, external appearance and landscaping will be supported.</p> <p>In order to protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape, development proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑☑ Respond positively to the visual inter-relationship between the settlements and the surrounding hillsides and follow the contours of the site; ☑☑ Not have an unacceptable impact on skylines and roofscapes; ☑☑ Be built to a density which respects the character of the surrounding area with only low density development likely to be acceptable in areas abutting the Enclosed Upland or Moorland Fringe Landscape Character Areas; ☑☑ Retain existing watercourses, trees and green infrastructure features that make a positive contribution to the character of the area; ☑☑ Incorporate native screen planting as a buffer to soften the edge of the building line in valley side locations; ☑☑ Retain and, where possible, enhance key views; and ☑☑ Retain and restore dry stone walls, vaccary stone flag walls and other boundary treatments which are particularly characteristic of Rossendale. <p>Development proposals should incorporate a high quality of landscape design, implementation and management as an integral part of the new development. Landscaping schemes should provide an appropriate landscape setting for the development and respect the character and distinctiveness of the local landscape.</p> <p>RCT support ENV4 and welcome how the Council has commissioned various consultants to better understand Rossendale’s valuable landscape and to investigate the potential effects of development. The Council together with neighbouring local authorities commissioned Julie Martin Associates to undertake a study⁵ to investigate the potential effects of wind energy development on the character and quality of the landscapes of Rossendale and the wider South Pennines area.</p> <p>More recently, the Council commissioned Penny Bennett Architects to develop this approach into a broader application to all development. This Study recommends that development should not generally take place within enclosed upland or moorland fringe landscape character types, identifies the importance of green infrastructure such as native screen planting and the need for development to retain key views to important landmarks.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV04	Further comment
1790	David	Trivett			Support	<p>Policy ENV4: Landscape Character and Quality.</p> <p>More consideration needs to be given to this policy in future before approval is granted for more wind turbines. Particularly the unacceptable impact on skylines and roofscapes.</p> <p>As the first paragraph in the Explanation of Policy ENV4.</p> <p>Development needs to conserve and enhance Rossendale's dramatic and attractive natural environment and its built environment. The Borough's landscape is significant in terms of its local identity, cultural value, tourism and general contribution to quality of life and it is essential that it is protected.</p> <p>The Council's planning decision to grant permission for the Scout Moor Wind Farm Expansion neither conserved nor enhanced the dramatic and attractive natural environment. Thankfully the Planning Inspector's recommendations and Secretary of State overturned the decision to preserve the landscape for the future.</p> <p>Similarly the Council's decision to grant permission for the erection of the two turbines at Sheephouse Farm Stacksteads was also flawed. Though smaller size turbines they do give the appearance of overspill from the Scout Moor wind farm group into the moorland fringe.</p> <p>Despite rejection by Councillors the skyline above Bacup is now dominated by the large scale turbines at Reaps Moss and Todmorden Moor.</p> <p>No more wind turbines of similar scale should be allowed to pollute "Rossendale's dramatic and attractive natural environment."</p> <p>"To ensure Rossendale's landscape is protected for future generations....."Policy ENV4</p>		

Number of comments ENV04 5

Reference ENV05 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks

469	Jeremy	Sutton	RSPB		Not Applicable	<p>Thank you for the invitation to comment, unfortunately due to other commitments I do not have time to provide detailed feedback.</p> <p>I would though like to point out that the boundary of the West Pennine Moors SSSI is incorrectly shown on the policies Map 2017, (probably due to the timetable for designation), I assume therefore that a revised map will be produced in the near future?</p> <p>https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/SiteDetail.aspx?SiteCode=S2000830&SiteName=Penn&countyCode=&responsiblePerson=&SeaArea=&IFCArea=</p>		
1050	Derek	Keeble	-	Green recreation site to Adalade St to Water St	Object	<p>The piece of recreation land from Water St to Adalade St should be included in the IWS site to the east of Goodshaw Lane as this piece of land is part of the habitat of the deer in the area. a few weeks ago I was watching the deer on this piece of land and can't understand why it is not included in the IWS</p>	No	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV05	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Object	<p>Biodiversity and Trees</p> <p>7.19 Protection of areas of biodiversity and ecological networks in development proposals is required by Policy ENV 5. Policy ENV6 relates to protection, management, 33</p> <p>enhancement and connection of the green infrastructure network. ENV5 continues to require a net gain for biodiversity where adverse impacts are unavoidable and ENV6 requires a net gain of 20% in biodiversity to be replaced off site. The wording here is considered to be overly onerous and provision of net enhancements is not necessary to ensure that development is acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>7.20 Peel therefore requests that the policy is amended to omit the net gain requirements and is re-worded to state that new development should mitigate its adverse impacts on ecology and green infrastructure, with improvements or enhancements sought where possible, such that it is consistent with the approach of the NPPF.</p> <p>7.21 Peel reserves the right to comment on the draft SPD proposed relating to Ecological Networks as it emerges.</p> <p>7.25 Peel questions the absence of any reference to 'geodiversity' (save for in the policy title) within the policy text itself and the absence of guidance within the accompanying Explanation to the policy. We understand 'geodiversity' to encompass the variety of rocks, minerals, fossils, landforms, sediments and soils, together with the natural processes which form and alter them as well as links that these establish with the local population and culture. It is suggested that either 'geodiversity' is removed from the policy title, or the policy text and accompanying Explanation is augmented to provide criteria and guidance relating to geodiversity interests.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV05	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks</p> <p>Development proposals that have potential to affect a national or locally-designated site and it's immediate environs as shown on the Policies Map or protected habitats or species will be expected to be accompanied by relevant surveys and assessments detailing likely impacts, proposals to avoid harm and where possible enhance biodiversity, and where necessary appropriate mitigation and on and off-site compensatory measures to offset the impact of development.</p> <p>Development proposals should protect areas of biodiversity and ecological networks and where possible enhance sites and linkages. Any unavoidable adverse effects should be minimised and mitigated against, and where this cannot be achieved, compensated for with a net gain for biodiversity demonstrated.</p> <p>Key components of Ecological Networks have been identified on the Policies Map. As well as designated ecological areas these include "Greenlands" which are areas of open space including parks, cemeteries and open land many of which were previously included in the Core Strategy. Opportunities to enhance components of the Ecological Network and the linkages between them will be supported with development proposals affecting them expected to identify how this is being addressed. A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will be produced setting out more fully the elements within and the role of Ecological Networks.</p> <p>The design and layout of new development should retain and enhance existing features of biodiversity value within and immediately adjacent to the site. Ecological networks should be conserved, enhanced and expanded. Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how ecological networks are incorporated within the scheme.</p> <p>Where appropriate, development should incorporate habitat features of value to wildlife within the development (including within building design).</p> <p>RCT support ENV5.</p>		
1790	David	Trivett			Not Applicable	<p>Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks.</p> <p>"Rossendale's ecological network comprises areas between sites that although not designated, also need to be protected to allow plants and animals to move between sites."</p> <p>SHLAA16079 - Land off Newchurch Old Road Bacup. HS2.32 Greenfield. Designated Greenlands.</p> <p>Although built to improved, current standards, the above proposed development and other Greenfield developments will still impact Policies ENV5 and ENV6 resulting in a net loss of green infrastructure.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV05	Further comment
1809	Alex	Rowe	Natural England		Not Applicable	<p>Chapter 4: Environment</p> <p>Policy ENV5: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Ecological Networks</p> <p>The protection and enhancement of biodiversity is addressed in Policy ENV5 of the Draft Local Plan. Overall Policy ENV5 sets out a strategy for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity that includes strategic policies to deliver this and promotes a network for future habitat creation and enhancement. The Draft Local Plan Policy ENV5 states:</p> <p>“Development proposals that have potential to affect a national or locally-designated site and it’s immediate environs as shown on the Policies Map or protected habitats or species will be expected to be accompanied by relevant surveys and assessments detailing likely impacts, proposals to avoid harm and where possible enhance biodiversity, and where necessary appropriate mitigation and on and off-site compensatory measures to offset the impact of development.”.</p> <p>In consideration of the above the Policy ENV5 has not fully demonstrated the requirements of the mitigation hierarchy as stated in the NPPF (paragraph:118). Development Management policies should set out criteria to firstly avoid, then mitigate and, as a last resort compensate for adverse impacts on biodiversity, which the Draft Local Plan for Rossendale currently does not clearly demonstrate. More guidance on how to advise on avoidance, mitigation and compensation can be found here: Application of the mitigation hierarchy in local plans.</p> <p>Environment Policy ENV5 needs to clearly set out that any proposal that adversely affects or causes significant harm to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) will not normally be granted permission. With regards to local sites, the Draft Local Plan should set criteria based policies to guide decision on developments impacting upon local sites. Appropriate weight should be given to the importance of local sites and the contribution they make to the wider ecological network. Draft Local Plan Policy ENV5 states:</p> <p>“Development proposals should protect areas of biodiversity and ecological networks and where possible enhance sites and linkages. Any unavoidable adverse effects should be minimised and mitigated against, and where this cannot be achieved, compensated for with a net gain for biodiversity demonstrated.”.</p> <p>The above Draft Local Plan Policy ENV5 includes policy wording that overall seeks to minimise impacts to biodiversity and ecological networks, as well as where possible provide enhancements. For priority species and habitats the Draft Local Plan should promote the protection and recovery of priority species and habitats, which should be linked to national as well as local targets. For further information see: Habitats and species of principal importance in England lists priority species and habitats (i.e. those material to planning).</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV05	Further comment
						<p>Net gain is discussed in the Draft Local Plan Policy ENV5 as an outcome of compensation, which is not consistent with the NPPF. Natural England would like to see additional wording added to this policy that makes it clear that the Draft Local Plan seeks to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. The NPPF (paragraph 9) states: "Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment as well as in people's quality of life, including (but not limited to):... moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature.". It is not clear that there is an aim to achieve a net gain in biodiversity, in the current Draft Local Plan that is inconsistent with the NPPF (paragraph 9). This has not been fully reflected in the current policy wording. Moreover, the NPPF (paragraph 109) also states: "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible..., contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.". In consideration of the above the Draft Local Plan Policy ENV5 does not fully encompass the NPPF's principles for a net gain policy, rather the currently policy only seeks to implement a net gain approach at the compensation stage.</p> <p>We welcome the Ecological Networks that have been identified in the Draft Local Plan Policies Map, as well the designated ecological areas referred to as "Greenlands". The Draft Local Plan Policy ENV5 also states: "Opportunities to enhance components of the Ecological Network and the linkages between them will be supported with development proposals affecting them expected to identify how this is being addressed. A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will be produced setting out more fully the elements within and the role of Ecological Networks."</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the above policy wording in the Draft Local Plan and specifically the opportunities for enhancement, as well as the specific comments relating to Ecological Networks. On this point, we would like to see details of specific habitat types that would be most appropriate for enhancement, placing the emphasis on increase size, quality and quantity of priority habitats within cores areas, corridors or stepping stones that improves connectivity for habitats and movement of species. The SPD that will set out in detail the specific elements and role of Ecological Networks that is welcome and a document that Natural England would like to be consulted upon at the earliest possible stage.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV05	Further comment
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Support	We support the proposed preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document to provide further details on the ecological networks in Rossendale. Given the significance of river corridors and networks in contributing the value of the biodiversity assets in the borough, we look forward to being involved in the preparation of the SPD.		
Number of comments					ENV05	7		
Reference		ENV06		Green Infrastructure				
764	Chris	Aspin	Helmshore Local History Society		Support	<p>I wish to object to the inclusion of land off Free Lane, Helmshore, in the district plan.</p> <p>This is largely occupied by allotment holders; and there is a long waiting list for plots.</p> <p>The council should encourage people to grow their own food and ought to consider making other sites available. The unused bottom part of the huge Helmshore Primary School field ought to be considered. The school was one of the first in Britain to have its own gardens, where fruit, vegetables and flowers were grown. The gardens have been built over and not replaced.</p> <p>The Free Lane site is unsuitable for housing; and villagers are united in thinking that more developments would not be welcome.</p> <p>Email received 23/10/2017: I'm fully behind you, Adrian. I'm against any change of use. The village needs allotments; and I've more than once suggested to our representatives that part of the unused Primary School Field should be made available. Deaf ears, I'm afraid.</p>		
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	Policy ENV6: Green Infrastructure 2.75 We have no general comments to make on this policy, other than that the Grane Road, Haslingden allocation (HS2.78) will ensure that the development effectively integrates with and protects the designated Green Infrastructure to the south of the site, and the open countryside to the west, and providing such linkages has been a key consideration in the masterplanning for the development.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV06	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Object	<p>Biodiversity and Trees</p> <p>7.19 Protection of areas of biodiversity and ecological networks in development proposals is required by Policy ENV 5. Policy ENV6 relates to protection, management, 33</p> <p>enhancement and connection of the green infrastructure network. ENV5 continues to require a net gain for biodiversity where adverse impacts are unavoidable and ENV6 requires a net gain of 20% in biodiversity to be replaced off site. The wording here is considered to be overly onerous and provision of net enhancements is not necessary to ensure that development is acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>7.20 Peel therefore requests that the policy is amended to omit the net gain requirements and is re-worded to state that new development should mitigate its adverse impacts on ecology and green infrastructure, with improvements or enhancements sought where possible, such that it is consistent with the approach of the NPPF.</p> <p>7.21 Peel reserves the right to comment on the draft SPD proposed relating to Ecological Networks as it emerges.</p>		
1771	Mohammed Ali	Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>Policy ENV6 wording could also be strengthened by stating that "Development proposals should support the protection, management, enhancement and connection of the green infrastructure network, as identified on the Policies Map".</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV06	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV6: Green Infrastructure Development proposals will be expected to support the protection, management, enhancement and connection of the green infrastructure network, as identified on the Policies Map. Proposals which enhance the integrity and connectivity of the green infrastructure network will be supported. Development proposals should seek first to avoid or if not feasible, mitigate biodiversity impacts on-site. Schemes which would result in a net loss of green infrastructure on-site will only be permitted if:</p> <p>☐☐The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision elsewhere (achieving an overall net gain of 20% in biodiversity offsite compared to that lost including long-term management proposals); and</p> <p>☐☐The proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on amenity, surface water run-off, nature conservation or the integrity of the green infrastructure network.</p> <p>Where practicable and appropriate, new green infrastructure assets incorporated into development proposals should be designed and located to integrate into the existing green Infrastructure network and should maximise the range of green infrastructure functions and benefits achieved.</p> <p>RCT support ENV6 provided that it is amended to include Greenlands and a commitment to consult with Natural England where the acquisition and creation of Green Infrastructure/Greenland has been grant funded by them, as successor to the Countryside Commission, following their involvement in the creation of Rossendale Groundwork Trust in 1983.</p>		
1790	David	Trivett			Not Applicable	<p>Policy ENV6: Green Infrastructure From Explanation</p> <p>Green Infrastrucure..... “which provide multiple social, economic and environmental benefits, support sustainable development and enhance quality of life.”</p> <p>The Council will apply a mitigation hierarchy tot the loss of green infrastructure. Wherever possible development proposals should avoid damaging the existing assets within the site.</p> <p>This includes protecting Rossendale’s Public Right of Way network..... but also one which is generally in poor state of repair.</p> <p>The above extract applies to all the Public Rights of Way connecting to Bankside Lane.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV06	Further comment
1809	Alex	Rowe	Natural England		Support	<p>Policy ENV6: Green Infrastructure</p> <p>We welcome Draft Local Plan Policy ENV6 that seeks to protect and enhance the green infrastructure network. For clarity and consistency, Natural England recommends that the NPPF definition of Green Infrastructure is referred to and acknowledged in the document to form the basis of discussions regarding policies contained in the Draft Local Plan for Rossendale.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure is defined by the NPPF as “a network of multifunctional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits.” (NPPF page 52).</p> <p>We also refer to the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) (paragraph 027) for further clarity: http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/green-infrastructure/</p> <p>The Natural England definition could also be used to give a wider interpretation of Green Infrastructure that can be found using the following link: http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35033</p>		

Number of comments ENV06

7

Reference ENV07 Environmental Protection

1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Object	<p>Environmental Impacts</p> <p>7.26 Policy ENV7 seeks to prevent adverse environmental impacts as a result of development. Peel is committed to assessing site conditions where sites are promoted for development, and to undertaking technical assessments of the impacts of development, in order to minimise and mitigate any impacts. It is requested that clarification is provided alongside this policy to identify thresholds where Air Quality Assessment is required.</p> <p>7.27 The expectation for electric charging points to be provided on ‘all new housing developments’ should be amended to allow for circumstances where this is not appropriate, practical or viable.</p>		
------	--	--	---------------------------------------	--	--------	--	--	--

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV07	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV7: Environmental Protection Development which has the potential, either individually or cumulatively, to result in pollution that has an unacceptable impact on health, amenity, biodiversity including designated sites, air or water quality will only be permitted if the risk of pollution is effectively prevented or reduced and mitigated to an acceptable level by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑☑ Undertaking assessments and/or detailed site investigations of land which is or may be affected by contamination and implementing appropriate remediation measures to ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use and that there is no unacceptable risk of pollution within the site or in the surrounding area; ☑☑ Ensuring developments are sensitively designed, managed and operated to reduce exposure of sensitive uses and wildlife to noise and noise generation having regard to the location of the proposed development, existing levels of background noise and the hours of operation; ☑☑ Assessing the impacts of new development on surface water and groundwater quality and implementing suitable measures to control the risk of these being adversely affected; ☑☑ Incorporating appropriate measures to prevent light pollution through the design and siting of the development and by controlling the level of illumination, glare, and spillage of light including through the use of developing technologies such as LED; and ☑☑ Undertaking Air Quality Assessments to the satisfaction of the Council for proposals which have the potential to have a significant adverse impact on air quality, particularly within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) shown on the Policies Map, and implementing measures such as Travel Plans, dust suppression techniques and the incorporation of electric car charging points to both mitigate the effects of the development on air quality and to ensure that the users of the development are not significantly adversely affected by the air quality within that AQMA. Provision of electric charging points will be expected on all new housing developments. <p>Development will not be permitted if the risk of pollution cannot be prevented or if mitigation cannot be provided to an appropriate standard with an acceptable design. New development proposals for sensitive uses, such as housing or schools, located near to existing noise, odour or light generating uses will be expected to demonstrate that the proposal is compatible with the surrounding uses and that an acceptable standard of amenity would be provided for the occupiers of the development, for example through the use of mitigation measures to reduce the exposure of the occupants to pollution, the design of the building and its orientation and layout.</p> <p>RCT support ENV7.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV07	Further comment
1805	Lynton	Green			Not Applicable	Thank you for your help. Unfortunately that reference is only to do with making electric vehicle charging a condition around all new HOUSING developments. It says nothing about public or retail car parks. Can I request that this is reconsidered as part of a formal response to the draft local plan. I would be grateful if you could pass this on to the Planning Manager and for the planning manager to acknowledge receipt of my comments.		
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Object	Issue: In relation to the impacts of new development on surface water and groundwater, a successful way of reducing the risk of pollution to the water environment is to ensure that foul drainage discharges to a public sewer unless it can be demonstrated why this is not feasible. Impact: By not requiring new development to connect to the public sewer where feasible, there is a risk that development may seek to use inappropriate methods of foul drainage in publicly sewered areas. Suggested solution: Revise the wording of the policy to include reference to the expectation that foul drainage from new development in publicly sewered areas will be expected to discharge to the public sewer to reduce the risk of pollution to controlled waters. Commentary: Government guidance on non-mains drainage in NPPF paragraphs 109 and 120, and national Planning Practice Guidance (Water supply, wastewater and water quality – considerations for planning applications, paragraph 020) stresses that the first presumption must be to provide a system of foul drainage discharging into a public sewer. Only where having taken into account the cost and / or practicability it can be shown to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that connection to a public sewer is not feasible, should non-mains foul sewage disposal solutions be considered. Making reference to the need to connect foul drainage to the public sewer where practicable will reduce the risk of developers pursuing less-sustainable alternatives.		
Number of comments						ENV07	4	
Reference		ENV08	Wind Turbines Areas of Search					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
600	Scott	Howard	Manchester Airport		Not Applicable	<p>Thank you for consulting and inviting comments from Manchester Airport on the Rossendale Draft Local Plan. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to this consultation and our response is centred around the safeguarding of Manchester Airport. Manchester Airport is a vital component within the UK's infrastructure network, and particularly within the Greater Manchester region, serving as the global gateway for the North of England. Annual passenger throughput is currently around 27 million, with over 70 airlines operating to over 200 destinations worldwide with a wide mix of full service, charter and lowcost operators. Manchester Airport is the 3rd largest passenger airport and the 4th largest cargo airport in the UK and the only airport outside London offering a dense network of scheduled and long-haul flights. The Airport has the potential to support 45 million passengers per annum and the projected growth at Airport City North and World Logistics Hub would ensure that the Manchester Airport economic area is a leading job creation region in the North. It is estimated that the Airport directly supports over 22,000 jobs in total and has an economic footprint in the North West region of £1.7 billion in GVA. Manchester is also an important cargo airport handling over 100,000 tonnes of freight in 2015, supporting a large number of businesses across the region with their exports. We firmly believe that Rossendale is ideally placed to capitalise on this growth and fully realise the economic benefits of these developments.</p> <p>Our comments are in relation to the environmental policies, specifically, Policy EN8: Wind Turbine Areas of Search and Policy EN9: Wind Farms and Individual Turbines, which are set out within Chapter 4 of the Plan.</p> <p>Policy EN8 refers to the individual areas of search for wind turbine development that have been identified on the Policies Map. Although the Airport Company welcomes and encourages the promotion of sustainable energy proposals and fully appreciates the need to identify suitable locations for these, we take a particular interest in the siting of wind turbine developments due to the potential impact they have upon radar and aircraft operations. In particular, we fully support the inclusion of "Air traffic radar reception" as a consideration in the decision-making process within Policy ENV9.</p> <p>Wind turbines can present a danger to aircraft and air traffic control (ATC) systems – they are often large physical obstacles and their rotating blades create electromagnetic disturbance that can present false returns on radar displays, which could be mistaken for or mask genuine aircraft returns causing incorrect information to be received by air traffic controllers. Although any aviation issues would be recognised at planning application stage through consultation with the appropriate aviation consultees (DfT/ODPM Circular</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
						1/2003 details the consultation that would be required with Manchester Airport), it is important to be aware of the need to protect the safe and efficient operation of aircraft and air traffic control (ATC) systems when deciding the final site allocations and development principles for wind energy schemes within the borough. Thank you again for providing Manchester Airport with the opportunity to comment on the draft version of your Local Plan. We hope that our comments have been useful and please don't hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or wish to discuss any of the issues raised in more detail.		
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	The above stated policies included within the Local Plan relate directly to wind power generation within the Borough. Construction of the wind turbines typically requires abnormal loads to use the SRN. Therefore, it is recommended that the construction management plans for such schemes takes into account the potential impact upon the SRN and adopts off-peak travel patterns to minimise any potential disruption upon the network.		
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	Wind Turbines 7.29 Policy ENV8 states that "Wind energy developments would be required to address the detailed requirements of Policy ENV10 on Wind Farms and Individual Turbines". Reference to Policy ENV10 is in error and should read Policy ENV9. 7.30 It also states that "The Written Ministerial Statement on Wind Energy Development (June 2015) indicates that all new Wind Energy development should have the backing of the public, and need to be located in "Areas of Search" shown in the Local Plan". This is not properly reflective of the content of the Written Ministerial Statement, which actually states: "...following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing..." 7.31 This clearly and properly places the onus on RBC to determine in its role as decision-maker whether "...impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed...". We therefore suggest that this part of the Explanation is re-written accordingly.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
1772	Peter	Wood			Object	<p>Representation on the Rossendale Local Plan with regard to Wind Turbines. The Rossendale Borough Council covers a large area of the Rossendale Valley. The purpose of this representation is to show the devastating effect on the vistas enjoyed by local people and visitors to the area and the setting of heritage assets and that no further turbines can be accommodated in the Rossendale Valley and surrounding areas.</p> <p>This representation is by no means complete and there are an incalculable number of vistas and heritage assets which have not been included. In less than eight short years the Rossendale Valley has gone from having no wind farms to seeing the construction of Scout Moor Wind Farm, Haslingden Moor Wind Farm (now with planning permission for additional four turbines), Crook Hill Wind Farm, Reaps Moss Wind Farm, Todmorden Moor, Crown Point Wind Farm, Hameldon Hill Wind Farm, Cliviger Wind Farm, Four smaller turbines near Deer Play plus a large number of singletons dotted haphazardly around the valley.</p> <p>The Rossendale Valley was given the name of 'The Golden Valley' during the Industrial Revolution. My photographic website the-golden-valley.uk is my humble attempt to capture and communicate the beauty of 'The Valley'. In terms of the long history of the valley, almost overnight the numbers of turbines have gone way beyond saturation and the landscape and its character cannot accommodate anymore turbines.</p> <p>The photographs in this presentation are all stills with no movement. What they do not capture and communicate is the effect of turbines known as 'flicker'. For myself, when I walk up to the moors, the continuous movement of the turbines attracts my eye, it is unrestful, distracting and makes me feel unwell. I find now when I walk up the moors I have to look in a different direction to how I am walking due to the turbines flicker, or look down at the ground, removing my natural experience of the moors which I had always enjoyed since early childhood, walking the very paths my ancestors have walked and sharing in their experiences.</p> <p>For myself and many other locals, the moors are our place of solitude, our place for quiet contemplation, rest and relaxation. We love the views and dramatic landscape and are very proud of our native valley. To see it being ruined by all these turbines is causing great suffering and depression. Please see appendix for photos.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
1775	Tom	Whitehead	16 different groups		Object	<p>We object to this policy in the strongest terms.</p> <p>The policy and supporting text talk in positive terms about areas 'being suitable' for turbine development. One thing that is clear from the appeal and call-in decisions referred to earlier in this representation is that the appropriateness or otherwise of turbine development within a landscape is a hugely complex matter; a pro-turbine policy such of ENV8 fails to recognise this complexity.</p> <p>The draft supporting text refers to the June 2015 Written Ministerial Statement, and recognises the importance of local opinion emphasised in that WMS. The Scout Moor public inquiry heard that 97% of respondents to that application were against the proposal. This reflects the sentiment of the local community when the existing Scout Moor development was consented a decade ago (at that time Rossendale refused the planning application). Turbines are not welcome in this landscape, and the community does not wish to see additional turbine development.</p> <p>The draft policy again refers to the Julie Martin study, which dates back to 2014; we'd restate that that document is out of date, and has been discredited through the Scout Moor call-in process. Indeed, the council's own landscape consultee to the planning application (as recorded in the officer's report to committee) recommended that the landscape impacts of additional turbines would be unacceptable.</p> <p>There is no need for a 'wind turbine area of search'; it is not a requirement on the LPA.</p> <p>Policy ENV8 should be deleted, and the tests set out in draft policy ENV9 instead relied upon (subject to our further comments to that policy).</p> <p>Signed on behalf of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rooley Moor Neighbourhood Forum • Holcombe Society • Bury Rural Inequalities Forum • Ramsbottom Heritage Society • Prickshaw & Broadley Fold Area Community Group • Rossendale Harriers club • Friends of Rooley Moor • Whitworth Residents • Turn Village Residents • Townsend Fold Residents • Affetside Society • Lane Head residents group • Edenfield Village Residents Association • Rochdale & Bury Bridleways Association committee • Rural Rossendale Trust Accommodation Providers • Norden Area Forum 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Object	<p>Policy ENV8: Wind Turbine Areas of Search</p> <p>Areas of Search for Wind Turbines have been identified on the Policies Map. Single, and exceptionally, small groups of Turbines of up to 59m may be suitable in the “Enclosed Uplands Wind Turbine Area of Search” shown on the Policies Map. Larger turbines of up to 125m may be considered on the “High Moorland Plateau Wind Turbine Area of Search” shown on the Policies Map. Development of new wind turbines would not be supported outside these areas.</p> <p>All areas of the Borough are considered to be potentially suitable for single turbines of up to 25m in height.</p> <p>A. RCT objects to ENV8, and in particular to the Areas of Search as shown on the Policies Map, and note evidence base is: The Landscape Capacity Study for Wind Energy Developments in the South Pennines by Julie Martin Associates (JMA2010), its map for Rossendale should be added or linked to the Policy Map and should be brought, up to date, to now include, as well as the present Scout Moor and other Wind Turbines, those that were refused A, and those that were approved B, by the Secretary of State’s decisions in 2017 on Scout Moor:-</p> <p>A. the proposed turbines sited near to the edge of the moor would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape character and visual amenity.would result in significant adverse visual effects and would harm the appearance of the area for local receptors to the north and west of Scout Moor.</p> <p>B. the proposal would be largely contained within the footprint of the existing wind farm and would have a negligible effect on the local landscape..... would integrate well with the existing wind farm and would have a localised visual effect of minor significance.</p> <p>It should also locate important open view areas, such as to west of Burnley Road, Loveclough, that have been included in Local Plans and supported at Planning Appeals.</p> <p>B. RCT object to no provision in ENV 8 to secure compatibility with developing Local Plans and Spatial Frameworks of adjoining areas: how larger turbines are visible for the greatest distance; RCT note:-</p> <p>October 2016 First Draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework, in its 242 pages, is silent on renewable and other energy sources: solar, shale, nuclear, wind, hydro, biomass, or even district heating in GM15 Carbon Emissions. A Second Draft is expected in 2018.</p> <p>GMSF’s 2015 Background Infrastructure and Environment section on Carbon Emissions: 16.5 In the case of wind turbines, national planning guidance directs that “a planning application should not be approved unless the proposed development site is an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Wind energy development</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
						<p>will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines or similar will not be sufficient". The question for the GMSF is therefore (a) is there sufficient potential for renewable energy generation in Greater Manchester (b) should this be within the scope of the GMSF and (c) is the available evidence sufficient?</p> <p>GMSF's Background Paper Greater Manchester Spatial Energy Plan 2016 Evidence Base Study: While technical potential can be identified there are considerable challenges in getting new onshore wind projects through the planning system which is likely to be constrained by the current policy position (DCLG, 2015)** A recent series of studies carried out for GM (JBA Consulting, 2014) identified a number of potential sites for wind turbines across 6 of the districts in GM.....Across the 6 districts a total of 60MW of potential wind resource has been identified (JBA Consulting, 2014). Using the output factor from existing wind in the GM area this could provide 141GWh per year. This is 1.1 % of the total 2015 electricity consumption in GM. There are large wind sites within Greater Manchester (Scout Moor), but the electricity and carbon savings are not attributed to GM but to neighbouring counties.</p> <p>C. RCT notes from **Written Ministerial Statement on Wind Energy Development (June 2015): In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
1785	Chris	Woods			Object	<p>I am writing in response to your Draft Local Plan Consultation. First I would like to congratulate you on the wide ranging, careful and detailed analysis in the Plan.</p> <p>I would like to confine my response to Chapter 4: Environment and in particular the moorland landscape and wind turbines.</p> <p>In the Draft Plan at Policy ENV1 you mention the need for landscaping as an integral part of the development, protecting existing landscape features and natural assets, habitat creation, providing open space, appropriate boundary treatments and enhancing the public realm. You also mention that is important that proposals do not increase the risk of flooding on the site or elsewhere, and have regard to the surface water drainage hierarchy.</p> <p>At Policy ENV2 the Plan states that applications affecting a Heritage Asset or its setting will be granted where they sustain, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of the heritage asset itself and the surrounding historic environment. Then again at Policy ENV3 proposals which would result in the total or partial loss of a locally listed heritage asset, and which require planning permission, will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the harm. Then again at Policy ENV3, development proposals which would result in the total or partial loss of a locally listed heritage asset, and which require planning permission, will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the harm.</p> <p>At Policy ENV4 the Plan states The Council will expect development proposals to conserve and, where possible, enhance the natural and built environment, its immediate and wider environment and take opportunities for improving the distinctive qualities of the area and the way it functions and not to have an unacceptable impact on skylines and roofscapes.</p> <p>At Policy ENV5 the Plan makes clear that Rossendale contains a diverse range of national, county level and locally designated sites which need to be protected and enhanced. Then again at Policy ENV6 the need for green infrastructure is mentioned and its important role in providing habitats and migratory routes for many plants and animals, and reducing flood risk through initiatives such as Natural Flood Management.</p> <p>At Policy ENV8 with respect to wind turbine development there are large areas of the Borough including Enclosed Uplands and the High Moorland Plateau where large scale wind turbine development might be allowed to take place. Mention is made of the considerable amount of wind energy development that has taken place in Rossendale in recent years. In parts of the Borough there has been cumulative visual impact, including with adjacent schemes outside Rossendale. Different heights and designs of turbine can have discordant visual effects. Other impacts include that of noise, shadow flicker and effects on hydrology. The Written Ministerial Statement on Wind</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
						<p>Energy Development (June 2015) indicates that all new Wind Energy development should have the backing of the public.</p> <p>At Policy ENV9 proposals for wind farms and individual turbines within Areas of Search shown on the Policies Map will be supported provided that:</p> <p>The scale, height and siting of the turbine(s) and all supporting information is appropriate to the area taking into account of a large list of criteria including; the topography and openness of the landscape, visual clutter, effect on land marks and land scape, on amenity, heritage assets and their setting, noise and amplitude modulation, peat and hydrogeology, recreational assets, the de-commissioning and removal of the turbines and the restoration of the site.</p> <p>The Framework and national guidance on renewable energy highlights the importance of increasing the amount of energy from renewable technologies to help make sure the UK has a secure energy supply, reduce gas emissions to slow down climate change and stimulate investment in new jobs and businesses.</p> <p>In summary, The Draft Plan emphasises the need to protect the existing landscape and Natural and Heritage Assets, to conserve and enhance the natural environment. to prevent developments that have an unacceptable impact on skylines and to do nothing that increases the flood risk.</p> <p>There are large areas of the Borough including Enclosed Uplands and the High Moorland Plateau where large scale wind turbine development might take place. Many criteria are included which have to be met before turbine development is permitted. I believe there should be no Areas of Search for wind farm development on the Rossendale Moors</p> <p>The recent Public Inquiry involving the Scout Moor Windfarm Extension addressed most of the issues discussed above and it was found that wind turbine development particularly on the moorland uplands was not compatible with those issues. Wind turbine development has an unacceptable effect on our precious landscape, the enjoyment of that amenity, natural heritage assets such as Waugh's Well and the Cotton Famine Road, peat, and hydrogeology.</p> <p>I may be mistaken but neither Waugh's Well nor the Cotton Famine Road are listed as heritage assets. Both are of local, county and National importance and should be in the Draft Plan as important heritage assets. Both would be adversely affected by wind turbine development as was demonstrated at the Scout Moor Inquiry.</p> <p>Much of Rossendale moorland is now a Site of Special Scientific Interest and is therefore protected from development as such.</p> <p>Renewable Energy is clearly important to mitigate Climate Change but with respect to wind energy the accent now is now very much on off-shore wind. The unreliability of on-shore wind makes it a terribly inefficient form of energy production. Another important advantage of off-shore wind is that there is no disruption of the blanket bog and peat of the moorlands which are essential</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-------	-----------------

for natural carbon capture and flood prevention. It is likely that the huge quantities of concrete that go into the turbine bases together with the interlinking roads mean that the moorland cannot soak up excess rain or prevent its run-off. It is likely that the recent severe flooding in Rochdale and Ramsbottom was exacerbated by the Scout Moor Wind Farm.

Perhaps the most telling point from the Scout Moor Inquiry was that the local community did not want any more wind turbines. The Written Ministerial Statement on Wind Energy Development (June 2015) states that all new Wind Energy development should have the backing of the public.

For all of the above reasons I do not believe wind turbine development is appropriate on the precious moorland within the Rossendale Borough and should not be included in the Plan. The area has done its bit for on-shore wind development. It is time to call a halt.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
1790	David	Trivett			Object	<p>Policy ENV8: Wind Turbine Areas of Search.</p> <p>“Areas of Search for Wind Turbines have been identified on the Policies Map. Single and exceptionally, small groups of Turbines of up to 59m may be suitable in the “Enclosed Uplands Wind Turbine Area of Search” shown on the Policies Map. Larger turbines of up to 125m may be considered on the “High Moorland Plateau Wind Turbine Area of Search” shown on the Policies Map. Development of new wind turbines would not be supported outside these areas.</p> <p>All areas of the Borough are considered to be potentially suitable for single turbines of up to 25m in height.</p> <p>The areas of search for Wind Turbines identified on the Policies Map should now be redrawn following the Secretary of State’s decision on 06/07/17 to refuse permission for the Scout Moor Wind Farm Expansion plan within the Rossendale Borough Council Boundary on the grounds of “the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area”</p> <p>Extract from the Secretary of State’s final decision letter of 06/07/17</p> <p>17.Application A: The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector’s analysis and conclusions at IR351-372 and IR376-377. He agrees with the Inspector that the proposal includes an area that is a valued landscape because of its openness, tranquillity and attractive views into the lower valleys. He notes that the proposal would extend the footprint of the existing wind farm and would introduce prominent views of turbines where none currently exist of the existing Scout Moor Farm. He considers that the proposed layout would not integrate well with the existing turbines. Overall, he agrees with the Inspector that the proposed turbines sited near to the edge of the moor would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape character and visual amenity</p> <p>The Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector’s that the proposed turbines sited near to the edge of the moor would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape character and visual amenity.</p> <p>The boundary line of the “High Moorland Plateau Wind Turbine Area of Search” should be redrawn, omitting the area earmarked for Scout Moor Expansion Wind Turbine development, to avoid any potential future conflict with the Secretary of State’s final decision on the proposal.</p> <p>The High Moorland Plateau Wind Turbine Area of Search boundary line should also be modified to remove the area included for the proposed 12 turbine wind farm application submitted by Coronation Power for Rooley Moor to avoid any future applications for other wind farms or a small group of turbines in the same area.</p> <p>The Reaps Moss and Todmorden Moor turbines are referred to as small groups!</p> <p>Small in number; but enormous, overbearing structures on the skyline above</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
						<p>Bacup.</p> <p>Similar consideration should also be given to the boundary transitions from the High Moorland Plateau to The Enclosed Uplands area of search with full attention given to avoiding more impact on landscape character and visual amenity from other viewpoints; both within Rossendale and from surrounding areas.</p> <p>I appreciate the last line of paragraph 5 page 66 “.....but not along the Heald Moor ridge.”</p> <p>This statement is in line with the recommendations contained in Julie Martin Associates January 2013 report to Calderdale Borough Council for the proposed Gorpley Wind Farm – Assessment of Landscape and Visual Impacts. However Rossendale Borough Council should not regard any future wind farm applications as a potential revenue stream.</p> <p>Great care should be taken in future to avoid the cumulative impacts of more wind turbines on;</p> <p>“our stunning hills and beautiful countryside are a major part of the quality of life for the people in our valley. If you force us to go ahead with these plans it will change the face of the valley forever”</p> <p>Extract from Councillor Alyson Barnes letter to David Cameron – Keep Rossendale Valley Green 03/03/16</p> <p>125m high wind turbines on the moors in the Borough have changed the valley.</p> <p>I also appreciate paragraph 1 page 69 of the Draft if “addressed” means dealt with correctly.</p> <p>“.....Community concerns need to particularly taken into account and addressed.</p> <p>Following the Public Inquiry in October 2016 the Council must now be fully aware there is considerable resistance to the erection of more wind turbines on the hills in the Borough.</p> <p>“To ensure Rossendale’s landscape is protected for future generations.....”</p> <p>Policy ENV4.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV08	Further comment
1809	Alex	Rowe	Natural England		Not Applicable	<p>Policy ENV8: Wind Turbine Areas of Search</p> <p>Natural England has reviewed the Wind Turbine Areas of Search (Policy ENV8) identified in the Draft Local Plan and recommends that areas containing deep peat are avoided. Natural England generally regards deep peat as peat of 40cm or deeper. The above point specifically relates to peaty soils not priority habitats.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan needs to address priority habitats, such as Blanket Bog. For priority habitats the NPPF paragraphs 117 and 118 that applies the mitigation hierarchy of avoidance, mitigation or as a last resort compensation is applicable in this context. No blanket bog should be included in the wind farm area of search because removing and relocating deep peat will invariably present significant habitat degradation and potential carbon release. All deep peat (40cm or deeper) is understood by Natural England to be Blanket Bog. We recommend that all Blanket Bog should be removed from the Area of Search. As there may be deep peat in the Area of Search that is currently not mapped as Blanket Bog we recommend that further investigation is carried out into the Wind Turbine Areas of Search (Policy ENV8) to determine the areas of deep peat and priority habitats for this area.</p> <p>To help provide guidance on the siting we refer your authority to the following report: Assessing Impacts of Wind Farm Development on Blanket Peatland in England Project Report and Guidance (2009) by Maslen Environmental (please see Annex 1 for further information).</p>		
Number of comments					ENV08	9		
Reference		ENV09	Wind Farms and Individual Turbines					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV09	Further comment
600	Scott	Howard	Manchester Airport		Support	<p>Thank you for consulting and inviting comments from Manchester Airport on the Rossendale Draft Local Plan. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to this consultation and our response is centred around the safeguarding of Manchester Airport. Manchester Airport is a vital component within the UK's infrastructure network, and particularly within the Greater Manchester region, serving as the global gateway for the North of England. Annual passenger throughput is currently around 27 million, with over 70 airlines operating to over 200 destinations worldwide with a wide mix of full service, charter and lowcost operators. Manchester Airport is the 3rd largest passenger airport and the 4th largest cargo airport in the UK and the only airport outside London offering a dense network of scheduled and long-haul flights. The Airport has the potential to support 45 million passengers per annum and the projected growth at Airport City North and World Logistics Hub would ensure that the Manchester Airport economic area is a leading job creation region in the North. It is estimated that the Airport directly supports over 22,000 jobs in total and has an economic footprint in the North West region of £1.7 billion in GVA. Manchester is also an important cargo airport handling over 100,000 tonnes of freight in 2015, supporting a large number of businesses across the region with their exports. We firmly believe that Rossendale is ideally placed to capitalise on this growth and fully realise the economic benefits of these developments.</p> <p>Our comments are in relation to the environmental policies, specifically, Policy EN8: Wind Turbine Areas of Search and Policy EN9: Wind Farms and Individual Turbines, which are set out within Chapter 4 of the Plan.</p> <p>Policy EN8 refers to the individual areas of search for wind turbine development that have been identified on the Policies Map. Although the Airport Company welcomes and encourages the promotion of sustainable energy proposals and fully appreciates the need to identify suitable locations for these, we take a particular interest in the siting of wind turbine developments due to the potential impact they have upon radar and aircraft operations. In particular, we fully support the inclusion of "Air traffic radar reception" as a consideration in the decision-making process within Policy ENV9.</p> <p>Wind turbines can present a danger to aircraft and air traffic control (ATC) systems – they are often large physical obstacles and their rotating blades create electromagnetic disturbance that can present false returns on radar displays, which could be mistaken for or mask genuine aircraft returns causing incorrect information to be received by air traffic controllers. Although any aviation issues would be recognised at planning application stage through consultation with the appropriate aviation consultees (DfT/ODPM Circular</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV09	Further comment
						1/2003 details the consultation that would be required with Manchester Airport), it is important to be aware of the need to protect the safe and efficient operation of aircraft and air traffic control (ATC) systems when deciding the final site allocations and development principles for wind energy schemes within the borough. Thank you again for providing Manchester Airport with the opportunity to comment on the draft version of your Local Plan. We hope that our comments have been useful and please don't hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or wish to discuss any of the issues raised in more detail.		
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England		Not Applicable	Policy ENV9 Wind Farms and Individual Turbines Proposals should be assessed on whether they may harm heritage assets and their setting and this cannot be determined by the proximity to the asset as stated in the Policy. Heritage assets can be harmed by development that is not within a prescribed distance and this needs to be assessed individually in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and the Plan's Policies. The policy should be amended to ensure that it deals with all levels of harm and not just significant harm – e.g. refer to unacceptable harm.		
1520	Alan	Heyworth			Object	The conditions listed under this heading (ENV9) clearly exclude any further wind farm development in the borough. There are no sites which would not result in unacceptable intrusion on the skyline. Protection of the skyline was, for many years, a main concern of the Council. Unfortunately, turbines which contravene these conditions have already been installed. - The Inspector's report on the Rooley Moor appeal Inquiry gives explicit reasons as to why no further proposals should be entertained. It will also make it much less likely that the council will be influenced by the fear of large penalties in the case of successful appeals. - Any proposals for a wind farm in Rossendale should have to provide a detailed explanation as to why it should be permitted here but would not be entertained in other parts of the country with no greater landscape value. What is it about Rossendale that apparently makes it an easier target? - The characteristic topography and skyline of Rossendale make it particularly susceptible to unacceptable damage to the landscape by large-scale turbines.	-	
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	The above stated policies included within the Local Plan relate directly to wind power generation within the Borough. Construction of the wind turbines typically requires abnormal loads to use the SRN. Therefore, it is recommended that the construction management plans for such schemes takes into account the potential impact upon the SRN and adopts off-peak travel patterns to minimise any potential disruption upon the network.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV09	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>7.32 In relation to the specific requirements identified in Policy ENV9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The criterion stating "...The perceived vertical height and horizontal expanse of the topography..." should be amended to include reference to "actual" height, as it is important that judgements are made with reference to facts. • The criterion stating "Shadow and Reflective Flicker impacts on buildings and Public Rights of Way are fully assessed with a precautionary approach taken to mitigation" should be amended to exclude reference to PROWs. It is not possible to predict when a public right of way will be used and to what intensity. Moreover, use of such rights of way is transitory in nature and thus the impact – if any – will be short-lived as people move through the area. This is in contrast to buildings where occupation can be predicted and effects will not be transitory. Government and industry guidance is clear that shadow flicker is an issue for buildings, not open landscapes (see Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 5-020-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014 of the online Planning Practice Guidance). In this respect, the policy criterion is not consistent with Government and industry guidance. • The criterion stating "...The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the setting of a settlement..." should be deleted. Settlements do not have any statutory protection. The key issue is instead resident amenity, which is addressed by other criteria. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV09	Further comment
1775	Tom	Whitehead	16 different groups		Object	<p>We object to this policy in the strongest terms.</p> <p>The starting presumption is that turbines 'will be supported'. Given the recent decisions cited above, this should not be the starting position of the LPA.</p> <p>The draft policy again refers to the Julie Martin study, which dates back to 2014; we'd restate that that document is out of date, and has been discredited through the Scout Moor call-in process. Indeed, the council's own landscape consultee to the planning application (as recorded in the officer's report to committee) recommended that the landscape impacts of additional turbines would be unacceptable.</p> <p>There should instead be a presumption against turbines, and any proposal for turbines should be assessed in accordance with the tests set. Reference to the Julie Martin study should be removed.</p> <p>Signed on behalf of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rooley Moor Neighbourhood Forum • Holcombe Society • Bury Rural Inequalities Forum • Ramsbottom Heritage Society • Prickshaw & Broadley Fold Area Community Group • Rossendale Harriers club • Friends of Rooley Moor • Whitworth Residents • Turn Village Residents • Townsend Fold Residents • Affetside Society • Lane Head residents group • Edenfield Village Residents Association • Rochdale & Bury Bridleways Association committee • Rural Rossendale Trust Accommodation Providers • Norden Area Forum 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV09	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Object	<p>Policy ENV9: Wind Farms and Individual Turbines</p> <p>Proposals for wind farms and individual turbines within Areas of Search shown on the Policies Map will be supported provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐☐The scale, height and siting of the turbine(s) and all supporting information is appropriate to the area taking into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The perceived vertical height and horizontal expanse of the topography; o The degree of openness of the landscape; o The scale of adjacent landscape features, buildings and walls; o The proximity to designated and non-designated built heritage assets; o The proximity to distinctive landforms, such as a ridgeline, knoll or rock outcrop, which makes a key contribution to local landscape character; o The presence of existing settlement or field patterns; and o The opportunities to screen or reduce the visual impact of the development; ☐☐It would not result in the loss of, or significantly detract from, key views of scenic landmarks or landscape features; ☐☐The design, colour, layout and arrangement of turbines are appropriate to their setting; ☐☐The proposal would not result in unacceptable visual clutter in combination with other existing structures with cumulative impacts fully assessed to the satisfaction of the Council; ☐☐There would be no unacceptable harm to neighbour amenity, protected species or the use of public rights of way or bridleways or a severe impact on highway safety; ☐☐Shadow and Reflective Flicker impacts on buildings and Public Rights of Way are fully assessed with a precautionary approach taken to mitigation; ☐☐The scheme would not result in unacceptable noise impacts, including amplitude modulation, on residential properties and other sensitive users; ☐☐The impact on geology, including former mine workings, peat and hydrogeology is fully appraised and issues identified addressed including restoration plans as appropriate; ☐☐Impacts on designated species and ecological assets are avoided or minimised; ☐☐The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the setting of a settlement; ☐☐The proposal does not cause significant harm to any designated heritage assets and their setting; ☐☐The impact on recreational assets is assessed and impacts on key routes such as the Pennine Bridleway and Rossendale Way are avoided or if this is not possible, mitigated; ☐☐The scale, siting and design of any ancillary structures and access tracks are appropriate to the character of the area and the landscape setting; ☐☐The submission contains a Construction Management Plan and proposals 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV09	Further comment
						<p>for managing the de-commissioning and removal of the turbines and the restoration of the site;</p> <p>Any landscape features removed or altered to enable the erection of the turbine are reinstated and the design, materials and scale of any new fencing or walling needed</p> <p>is appropriate to the character of the local area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Issues with respect to the following are appropriately addressed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority: Shadow and reflective flicker o TV and phone reception o Air traffic radar reception; and <p>A de-commissioning scheme is included.</p> <p>Applicants will be expected to take into account the latest Good Practice guidance produced by or on behalf of the Council on assessing the Landscape Impacts of Wind Turbines.</p> <p>RCT while welcoming these safeguards in ENV9, objects to a presumption to support individual turbines without taking account of their “cumulative” affects: the impact of a large number of single turbines over a wide area could be far worse than a small group. Overall, there is a need to acknowledge that by appearing to be accommodating of turbines, Rossendale Borough Council is opening itself up to more possible Appeals and Inquiries which are time, energy and financially draining. The Council should, in its policy, make clear that applications for ALL turbines MUST go through a public assessment process and that notice will be taken of the results of that process. Recent experience should inform this policy.</p>		

Number of comments ENV09

7

Reference	ENV10	Other Forms of Renewable Energy Generation						
731	Emily Hrycan	Historic England	Not Applicable	ENV10 Other Forms of Renewable Energy	The explanation text accompanying the policy does not refer to all types of heritage assets and should be amended.			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV10	Further comment
1774	Melanie	Lindsey	The Coal Authority		Not Applicable	Representation No.2 Policy ENV10 Explanation Test of Soundness Positively Prepared: No Justified: Yes Effective: No Consistency to NPPF: No Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Coopeate: Yes Comment – The Coal Authority is pleased to see that the supporting text to this policy makes reference to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. However, we would have hoped to see more explicate reference in respect of the requirements for consultation and consideration of mineral safeguarding and mineral consultation areas included somewhere in the plan. We are also disappointed that there is no identification of mineral safeguarding areas on the Policies Map. It is requested that consideration be given to additional signposting within the plan in respect of minerals safeguarding and consultation and additional text provided to clarify for the plan user how the two plans works together.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV10	Further comment
1775	Tom	Whitehead	16 different groups		Object	<p>Draft Policy ENV10</p> <p>We object to this policy.</p> <p>Whilst renewable energy may be appropriate on a very small-scale (single dwelling), the LPA should adequately prepare for applications for ‘solar farms’ (or other large scale renewable energy development): large-scale solar development would have a considerable adverse impact on the landscape, and any policy should set out the tests to be met within the policy itself (not in the explanation) in order to give the tests the status; this is the approach the LPA has already taken with draft policy ENV9.</p> <p>Tests should be added to the body of the policy, to ensure that the adverse impacts of such development are properly considered, and additional tests considered (such as those in draft ENV9).</p> <p>Signed on behalf of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rooley Moor Neighbourhood Forum • Holcombe Society • Bury Rural Inequalities Forum • Ramsbottom Heritage Society • Prickshaw & Broadley Fold Area Community Group • Rossendale Harriers club • Friends of Rooley Moor • Whitworth Residents • Turn Village Residents • Townsend Fold Residents • Affetside Society • Lane Head residents group • Edenfield Village Residents Association • Rochdale & Bury Bridleways Association committee • Rural Rossendale Trust Accommodation Providers • Norden Area Forum 		
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV10: Other forms of Renewable Energy generation</p> <p>The Council will take a positive approach to renewable energy proposals in the Borough including solar and hydro-electric schemes subject to the Authority being satisfied that any negative impacts, including of any supporting infrastructure, can be minimised.</p> <p>RCT support ENV10.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV10	Further comment
1790	David	Trivett			Not Applicable	<p>Policy ENV10: Other forms of Renewable Energy Generation</p> <p>It is good to see the Council are considering the energy mix for the future. The anticipated growth in demand for electricity to power the growing number of electric vehicles needs to be based on a stable supply platform.</p> <p>Wind turbines contribute but the industry has recently conceded the numbers given for reduction in CO2 have been inaccurate. Future supply stability needs a flexible approach to generation and energy storage. This mix to exclude coal but will include; Nuclear (Internationally contentious) Wind (on and offshore) with the balance for me leaning toward offshore. Gas, Solar, Biomass, Hydro, Energy from Waste. Fracking (contentious)</p> <p>Good to see the Borough Council is already using solar panels and more are appearing locally on industrial and domestic roofing. I think all new houses should be constructed with solar heating of some description.</p> <p>Gas will be necessary for some time to come and is an efficient way of generating electricity quickly as load demand fluctuates.</p> <p>Small scale Hydro Electric schemes will be a useful contribution in the future. A line of small scale turbines in the Irwell and other rivers would be a clean and sustainable generation source. There is an opportunity close to the Council offices at Futures Park where the Irwell passes under the road bridge. A deep channel with one or two turbines in place could form the basis of a generating station owned and operated by the Borough.</p> <p>With the numerous redundant quarries in the Borough there is an opportunity to create a pumped storage supply network which could help mitigate the flood risk. The large 2.7million gallon capacity storm water attenuation tank facility installed by United Utilities in Stacksteads in 2013 to reduce pollution to the river Irwell being an example of the type of structure which when connected to a moorland top quarry lake, or reservoir could be used for a pumped storage generating station. The Deerplay Mine Water Treatment facility, though used to clean the pumped mine water which polluted the Irwell, is another example of easily constructed water storage pounds which could be used as for pumped storage electricity generation. The Borough and or Lancashire could be self sufficient with electricity generation using a network of similar stations using the local hills and rivers.</p> <p>The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Greg Clark launched the Faraday Challenge on 24/07/17 with £246 million investment in battery technology. There are opportunities here for the future also to maintain stability of electricity supply and power vehicles. The UK has hundreds of tons of radioactive, nuclear waste in storage ponds. Scientists have already demonstrated that this material has the potential to store considerable amounts of electrically generated power.</p> <p>Hydraulic fracturing for gas should be allowed to proceed with the safeguards noted in the Draft in place.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV10	Further comment
						<p>It has already been used in the offshore wells around the UK to fully exploit reserves and is already a proven technology. Liquid natural gas, extracted using this method, is being imported from the US. We should be using our available resources efficiently to ensure continuity of strategic supply avoiding the possibility of the taps being turned off elsewhere.</p> <p>Biomass already implemented is good news and should be developed further. An Energy from waste station could be located within a large scale, redundant quarry which would be better than filling it with domestic waste. The roadways already set up for the transportation of extracted stone could enable the plant construction and waste delivery vehicles. Connection to the National Grid infrastructure would also be straightforward using the same route.</p> <p>Methane extraction boreholes into the coal seams of the redundant mines in the Borough?</p> <p>Natural Gas extraction may not be considered sustainable development but it is naturally occurring, strategic, resource that should be exploited while the country makes the transition to its clean energy goals.</p>		
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Object	<p>Issue: The Environment Agency would have a regulatory role in relation to hydropower schemes, but this is not referenced in the policy or supporting statement.</p> <p>Impact: Those proposing hydropower schemes through the planning system may not be aware of the need to ensure that their scheme will also have to comply with several Environment Agency regulatory regimes.</p> <p>Solution: Revise the policy or supporting statement to make it clear that hydropower schemes will also need to comply with legislation governed by the Environment Agency. Developers should be advised to speak to the Environment Agency before submitting any planning application for a hydropower scheme.</p> <p>Commentary:</p> <p>To ensure that any hydropower schemes that emerge are compliant in relation to both planning and permitting regimes, it is strongly recommended that developers speak with the Environment Agency to discuss their proposals at an early stage.</p>		
Number of comments		ENV10				6		
Reference		ENV11		Surface Water Run-Off, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV11	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	7.28 Policy ENV 11 sets out various requirements in relation to flood risk, drainage and water management. It is considered that in general terms the policy is broadly appropriate. However, it is noted that the requirement for applications for minor schemes to demonstrate that SuDS solutions have been considered is not consistent with the requirements of the Framework and the related ministerial statement. It is requested that the policy be amended accordingly so that demonstration of SuDS solutions considered is only required for major development (over 10 dwellings).		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV11	Further comment
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities		Support	<p>Policy ENV11: Surface Water Run-Off, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality:</p> <p>United Utilities fully supports this policy which seeks to maximise the use of permeable surfaces/areas of soft landscaping, and the use of Green Infrastructure as potential sources of storage for surface water run-off. We are pleased to see that the policy states that development should not increase on-site or off-site surface water run-off rates and, where practicable, should seek to reduce surface water run-off; and that the policy expects all proposals for major development (and minor development where appropriate) to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). However, we would wish to see the following inserted to supplement the wording in ENV11:</p> <p>“Surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An adequate soakaway or some other form of infiltration system. 2. An attenuated discharge to watercourse. 3. An attenuated discharge to public surface water sewer or highway drain. 4. An attenuated discharge to public combined sewer. “ <p>United Utilities fully supports the use of appropriate conditions and/or legal agreement(s) to secure the implementation of SuDS and associated management and maintenance measures.</p> <p>We also support the inclusion within the policy of the requirement for developments to be served by separate surface water and foul wastewater drainage, and that development proposals which discharge surface water runoff to foul drainage connections or combined sewers will only be supported where there is no alternative available and the proposal would not exacerbate the risk of flooding or have a harmful impact on water quality.</p> <p>United Utilities recommends that the following be inserted into Policy ENV11: “The treatment and processing of surface water is not a sustainable solution. Surface water should be managed at source and not transferred. Every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewerage network. A discharge to groundwater or watercourse may require the consent of the Environment Agency.”</p> <p>We wish to emphasise our preference that development on Greenfield sites should not discharge surface water into the public combined sewerage network and should not increase the rate of run-off into the public surface water network.</p> <p>On previously developed land, applicants should target a reduction of surface water discharge in accordance with the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage produced by DEFRA (or any replacement national standards). In demonstrating a reduction in discharge, applicants should include clear evidence of existing positive connections from the site with</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV11	Further comment
						<p>associated calculations on rates of discharge as part of the application submission material.</p> <p>Policy recommendations</p> <p>As mentioned above, there may be requirements for infrastructure improvements to accommodate the proposed growth in the Draft Local Plan. United Utilities would like to recommend the insertion of the following into the plan in order to allow such infrastructure to be provided in a timely manner and to prevent delays on allocation delivery. The recommendation(s) can be amended at will to fit your boroughs specific needs/requirements.</p> <p>Policy text – “In considering development proposals, it may be necessary to co-ordinate the timescales for delivery of development with the timescales for the delivery of infrastructure. For large development sites, which may be constructed over a number of years and by various developers, it will be necessary to ensure a coordinated and rounded approach to the delivery of infrastructure, especially drainage infrastructure through the requirement for site wide strategies which establish principles to be adhered to during the construction process.”</p> <p>Explanation – “The Council encourages such proposals and other relevant policies in the Local Plan. Applicants should be aware that redevelopment proposals in these locations can place different pressure on infrastructure. It will be necessary to consider the impact of any redevelopment proposal on infrastructure as part of an application submission. It may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery/ upgrading of infrastructure”</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV11	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV11: Surface Water Run-Off, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality</p> <p>All Development proposals will be required to consider and address flood risk from all sources. Planning permission will only be granted for proposals which would not be subject to unacceptable flood risk or materially increase the risks elsewhere. This should be informed by consideration of the most up to date information on Flood Risk available from the Environment Agency, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and from the Lead Local Flood Risk Authority.</p> <p>All development proposals will be required to manage surface water as part of the development and should seek to maximise the use of permeable surfaces/areas of soft landscaping, and the use of Green Infrastructure as potential sources of storage for surface water run-off. New development should not increase on-site or off-site surface water run-off rates and, where practicable, should seek to reduce surface water run-off.</p> <p>Proposals for major development as identified by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and subsequent amendments will be expected to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which manage any surface water run-off arising from the development and minimise the risk of flooding on the development site and in the surrounding area. The proposed drainage measures should fully integrate with the design of the development and priority should be given to SuDS techniques which make a positive contribution to amenity, biodiversity and water quality as well as overall climate change mitigation. Alternatives to SuDS will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that SuDS are impractical or there are other exceptional circumstances. All SUDS schemes should incorporate clear implementation, management and maintenance arrangements.</p> <p>Proposals for minor development should also consider the incorporation of SuDS into the design of the scheme in accordance with the drainage hierarchy set out within the Framework. Any drainage proposal for minor schemes should at least demonstrate that SuDS solutions have been considered</p> <p>Development proposals which discharge surface water runoff to foul drainage connections or combined sewers will only be permitted if it has been demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐☐ Separate surface water drainage is not available and cannot be practicably provided; ☐☐ Sufficient capacity exists in the foul or combined sewer; and ☐☐ The proposal would not exacerbate the risk of flooding or result in deterioration in water quality. <p>RCT support ENV11, and note that the Council commissioned JBA Consulting to undertake a Level 1 and Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2016) for</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV11	Further comment
						<p>Rosendale8. This study looked at a large number of potential development sites in the Borough and made recommendations in relation to their potential flood risk. The Council has taken the recommendations into account when considering individual site assessments for the Local Plan. RCT note that Rosendale has many wet and well spring'd slopes, and of the long tradition of private culverts to water courses and even to public sewers, which with the private sewers transfer, we should gradually see being recorded, and possible need's to require SuDS works.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV11	Further comment
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Object	<p>Issue: The policy states that 'planning permission will only be granted for proposals which would not be subject to unacceptable flood risk or materially increase the risks elsewhere'. This does not take account of the fact that some development types are inappropriate in flood zones and should not be permitted regardless of whether or not the risks can be managed.</p> <p>Impact: The wording of the policy does not comply with the requirements of Paragraph 100 of the NPPF and the associated Flood Risk Tables included in the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the NPPG</p> <p>Solution: Reword the policy to ensure that inappropriate development will not be permitted, i.e. 'planning permission will only be granted for proposals which are not classed as inappropriate in a Flood Zone, would not be subject to unacceptable flood risk or materially increase the risks elsewhere'</p> <p>Commentary: Not all development types are appropriate in a Flood Zone, even if a FRA demonstrates that the risks can be appropriately managed. The provision of a FRA will not make such developments acceptable and so the wording of the draft policy should be amended to ensure that it is clear that only development classed as appropriate can be permitted in a Flood Zone.</p> <p>Issue: Where necessary, planning applications will need to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) but this is not clear based on the policy or supporting statement.</p> <p>Impact: A lack of clarity over the need for a FRA could lead to planning applications being submitted contrary to the requirements of Paragraph 103 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Solution: Revise the policy and / or supporting statement to ensure that the need for a FRA to consider and assess flood risk is clear and sufficient detail is provided to ensure applicants know what they will be expected to submit with their planning application.</p> <p>Commentary: Paragraph 103 of the NPPF identifies when planning applications should be accompanied by a FRA. While we are not suggesting that Policy ENV11 should repeat this criteria, we would suggest that making reference to the need for all applications to be accompanied by a FRA in accordance with paragraph 103 of the NPPF provides more clarity and avoids any doubt.</p> <p>Issue: There is no cross-referencing between the policy and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)</p> <p>Impact: Any mitigation measures identified in the SFRA to make any allocations acceptable in terms of NPPF requirements have not been identified so it is unclear whether all the proposed site allocations are NPPF compliant</p> <p>Suggested solution: Review the policy and supporting statement and revise /</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV11	Further comment
						<p>amend as necessary to ensure that any SFRA requirements can be clearly cross-referenced and secured through the application of Policy ENV11 when considering planning applications on any allocated sites with known flood risks.</p> <p>Commentary: Where site specific mitigation measures are necessary to make a development safe in planning terms, these should be specified at an appropriate point in the local plan and it logical that they would form part of Policy ENV11.</p>		

Number of comments ENV11

4

Reference	ENV12	Trees and Hedgerows
-----------	-------	---------------------

1766		Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd	Object	<p>7.22 Protection of trees in development proposals is the subject of ENV12. The policy sets out the requirements for justification of the loss of any trees and woodlands as part of an Arboricultural Implications Assessment to be submitted with the application. The policy further states a number of requirements (items a – e) for development proposals and sets out a requirement for compensatory planting at a ratio of 2:1, unless compensatory measures are proposed.</p> <p>7.23 It is considered that this policy is inconsistent with the Framework (para 118) which is more explicit in stating that such losses may be acceptable in planning terms where “the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss”. A replacement ratio of 2:1 is excessive and an unrealistic expectation for on site replacement within development proposals. No methodology for defining ‘compensatory measures’ where the 2:1 replacement can’t be met is identified, but it is anticipated that this would take the form of a financial contribution. Peel therefore requests that this requirement is removed, in favour of a more balanced, appropriate and site specific expectation.</p> <p>7.24 Furthermore, there is a lack of clarity in the policy, where it states that development proposals should “a) not result in the loss of trees or woodland which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order or which are considered worthy of protection”. The meaning of ‘worthy of protection’ is open to interpretation and should be removed from the policy. Proposals for the amendments of TPOs can be considered through the application process.</p>
------	--	---------------------------------------	--------	---

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV12	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy ENV12: Trees and Hedgerows</p> <p>Development proposals must seek to avoid the loss of, and minimise the risk of harm to, existing trees, woodland, and/or hedgerows of visual or nature conservation value, including but not limited to ancient and veteran trees. Where trees and/or woodlands are to be lost as a part of development this loss must be justified as a part of an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) submitted with the application The Council will expect developers to plan for retention by using an AIA to inform site layout, in advance of the submission of any application. Where trees, woodland and/or hedgerows lie within a development site, they should wherever possible be incorporated effectively within the landscape elements of the scheme Development proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) not result in the loss of trees or woodland which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order or which are considered worthy of protection; b) not give rise to a threat to the continued well-being of retained trees, woodlands or hedgerows; c) not involve building within the canopy or root spread of trees, woodlands, or hedgerows which are to be retained, except where it can be proven that the construction can be carried out in accordance with the most up-to-date British Standard and an appropriate method statement is fully adhered to; d) make a positive contribution to Green Infrastructure where it is within or adjacent to identified Green Infrastructure networks; and e) make a positive contribution to biodiversity. <p>To ensure that the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the harm resulting from the loss of trees, woodlands or hedgerows, compensatory planting must take place at a ratio of at least 2:1. Where this ratio cannot be achieved this must be fully justified with compensatory measures proposed clearly justified.</p> <p>Trees within a Conservation Area that are 75mm diameter or above at 1.5m above ground level, and trees protected by tree preservation orders will be given detailed consideration when considering planning consent. Any planning proposal must seek to retain these trees unless there are sound arboricultural reasons (as justified within the AIA) for their removal.</p> <p>RCT support ENV12 and note that Rossendale generally has a low level of tree coverage and the retention and protection of trees, woodland and hedgerow is critical in terms of biodiversity and also to protect the Borough's individual landscape and character. Trees and hedges also have an important role in management of climate change including urban cooling effects. Core woodland areas exist at Whitworth, Buckshaw Brow, Edenfield and the Ogden Reservoir Valley and these areas are connected by "stepping stone" habitats as identified on the Lancashire Ecological Network Maps. RCT note the legacy of Lancashire County Council and Rossendale Groundwork's often Countryside</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	ENV12	Further comment
						Commission/Natural England and Forestry Commission grant funded tree plantings; and the so far unsuccessful LCC grant bid funded Community Woodland Project from Cloughfold to Waterfoot.		

Number of comments ENV12 2

Chapter 5: Leisure and Tourism

Reference LT1 Protection of Playing Pitches, Existing Open Spaces and Sport and Recreation Facilities

155	Jo	Furtado		Support	5. LTI The statement on the value of playing pitches is very welcome ... but with one caveat. The statement that development on such pitches will only be permitted if a replacement of equal or higher standard is provided "elsewhere in the Borough" should reasonably read "within the township": a super-duper pitch coming on stream in Whitworth is not much use to a team dispossessed in Haslingden, nor vice versa, is it? Support, if the wording is changed.
-----	----	---------	--	---------	---

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT1	Further comment
1614	Helen	Ledger	Sports England		Not Applicable	<p>3. Policy LT1 – support for the first two bullets but the final two cause concern. The full range of this policy should be led by the research in the PPS and not a vague judgement about bigger and smaller areas, this is quite subjective. If you have a very large multisport site of 2 ha; the 3rd bullet would allow loss of a small section, maybe as much of a junior pitch, provided improvements were made to other pitches, but what if this is contrary to the PPS?</p> <p>Final bullet is OK but reference is needed to current and future needs to future proof the policy. Suggest adding red text here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of school playing fields, the development is for education purposes or the Department for Education is satisfied that the land is no longer required for school use and its loss would not result in a shortfall in recreational open space/playing pitches for the local community now or in the future. <p>4. Mission – built sports facilities should have the same or similar protection to pitches. These are often on school sites, can bullet 4, policy LT1 be amended to take this into account? Has the council carried out any evidence gathering on built sports facilities to understand supply and demand and current and future potential deficits, similar to the PPS? Sport England recommend our methodology to study this, see: https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/assessing-needs-and-opportunities-guidance/</p> <p>5. Should the council also consider allocating new land for playing fields and sports facilities? It looks like the PPS conclusions mean it is possible to remedy youth football shortages through existing stock so this may not be needed, but how will proposals for new playing field sites or artificial grass pitches be considered under this draft plan? The latter can create very controversial applications. Maybe worth considering a policy of this nature. Without any evidence on built sports facilities it is hard to say whether any sites need to be allocated. An evidence gap on this could raise soundness issues at submission stage.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT1	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy LT1: Protection of Playing Pitches, Existing Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Playing Pitches, Existing Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities are shown on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Development proposals which would result in the loss of playing pitches and associated facilities and land or buildings in recreational or sporting use or last used as such or which would prejudice the use of these areas for sport and recreation will be resisted and only be permitted where:</p> <p>☒☒A replacement of the same type, of an equal or greater quantity and quality is provided in an appropriate location; or</p> <p>☒☒It is demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that there is a surplus of recreational land or facilities of the same type relative to the current and likely future needs of the local community. All development affecting playing pitches and associated facilities will be considered against the most up to date version of the Playing Pitch Strategy; or</p> <p>☒☒The development involves the loss of a small part of a larger site in recreational use and would result in the enhancement of recreational facilities on the remainder of the site, or on a nearby site serving the same community; or</p> <p>☒☒In the case of school playing fields, the development is for education purposes or the Department for Education is satisfied that the land is no longer required for school use and its loss would not result in a shortfall in recreational open space/playing pitches for the local community.</p> <p>RCT support LT1 and note that the Council commissioned a Playing Pitch Strategy for the Borough (2016) which identified a deficit of football pitches and rugby pitches and recommended that all existing pitches should be retained, including those not currently in use. Development on such pitches will only be permitted if replacement of equal or higher quality is provided elsewhere in the Borough. RCT however note the Council's recent planning permission for housing on a private football pitch and adjoining Council Greenland, where the replacement pitch is some distance at Marl Pits. There's reference to "Hubs", but neither Haslingden and Marl Pits are on regular bus routes. And where's the Hub for East Rossendale?</p>		

Number of comments LT1

3

Reference LT2 Community Facilities

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT2	Further comment
33	Katie	Richardson	-		Not Applicable	There is a play park on Station Road, Healey Dell currently consisting of a few pieces of equipment (slide, swings rocker etc) it doesn't appear to be plotted on the local plan/map. - I appreciate the land may not be plotted as it doesn't fall under the 'change of use or loss' category, for which I suppose we should be grateful. However I'd like to raise that this park has been overlooked for quite some time and I'd like to hope it can be added to the future redevelopment plans for improvements. In doing this you would 'enhance quality of life' within the area for residents and the many visitors that frequent Healey Dell, parking on Station Road and walking in. It attracts lots of families as it is only 100metres from the Fairy Bridge / Waterfalls of the Dell and is close to a local convenience shop which is supported by the visitors. - I would very much like to here what the plans are for this facility in future. - Thank you -		
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy LT2: Community Facilities</p> <p>Development proposing the change of use or loss of any premises or land currently or last used as a community facility (including public houses, post offices, community centres, village and church halls, places of worship, children's centres, libraries, cultural facilities, theatres, parks and open spaces and health facilities) will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) The facility no longer serves the local needs of the community in which it is located; and</p> <p>b) Adequate alternative provision has been made, or is already available, in the settlement or local area; and</p> <p>c) The use is no longer financially viable; and</p> <p>d) The facility is in an isolated location remote from public transport routes; or</p> <p>e) There is an amenity or environmental reason why the facility is no longer acceptable.</p> <p>RCT support LT2 and note that the provision and retention of community facilities is considered to be integral for ensuring that communities are sustainable in the long term. The Council will however safeguard community facilities against unnecessary loss, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day to day needs locally, unless it is demonstrated that the facility which would be lost is no longer required or suitable or that an appropriate replacement facility would be provided. RCT note the 1974 Local Government Reorganisation legacy of spending balances and loading future generations, still retains, the over budgeted Haslingden Sports Centre, Marl Pits Swimming Pool and Sports Facilities, and Whitworth Swimming Pool. However Bacup no longer has its Leisure Centre, and it's unclear how far the facilities at Fearn's Comprehensive School were intended to be a Joint User Project by Lancs CC, as Bacup BC did not appear to provide funding. Hence East Rossendale is less well provided for.</p>		
					Number of comments	LT2	2	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT3	Further comment
Reference		LT3		Tourism				
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy LT3: Tourism</p> <p>Tourism throughout the Borough will be promoted in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑☑ Supporting the “Adrenaline Valley” ☑☑ The development, extension and upgrading of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways (specifically the Rossendale Way, Irwell Sculpture Trail and Mary Towneley Loop, and more generally the Public Rights of Way network), supported by appropriate signage, interpretation and public art ☑☑ Support for the clustering of tourism related activities ☑☑ Events promotion ☑☑ Taking a positive approach to development of complementary accommodation and hospitality facilities. <p>Proposals for the enhancement of existing facilities and activities, as well as the development of new facilities and activities will be considered favourably. This will also include supporting infrastructure, such as enhanced access through car parking, bike racks, public realm and public transport improvements. The use of existing buildings will be encouraged. New development outside the urban boundary will be considered acceptable where it is essential for the proposed facility, and no sites within the urban boundary are suitable, and there are no unacceptable impacts affecting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑☑ Landscape character ☑☑ Visual quality (including light pollution) ☑☑ Neighbour amenity ☑☑ Highways ☑☑ Nature conservation assets <p>RCT supports LT3 and note that the tourism sector has an important role to play in Rossendale’s future prosperity. As reported in the 2017 Rossendale Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study, STEAM data from 2015 noted that Rossendale attracted 2% of all tourist visiting Lancashire, providing a total economic impact of £53m, which had grown by 3% from the previous year. RCT also notes that an ageing population might be more likely to come to see heritage assets, and at times notes that its Grade II Listed Weavers Cottage on Bacup Road is often left off local lists.</p>		
1790	David	Trivett			Support	<p>Policy LT3: Tourism</p> <p>I fully support the promotion of tourism to enjoy the Rossendale Hills. It is a wonderful environment to live and should be maintained. I like the “Adrenaline Valley” concept.</p> <p>Good to see the recent spend on Ski Rossendale.</p>		
Number of comments		LT3		2				
Reference		LT4		Overnight Visitor Accommodation				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT4	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy LT4: Overnight Visitor Accommodation</p> <p>The Council will take a positive approach to new high quality visitor accommodation. This includes hotels, bed and breakfast establishments, self-catering facilities, bed and tack, camping barns and sites used for camping and caravanning. Proposals will be supported particularly where use is made of existing buildings.</p> <p>Proposals will be supported at locations both within and outside the urban boundary where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐☐ They are appropriate to the locality; ☐☐ They are complementary to existing tourism facilities; ☐☐ There is suitable access by a variety of modes; ☐☐ The capacity of the existing infrastructure is adequate; ☐☐ There are no adverse impacts on visual amenity, landscape or nature conservation and ☐☐ The development will not reduce the amount of land for the purposes of open space and recreation. <p>All ancillary facilities should be designed (in terms of style and materials) to take into account their functions and blend into their settings, with appropriate landscaping and boundary treatments.</p> <p>Ancillary facilities such as cycle storage or horse paddocks will be encouraged in locations such as along bridleways or the cycle network.</p> <p>Any large scale hotel proposals (40 bedrooms or over) should be located in or adjacent the centres of Rawtenstall, Haslingden or Bacup. Outside these centres, large scale hotel proposals will only be supported where they form part of a wider regeneration scheme, can demonstrate a wider community benefit and access to the site can be provided by a variety of modes.</p> <p>RCT support LT4 and note A key finding of the 2017 Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study is that whilst the tourist economy in Rossendale is improving, the Borough is lacking in overnight accommodation, with ‘staying visitors’ accounting for just 22% of the total ‘visitor days’ recorded in the Valley in 2015 (compared to 31% at the county level). As the tourism offer improves in the Borough it expected that the number of overnight stays will increase. STEAM data from 2015 noted that Rossendale only has 268 visitor ‘beds’ distributed throughout the Borough, with no modern hotel space available. Accordingly this Report recommended that the Council should prioritise overnight accommodation and look to promote delivery of a modern ‘budget’ hotel to serve the Rossendale area. However RCT also note past unsuccessful developer’s aims for hotels in New Hall Hey, and site of demolished Accrington and Rossendale College. RCT is concerned that the notion of a “budget” hotel, as a priority, is not just looking for a use to go onto the Council/RTB’s site of the demolished Valley Centre. Could more rooms close to local pubs, restaurants and Just Eat “takaways” be as attractive for</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT4	Further comment
						"staying visitors", than the utilitarian, out by 10.00am, ambience of a "budget" hotel. Or somewhere safe to "park-up" their VW Camper Van.		
Number of comments		LT4				1		
Reference	LT5	Equestrian Development						

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT5	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy LT5: Equestrian Development</p> <p>Proposals for new, or extensions or alterations to existing, private or commercial equestrian facilities will be supported subject to the following criteria:</p> <p>☐☐In the case of indoor facilities or commercial stables, priority is given to the re-use and conversion of existing buildings or the proposal forms part of a farm diversification scheme;</p> <p>☐☐The siting, design and materials would not have an unacceptable impact on visual amenity or the character of the area. They should be well related to existing trees, hedges or landscape features, avoiding prominent positions, and generally at least 30 metres away from neighbouring residential properties;</p> <p>☐☐A small private development will involve no more than three horses. For development proposals involving more than three horses, the applicant should submit a statement with the planning application detailing why accommodation of the size proposed is required;</p> <p>☐☐Traditional designs will generally be the most appropriate, clad externally in timber and with an internal timber frame, with a maximum ridge height of 3.5 metres for stables. Tack rooms and hay stores should be part of the same building, and each should be of a similar size to an individual stable;</p> <p>☐☐Any new or extended stables and associated infrastructure (including ménages, hard-standing, fencing and riding-arena) is of a scale that is proportionate to the activity proposed;</p> <p>☐☐Hard-standing areas, access tracks and sand paddocks should be of the minimum size necessary and should not encroach on the open countryside;</p> <p>☐☐The design of storage or parking of horse boxes on site, and fencing is appropriate to the local vernacular and not suburban in appearance;</p> <p>☐☐Sand paddocks/ménages will utilise existing ground levels unless absolutely necessary and should not appear built out of the ground and thus alien to the natural contours of the land;</p> <p>☐☐Floodlighting will be resisted particularly in the open countryside or close to residential properties. Where floodlighting is proposed, it should be designed to minimise light spillage from the lit area and ensure that protected species will not be adversely affected;</p> <p>☐☐The site has adequate vehicle access and the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network and highway safety. The movement of horses or vehicles resulting from the siting of stables should not create danger to horses and riders, or to other road users. Stables are best sited to have safe and convenient access to the bridleway network or minor roads, although existing bridleways should not become over-intensively used as a result of the development;</p> <p>☐☐The proposal meets appropriate national standards for horse welfare and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT5	Further comment
						<p>management such as those established by the British Horse Society;</p> <p>There should be proper screening for car and horse-box parking and appropriate arrangements for the storage and disposal of manure which would not have an unacceptable impact on surface or ground-water or residential amenity; and</p> <p>Provision is made for removing any equipment and re-instating the land once its use for horses is no longer required or where the stables and associated development have been unused for a period of at least six months within 10 years of their completion.</p> <p>RCT support LT5's aims To minimise the visual impact of proposals, the design, siting and scale of any new or extended stables and associated infrastructure will be expected to be appropriate to its context and should not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of its surroundings.</p>		
Number of comments		LT5				1		
Reference		LT6		Farm Diversification				

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	LT6	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy LT6: Farm Diversification</p> <p>Proposals for farm diversification which require planning permission will be permitted on existing farm holdings provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐☐ They would make a positive contribution to the continued viability of the farm holding; ☐☐ They would retain or enhance the character of traditional farm buildings; ☐☐ Where possible, the proposal re-uses existing buildings of substantial and permanent construction which are structurally sound and capable of conversion without major alterations or the development is well-related to existing buildings if no suitable buildings are available for re-use; ☐☐ The agricultural diversification is subservient to the main agricultural use of the farm; ☐☐ Wherever possible, they add value to produce of the farm or produced locally, or contribute to the tourism economy; ☐☐ The scale and nature of the diversification proposals are appropriate for the location and would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity, landscape character, the enjoyment of the countryside or the purposes of the Green Belt; ☐☐ They do not require new dwellings within the rural area to support the enterprise; ☐☐ They do not create extensive areas of hardstanding; and ☐☐ The volume and type of traffic that would be generated is appropriate to the accessibility of the site and the standard of the local highway network. <p>RCT support LT6, and suggest specific support for funding grant applications for projects that would bring benefits to the community in terms for example of improved access to the countryside outside the Urban and Green Belt Boundaries.</p>		

Number of comments LT6

1

Chapter 6: Transport

Reference TR1 Strategic Transport

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR1	Further comment
155	Jo	Furtado			Object	<p>3. Roads/traffic (TR1?)</p> <p>Page 84 of the DLP says, "Rossendale has high levels of out-commuting ... levels are particularly high to Rochdale, Bury and Burnley."</p> <p>After that there is, in the DLP, NO further mention of the congestion on the A671 south to Rochdale, despite the fact that most of the out-commuting to Rochdale either originates in Whitworth or passes through it - the focus is entirely upon escape from Rawtenstall via the M66/ELR. It is approximately 2 miles from the Rossendale boundary at Healey Corner to the centre of Rochdale, and whichever of the two roads one chooses at Healey Corner during the morning rush-hour there is significant congestion: queues back up on the A671 to within a quarter of a mile of Healey Corner routinely. Whitworth residents who must commute already make jokes about the need to leave home the night before in order to get to work on time(n the morning.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan correctly notes that on the section of the A681 from Toll Bar through Stacksteads there is no alternative parallel route, which can be problematic in the case of accident or roadworks.</p> <p>However, there is no mention in the IDP of the 3 sections of the A671 in Whitworth where there is no alternative route - from the top of New Line to the Halfway House at Facit; from the bottom of Coppice Drive to the northern junction with Tonacliffe Road; and from the southern end of Tonacliffe Road to Healey Corner. Just recently on the occasion ofthe unannounced demolition of Albert Mill those of us travelling the 3 miles to Rochdale were obliged to turn around and go via Bacup, Walsden and Littleborough.</p> <p>The IDP makes absolutely NO mention of Whitworth's infrastructure (road) problems. It's as if we have none; or they are considered too trivial to mention; or there may be issues, but no-one's bothered to find out; or because the regular congestion happens, on a daily basis, Monday to Friday, beyond the boundaries of Rossendale it doesn't concern Rossendale, even though it is partly Rossendale citizens who cause the congestion and Rossendale citizens who absolutely have to suffer it.</p> <p>More housing on any significant scale will only make things worse. Oppose.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR1	Further comment
1437	Joanne	Finn	-		Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed number of homes to be built in Rossendale over the next 15 years. Whilst I recognise that there are legal obligations etc placed upon the Council by the Government to provide a prescribed number of homes I don't feel that such a high number is feasible given the geography of the valley and the pressures that the area is already under particularly with regards to schools and most crucially traffic as well as the impact this will have upon the appearance of the valley. - Many of the Valley's roads are already under considerable strain, particularly as you have identified the Rawtenstall gyratory which is impacting upon people's quality of life, additional houses would compound this especially as to afford these aspirational homes most people would have to work outside the Valley. I don't feel that realistically there is anything that can be done to improve traffic congestion around Rossendale or into Manchester given the geography and financial constraints and this Plan makes the right noises as it has to do but in reality can achieve virtually nothing. Whilst there is a good bus system into Manchester, aside from the getting to the busstop lack of parking problem it only benefits those who work near the City Centre, which I'd think the majority don't, like myself, currently a stay at home Mum but I spent years commuting to Salford, Warrington and Liverpool where public transport isn't an option. Minor tinkering of traffic light timings etc or improving Siminster Island won't really make a difference, the rail link has been talked about for years but as far as I'm aware nothing tangible has or is likely to happen and park and ride will have some value for people to the west of the Valley and neighbouring areas but not much. I feel that this drive to build is ruining the enjoyment for those that live here. - -</p>		<p>I'm not sure that this is the right place to put it but I'd also like to comment on the Consultation process for this and plans etc including Lives and Landscapes .Whilst I'm sure you will comply with the legal minimum requirements Most people I spoke to didn't know about the Consultation we only found out because a neighbour knew there was a proposal for the field but didn't know the process. We've found out about things retrospectively in the past. People generally feel this is deliberate to minimise likelihood of objections. I'd expect it to be better advertised, including more often in the local paper and on the front page on your website. Even knowing of it's existence you have to hunt to find it on the website.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR1	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>POLICY TR1: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan highlights the high levels of out-commuting to the neighbouring authorities, of which a significant majority travel to Rochdale, Bury and Burnley. It also draws attention to the increasing issue on the M66 regarding peak hour congestion.</p> <p>In regard to the SRN, a significant proportion of the congestion in Rossendale is located around the gyratory and the Haslingden Tesco roundabout. The issue regarding congestion associated with the Haslingden roundabout is further exacerbated by those wishing to travel from Rawtenstall and the eastern part of the Borough in a northbound movement along the A56(T). The Local Plan states that Rossendale Borough Council will continue to work with the Local Highway Authority, Lancashire County Council, in examine ways to improve traffic flows whilst also working collaboratively with Highways England to ensure effective management of the A56(T) / M66 corridor. This approach is welcomed.</p> <p>Although a significant proportion of the Borough's residents travel to work in the neighbouring areas of Burnley, Rochdale and Bury, the suggested upgrading of the East Lancashire Railway would provide an alternative mode of transport for commuters who currently rely heavily on the A56(T) / M66 corridor for travel.</p> <p>The Council has also stated that they recognise the importance that bus services play to the area and state that a new bus station is currently being constructed at Rawtenstall and that they will continue to explore additional avenues to improve services.</p> <p>Proposals which reduce the need to travel will also be encouraged. The Policy states that the main focus will be placed upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Improving links to Greater Manchester; ☑ Development of East Lancashire Railway to enable commuting; ☑ Developing strategic cycle network; ☑ Addressing congestion hotspots, especially the gyratory at Rawtenstall ; ☑ Promotion of sustainable transport solutions; ☑ Integrating transport more effectively; and ☑ Ensuring that development that generates significant movement is located where need to travel is minimised and use of sustainable transport modes is maximised. 		
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Support	<p>Policy TR1: Strategic Transport</p> <p>2.76 Taylor Wimpey welcome the focus on developing the potential of the East Lancashire Railway for both transport and tourism purposes, as this would introduce a further sustainable transport mode into the area, and reduce the reliance on the private car for commuting purposes.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR1	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	Road Safety Figure 14 illustrates the rate of Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) casualties and shows that Rossendale KSI indicator has been significantly worse than the England average for 2012-2014 and 2013-2015. Figure 14xiv: 1.10 Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) on England's roads Recommendations: Future developments in Rossendale should support a reduction in the current rate of people killed or seriously injured on roads whilst also promoting active travel in a way that is safe and sustainable and it is commendable that so many policies stipulate consideration of "highway safety". We recommend further work is undertaken with Lancashire County Council's Safe and Healthy Travel team to understand Rossendale road safety data in more depth and any steps that can be taken to address this public health indicator. We recommend that new developments in or around accident hot spots should demonstrate consideration and practical measures aimed at reducing KSIs and improving general road safety. Policy TR1: Strategic Transport, could be amended to include reference to a requirement for development proposals to have no adverse impact on road safety and to also where appropriate help to address existing accident hot spots. With regard to air quality, the policy could also require that development proposals include the provision of electric charging points. Please see appendix for figures		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR1	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy TR1: Strategic Transport</p> <p>Opportunities to enhance the Borough’s external and internal connectivity will be actively supported. Proposals which reduce the need to travel will also be encouraged. Working closely with partners inside and outside the Borough, focus will be on the following:</p> <p>Improving links to Greater Manchester and the M60/M62;</p> <p>Developing the potential of the East Lancashire Railway for both transport and tourism purposes;</p> <p>Developing the strategic cycle network (Valley of Stone Greenway/National Cycle Route 6) including links between the different routes and to neighbouring authorities;</p> <p>Addressing congestion hotspots, especially the gyratory in Rawtenstall;</p> <p>Promoting sustainable transport solutions to address congestion and air pollution;</p> <p>Integrating transport more effectively into proposals to improve the public realm where there are opportunities to do so, for example, the area outside Bacup Library and pedestrian links between Rawtenstall Railway Station and town centre; and</p> <p>Ensuring that development that generates significant movement is located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.</p> <p>A site for “Park and Ride” facilities will be protected at Ewood Bridge and is shown on the Policies map.</p> <p>RCT support TR1 and note that Traffic congestion in Rossendale is most pronounced around the gyratory in Rawtenstall but is also evident from Crawshawbooth into Rawtenstall, Haslingden Tesco roundabout, in Waterfoot and Stacksteads. A new bus station is currently being built in Rawtenstall as part of the Spinning Point development and the Council will explore other opportunities to improve bus services. However RCT sees a need to remind us all of the roles in Rossendale of GOV UK:-</p> <p>A. Rossendale in Lancashire’s Roads.</p> <p>While there is now only a heritage railway, some parts of Rossendale are well served by roads. More were to be, but as you can see from this 1965 LCC Major Road Proposals Plan, the M65 is not there, nor the use of the Haslingden Bye-pass as an A56T diversion instead of the Crawshawbooth Bye-pass.</p> <p>This left Rawtenstall with just the dual carriageway of St Mary’s Way, meeting, at “Tup Bridge”, the single carriageway Burnley Road. There are many local memories of its original Queens Square Bus Station on the site of what’s now the Fire Station.</p> <p>And there’s an abandoned section of Pedestrian Underpass, intended for a new Queens Square Bus Station; but this was, RCT believe, prevented by?</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR1	Further comment
						<p>Yourselves, the highway authority, or the North West Roads Construction Unit who were responsible for the design and construction of these roads?</p> <p>B. The A56T Diversion from Rawtenstall to Haslingden.</p> <p>RCT see that the 1970s abandonment of the Crawshawbooth Bye-pass, with up to 4 alternate routes, has moved the focus for new development towards the M66/A56T Corridor. What's now classed as Rossendale West: Edenfield, Helmshore, Haslingden, Acre, and Rising Bridge, has since the 1980s seen the construction of new housing estates, business parks, and retail outlets. Compare Haslingden Sykeside Tesco's Business Rates of £210/sqm with Rawtenstall Bocholt Way Tesco's £180/sqm, the X41 Transdev commercial bus service from Blackburn to Manchester via Rising Bridge, Acre, Haslingden and Helmshore with no reason to detour to a Rawtenstall Bus Station. Rawtenstall is reached by the 464 Rosso from Accrington to Rochdale. But as for "sustainable transport modes" in terms of NPPF 2012, RCT note the long walks between bus stops in Haslingden for these services – Not quite Super Stops? Not part of a "Hub and Spoke" bus route pattern. How sustainable to need to look at car park charges to help with running costs of Rawtenstall Bus Station – no grant "free money".</p> <p>C. RCT note these proofs of how Rossendale's roads were "sorted" with no local say:</p> <p>Hansard 29 March 1972</p> <p>Mr Michael Heseltine. Alternative routes for the northern end of the Edenfield-Rawtenstall by-pass to the Calder Valley fast route, details of which were announced by my hon. Friend the Minister of Local Government on 17 March, are currently being investigated. In the meanwhile work on detailed plans for the Crawshaw-booth bypass had been suspended. However minor improvements to the A56 are being considered.</p> <p>Haslingden Bye-pass Public Enquiry Inspector Philip M Vine 17 June 1976:</p> <p>75. Bearing in mind the above facts, I reach the following conclusions:-</p> <p>1 With regard to the Department's intention that the Haslingden Bye-pass shall form the outhern section of a diversion from Bent Gate to Huncoat of the existing A56 from Rawtenstall to Burnley, I am unable to reach the conclusion that such diversion is preferable to an improvement on the line, or approximate line, of the existing A56. Although the diversion of the A56 as proposed by the Department may well be the preferred solution to the undoubted inadequacy of the existing A56, insufficient evidence was tendered by the Department to justify such a conclusion.</p> <p>No evidence, or insufficient evidence was given as to:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) comparative costs of construction, b) comparative costs of land acquisition, c) comparative quantified travel benefits or disbenefits, d) comparative numbers of properties affected, 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR1	Further comment
						e) comparative environmental impact, f) comparative predicted traffic flows.		
1790	David	Trivett			Support	<p>Policy TR1: Strategic Transport</p> <p>Fortunately I no longer need to join the queues heading out of and then back home to the Valley.</p> <p>The traffic from Bacup down to Rawtenstall to access the Motorway network was always an issue necessitating an early start and late return to miss the congestion.</p> <p>Unfortunately I don't see a solution to the traffic issues on the roads in the valley.</p> <p>We are victims of the 1960's decision to move away from rail to road before sustainable development was created.</p> <p>The valley would be a completely different place if the railway connection had been left intact. Considered inefficient in 1963 but what a benefit it would be to the valley now.</p> <p>Good to see the continuing support for the East Lancashire Railway. It could be useful link in the future.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR1	Further comment
1820	Kelly	Holt	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>The Highway Authority would expect the Highway Capacity Study, that is currently underway by Mott MacDonald, to provide the necessary evidence to demonstrate the cumulative impact of the sites on the highway network and highlighted any mitigation measures that are required. Many of the individual sites fall below the threshold to provide a full Transport Assessment and therefore the Highway Capacity Study will provide an important tool for the Highway Authority when assessing the smaller sites individually and the larger sites that come forward piecemeal.</p> <p>The larger development sites will be subject to a full transport assessment and Travel Plan in accordance with National and Local Policy and the evidence collected in the Highway Capacity Study . The Highway Authority will seek a detailed design to determine the impact upon the highway network and any mitigation measures will be investigated by the developer.</p> <p>The sustainability of all sites will be a key consideration for the Highway Authority and improvements to local public bus services and infrastructure will be requested where necessary. Existing Public Rights of Way must be integrated into any development and improved where necessary. Internal road layouts in accordance with the Manual for Streets will be necessary to maximise permeability onto the highway network with high quality pedestrian and cycle links to maximise sustainability.</p> <p>The site allocations plans do not provide details of potential access points onto the highway network so some assumptions have been made where connections exist or could be made within the land highlighted on the plans. The Highway Authority have provided comments on the main sites that have been of concern to local residents, as highlighted on your email during the consultation period.</p>		
Number of comments						TR1	8	
Reference		TR2	Footpaths, Cycleways and Bridleways					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR2	Further comment
1042	John	Lord	LANXESS Urethanes UK Ltd		Object	In the area adjacent to our property, we query the accuracy of the right of way shown on the proposals Map (shown as a yellow line) where it joins and then follows the line of the companies' access road. The Proposals Map claims this as existing PROW. We believe this to be wrong, as apart from a short stretch which runs to the south of our access road, this is not existing PROW. Our access road is used exclusively by the company, largely for heavy tanker traffic and is therefore unsuitable for pedestrians or cyclists. - - The company has been in negotiation with Lancashire County Council for some months with regard to the route of a PROW in this area (National Cycle route 6 - footpath and cycle path), and within these discussions the line shown yellow is an option proposed by LCC. The company has strongly objected to the proposed PROW passing close to its existing operational boundary and the related COMAH area, for security and health and safety reasons. We are currently awaiting a response from LCC regarding our objection. - - Notwithstanding that the majority of this proposal is not existing PROW, in light of these ongoing discussions, we believe it would be highly inappropriate to include this proposed PROW in the Local Plan, in advance of agreement between LCC and the company. -		
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Not Applicable	Policy TR2: Footpaths, Cycleways and Bridleways 2.77 We do not have general comments in relation to this policy, however it is relevant to the Grane Village allocation (HS2.78). This policy states that proposals to improve, extend or add to the existing footpath, cycleway and bridleway network in the Borough and in new development will be supported. National Cycle Route 6 is listed as a key route in the Borough. This policy would therefore support the development of the Grane Village site, as it will link directly to National Cycle Route 6, which runs down the eastern boundary of the site. It will also improve the existing Public Rights of Way which are currently poorly maintained and demarcated and will introduce new walking and cycling routes through the site, improving connectivity between the Cycle Route and urban area to the east, and the Grane Valley and reservoirs to the west.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR2	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy TR2: Footpaths, Cycleways and Bridleways</p> <p>The Council will support the development and enhancement of a strategic Public Rights of Way network including enhancements to surfacing, signage and feeder routes. Key routes are shown on the Policies Map and include: The “Valley of Stone Greenway” (Rawtenstall to Rochdale)</p> <p>National Cycle Route 6 (Bury-Accrington)</p> <p>Rawtenstall to Clowbridge Reservoir</p> <p>Pennine Bridleway (Mary Townley Loop)</p> <p>Irwell Sculpture Trail/ Rossendale Way.</p> <p>Proposals to improve, extend or add to the existing footpath, cycleway and bridleway network in the Borough and in new development will be supported providing they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Are integrated with existing routes to facilitate access on foot, by bicycle and by horse; b) Where appropriate, identify gaps in the existing network and map potential new link routes, particularly in areas where there is a high level of demand; c) Facilitate access to the network of footpaths, bridleways and cycleways by requiring new development adjacent to existing pedestrian, bridleway or cycle routes to provide direct, safe and secure links to these routes where possible. d) Do not harm residential amenities; e) Do not harm nature conservation interests; f) Take into account the needs of agriculture; g) Are located and designed to minimise the risk of crime; h) Have regard to the needs of people with impaired mobility; and i) Have regard to other users of the route and vehicular traffic. j) The development would not reduce, sever or adversely affect the use, amenity or safety of a Public Right of Way (PROW), or prejudice the planned development of the network, if acceptable provision is made to mitigate those effects, or divert or replace the right of way before the development commences. Any replacement or diverted PROW must be no less convenient or safe, and of no lower quality than the facility being replaced; Where developments are directly related to the Public Rights of Way network contributions may be sought for their enhancement. <p>RCT support TR2 where Although Rossendale has the densest public rights of way network in Lancashire, much of the network is in a poor condition and there is an identified need to develop, extend, upgrade and improve access to the network. However RCT see need to note the legacy of Lancashire County Council, and Rossendale Groundwork’s creation of many new pedestrian, cycle and horse riding routes, such as Alan Fishwick Way, Lench Valley Cycleway, Cloughfold Greenway, often from “free money” grants from Countryside Commission, and which are not part of the LCC network, and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR2	Further comment	
						which should be under the same management structure. This might ultimately require "hard choices" to achieve a well maintained core network.			
1790	David	Trivett			Not Applicable	Policy TR2: Footpaths, Cycleways and Bridleways Good to see the work underway on the strategic routes but a lot of work required on the smaller, but important, public rights of way. Many of which need repair and maintenance to ensure they continue. Land owners with public rights of way across their property should be made to keep the paths and access points to ensure the safety of users. Could the Council please consider not wasting any more money, grant aided or not, on "artworks" like the Weave in the Glen and the Birds outside Bacup?			
Number of comments		TR2				4			
Reference		TR3	Road Schemes and Development Access						
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	Policy TR3: Road Schemes and Development Access Permission will not be granted for any development on land which: 1) Is required to allow road access to a site allocated on the Policies Map for development; or 2) will prejudice the construction of identified road schemes. RCT support TR3, but must note the recent permission for a bungalow that would prevent the linking of Hollins Way, a mid 1960s Spine Road intended to serve developments from Burnley Road to Newchurch Road. But those were the days: when infrastructure was done first as at Runcorn New Town, and in the early years of Warrington New Town.			
Number of comments		TR3				1			
Reference		TR4	Parking						
467	Colin	Francis			Not Applicable	Now that the government has announced only electric cars can be purchased from 2040 how are we going to charge them My house is situated directly on the main road (no off road parking) After a conversation with a spokes person from Rossendale borough council I have been told I must not trail a charging cable across the pavement How can I charge my car?			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR4	Further comment
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Object	<p>Policy TR4: Parking</p> <p>2.78 This policy requires compliance with the parking standards set out in Appendix 1. However, Appendix 1 sets out maximum standards (with some exceptions) which are no longer supported by government policy following the written ministerial statement, entitled 'Planning Update March 2015', which states that: "Local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and nonresidential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network."</p> <p>2.79 Therefore, unless such justification is provided it is recommended that the maximum standards provided in Appendix 1 should be deleted.</p>		
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>Parking</p> <p>7.33 Policy TR4 requires all proposals for new development to meet the parking standards, included at Appendix 1 of the DLP, unless an evidence based approach for alternative provision is presented.</p> <p>7.34 The flexibility included in the wording of the policy is welcomed. However, it is considered that the inclusion of parking standards as 'maximum' in the DLP does not adequately reflect the Framework or the ministerial statement abolishing national maximum parking standards⁵⁷. The ministerial statement states that 'Local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network', alongside the Framework requirement for a contextual approach when setting local parking standards (NPPF, para 39).</p> <p>7.35 It is therefore requested that the parking standards are revised to allow for a site specific approach to determining parking levels for new development.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR4	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Support	<p>Policy TR4: Parking</p> <p>All proposals for new development will be required to meet the parking standards set out within Appendix 1 unless the applicant can provide an evidence based approach as to why a different level of provision would be appropriate, to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>Where parking is being provided to serve new development or to address specific local parking problems in existing residential and business areas, the Council will expect the parking provision to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be conveniently located in relation to the development it serves; Be safe, secure and benefit from natural surveillance; Be designed to ensure that the use of the parking provision would not prejudice the safe and effective operation of the highway network; Not dominate the street scene or detract from the character of the area; Incorporate secure, covered cycle parking in line with the Parking Standards set out in the Local Plan unless otherwise agreed; Incorporate charging points for electric vehicles where the Council considers it appropriate to do so; and <p>Where appropriate, incorporate adequate soft landscaping and permeable surfaces to avoid the over-dominance of parking and to limit surface water run-off.</p> <p>Proposals to redevelop existing garage colonies will only be supported where: It has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Council that the garage colony is vacant or underused and there is unlikely to be any future demand for the facility; and</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site would not result in a significant increase in on-street parking which would have an adverse impact on the street scene or on highway safety.</p> <p>RCT support TR4 and note that Residential Garages will not be counted towards parking provision figures unless suitable evidence is provided. A creative approach should be taken to residential parking design building in principles in “Manual for Streets” (2007) to ensure that layouts are not car dominated. However this needs to state – unless at least 3 metres internal width. Gradients of parking spaces in many developments are irresponsibly too steep, and where located running down to key access roads, such as Hollins Way; the Council should be prepared to accept their past actions by providing grants to remodel, closer to level, such private parking areas</p> <p>Rossendale Civic Trust support TR4’s retention of Core Strategy parking standards, but note some inequalities in Rossendale’s Public Car Parking, and, see below, have specific objections to present policies affecting Bacup. Areas and Numbers. - 2 February 2013</p> <p>Core Strategy Parking Standards for A1 Retail with accessibility reductions: Food: 1 Space / 15 - 22sqm</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR4	Further comment
						<p>Non Food: 1 Space / 21 - 31sqm Bacup* 116 Long Stay – 117 in 2014 + 91 On-street = Total 208 Net Retail less Coop and Morrisons 4095sqm 35sqm / Off-road Space 20sqm / Off-road + On-street Space. Crawshawbooth 7 Long Stay + 13 Short Stay = 20 Net Retail 899sqm 45sqm / Space Haslingden 168 Long Stay + 66 Short Stay = 234 Net Retail less Winfields, Coop and Holden Wood 5982 sqm 26sqm / Space Rawtenstall 285 Long Stay + 136 Short Stay = 421 + On-street 118 = Total 539 Spaces Net Retail Primary and Secondary less Lidl and Focus 8877sqm 21sqm / Off-road Space 65 sqm / Short Stay Off-road Space 16/17sqm / Total Space 35 sqm / Total Short Stay and On-street Waterfoot 94 Long Stay + 34 Short Stay = 128 + On-street c60 = Total 188 Spaces Net Retail 3129sqm 24 sqm / All Off-road Space 92 sqm / Short Stay Off-road Space 17 sqm / Total Space. 33 sqm / Total Short Stay and On-street Whitworth 83 Long Stay Net Retail less Coop 1114sqm 13sqm / Space</p> <p>*RCT note comments on Bacup THI's Public Realm 2014. RCT did not see the complete replacement of St James Square's present working highway layout of sufficient priority to spend a reported £400,000. Bacup, unlike other shopping centres in Rossendale, has less car parking: c96 to Rawtenstall's c529, and far less in relation to number and size of its shops: 1/43sqm to Rawtenstall's 1/16-17sqm of net retail floor area, and no Short Stay Car Park close to its centre. Now with a large supermarket and its 132+ space car park on the edge of the town centre, the town centre shops are at a disadvantage. The best way to conserve Bacup's historic town centre is to have successful traders. A need, as</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	TR4	Further comment
						set out in the 2011 approved local plan, "Town centre parking in Bacup and at key visitor locations will be provided and improved". Our members also had concerns about the suitability of "shared space" at well over national guidance of 100 vph, and we gave detailed comments on the concept design for St James Square, and where we saw a need for some changes in priorities. Not very sustainable.		
Number of comments						4	TR4	
OTHER COMMENTS								
Evidence Base								
Reference	Evidence Base		Evidence Base					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
74	Edmund	Dixon	-	Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017	Object	1 RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE - The Infrastructure Delivery paper cites the Jacobs Study which indicated that a functional rail link for Rawtenstall would cost £50m and need a subsidy of £500,000 pa. I have read in the local free press that a rail link could be opened on existing tracks to an interchange with the Bury metro just south of Bury. This could give a faster journey time to Manchester than via Heywood, at a cost of ca £10m. - - If a levy on 4000 new homes at £1000 per home were made, this would deliver nearly half the money, and perhaps the MP responsible for the northern 'Powerhouse' could prevail upon the Minister for Transport to raise matched funding. - - 2 ROAD ACCESS - The Infrastructure study notes that performance of the M66/A56 is forecast to continue to deteriorate over the Plan period. - I do not understand how you can plan for 4000 more homes without specific SMART (timed, measurable) objectives for improving flows on this strategic transport corridor.		POLITICS: both main parties have recently campaigned to 'Keep Rossendale Green.' If you have any integrity you will ensure that Dobbin Wood remains green and is not built on, in accordance with the original CPO (1983) 'for the purposes of preserving or enhancing the beauty' of this key local asset. - - METHODOLOGY: over 10% of homes in my road (BB4 7PD) appear to have been unoccupied for the last 5 years. The local plan should factor in the number of vacant homes and bring these into use before desecrating irreplaceable areas of woodland within the urban boundary. - - HOLISTIC PLANNING: the Council and local MP need to prevail upon the government to develop a holistic approach to planning, delegated to local level which respects our topography and local housing needs, not imposed national targets, and maintains police stations, health and education infrastructure and museums of national significance if the local economy is to be developed; or, if austerity is to be imposed, plan on building fewer houses and accept that the local population will shrink. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
481	John	Atherton		SHMA	Not Applicable	<p>Sorry, we are late getting back to you from the Open Day – we said we would write to you regarding the Strategic Housing Market Area (SHMA) and the affordability of housing in Rossendale:–</p> <p>We mentioned to you (at the Evidence Base Open Day) details of a report by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (7 sept' 2015) about Greenvale homes and the housing register not being kept up to date – there were 1567 applicants on the housing register but 923 of these applicants are not making any bids for properties. The reason we mentioned this was because we do not think that the report by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee was considered in the SHMA - the report showed good evidence of some of the practices used by Greenvale Homes in managing the housing stock of social housing in Rossendale, including the number of re-lets.</p> <p>Another issue we would like to mention is that in the executive summary of the SHMA – it refers to building more aspirational housing to stop the high net out migration of people to surrounding districts, which the Planning Department has mentioned in the new Local Plan - but the SHMA does not supply any evidence that building more 4/5 bedroomed detached housing would stop people moving out of the area? (it seems wrong to assume without evidence, that people are moving out of the areas because there is not enough aspirational housing – there could be many reasons e.g.: road congestion getting worse, moving nearer workplace, children finishing education, aging population downsizing home etc.)</p> <p>Also, pages 60-61 of the SHMA shows evidence of a net in migration of people into Rossendale – it's a bit confusing.</p> <p>On the issue of affordability of housing in Rossendale, the SHMA report (table 4.9) says that 82% of newly forming households in Rossendale cannot afford to buy lower quartile priced property and that 72% of all households cannot afford to buy lower quartile priced property. To say that 72% of all households cannot afford to buy a property seems hard to understand. Using even the simplest scenario of calculating affordability of housing, using the lowest quartile property and using the legal minimum and living wage rates, show that a dual household in full time employment can easily afford to buy and rent this type of a property.</p> <p>Two people coming together to buy or rent a house today is the norm – example: Two people, both are 25 years old and working in Rossendale, meet, fall in love, and decide to buy a home together. Both people are working full time and earn the living wage (£7.50 per hr) - what housing would be affordable? and using the same scenario but these two people are between 19 and 24 years old, earning the minimum wage (£7.05 per hr) . These scenarios could be two friends, siblings, extended family members etc. buying or renting property together.</p> <p>The table below shows the details of this simple scenario, by using the lowest</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						<p>structure for newly forming households - because the minimum wage is the minimum wage – there is no lower wage.</p> <p>We hope that you will consider our points, we think this information is important and could help in deciding the correct number of affordable houses to be built in Rossendale.</p> <p>Hope to hear from you and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any queries.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Not Applicable	<p>Consultation Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) July 2017</p> <p>Historic England is the Government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). We champion and protect England's historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, enjoyed and cared for.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above, this letter details the expectations of the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) and the historic environment.</p> <p>The preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan in support of the Local Plan provides an opportunity to acknowledge and respond to the many opportunities that exist to help secure the conservation and enhancement of the area's historic environment.</p> <p>Evidence Base</p> <p>Throughout the plan-making process, it is important that the Council produces a draft Local Plan that it is fully informed by an adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence base for the historic environment. This is important to ensure the appropriate consideration of infrastructure at both a strategic and local authority-wide level, as well as for individual sites and for specific localities and 'area-based' plans. This will ensure that the Council has a better understanding of the demands that new development may place on the areas in which it takes place and the potential implications and opportunities this may have for the historic environment.</p> <p>A Positive Strategy for the Historic Environment</p> <p>Many infrastructure projects may be associated with the repair and maintenance of heritage assets and it is now well established that heritage is not an adjunct to a healthy economy, but an important component of growth and a source of employment.</p> <p>Infrastructure is typically grouped according to three main categories covering physical, green and social (and community) infrastructure. Each of these categories can and should be broadly interpreted to include opportunities for the sustainable management of the area's historic environment and its heritage assets. It is important that as part of the Local Plan, that it contributes towards delivering a positive strategy for the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the historic environment as outlined in the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) (NPPF).</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>The NPPF endorses the protection and enhancement of the historic environment as an integral part of sustainable development (paragraphs 7 and 9) and recognises the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits it can bring (paragraph 126). The IDP should ensure that it is clear on the range of ways in which the historic environment can contribute to and benefit from the infrastructure and investment needs required to create and maintain sustainable communities.</p> <p>Physical Infrastructure</p> <p>Heritage assets can help to deliver a range of infrastructure needs associated with, for example, housing, economic development and sustainable transport networks. Historic buildings within or in the vicinity of a settlement may offer opportunities for residential reuse, including for affordable housing. Many heritage assets are economic assets in their own right, supporting not just the tourism sector but the broader regeneration and economic growth of the area. For example, the adaptive reuse and repair of historic buildings may offer opportunities for business or employment use in both urban and rural contexts (see: Constructive Conservation – Sustainable Growth for Historic Places and The reuse and conversion of historic farm buildings on the Historic England website https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/constructive-conservation/sustainable-growth-for-historic-places/).</p> <p>More generally the investment in heritage assets (e.g. heritage at risk), and the wider historic character of a place (e.g. conservation areas at risk) may also serve to strengthen and reinforce the attractiveness of a place to retain and attract economic development and to stimulate and support the area's tourism offer. Investment could be directed to establishing or extending area-based schemes aimed at regenerating valued historic townscapes, as exemplified by Townscape Heritage Initiatives supported by the HLF and Historic England's current programme of partnership working. Specific opportunities may also exist to further develop the tourism offer of established heritage assets open to the public (such as those managed by the National Trust or English Heritage) and their links to nearby communities. Historic England also has a number of other publications that illustrate other practical examples of where the protection and adaptation of historic places through active management (constructive conservation) can deliver social and economic benefits, this includes Valuing Places: Good Practice in Conservation Areas (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/valuing-places/) and Constructive Conservation In Practice (https://historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/constructive-conservation-in-practice/).</p> <p>Improvements to the public realm in town and village centres can help encourage walking and cycling and support the delivery of sustainable</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						<p>transport objectives. Investment in the public realm can also support the delivery of the objectives for the historic environment through helping to deliver conservation area management plans and tackling issues related to heritage at risk. Improvements could include promoting community based de-cluttering audits and the better coordination of signage and street furniture. Improvements in the overall quality, character and indeed functioning of areas can also contribute to wider policy aims linked to tourism, the economy and the built environment.</p> <p>In certain cases direct investment in a heritage asset might be required to support the development of an area - for example, investment in the improvement and or maintenance of an historic bridge where it is part of the transport infrastructure for the planned development. In this regard, the local authority should give consideration to any historic assets, particularly those identified as at risk, which could be targeted for investment for their repair and appropriate reuse in support of the economy. The IDP should also recognise the historic value of green infrastructure and it should ensure that it has considered areas of the public realm which could be highlighted for future investment, especially where the local area is likely to receive future development and increased use and pressure.</p> <p>Social and Community Infrastructure</p> <p>Historic buildings, including places of worship, can accommodate many social and community services and activities as well as represent a focus for the community in their own right. Investment in their continued or improved maintenance would help extend the capacity of existing infrastructure. Promoting the adaptive reuse of a vacant or underused building or facilitating the multiple-use of existing buildings for a wider range of community services might also offer the opportunity to support the repair and maintenance of historic buildings, particularly where identified nationally or locally as being at risk.</p> <p>The community transfer of assets may also be an option for delivering infrastructure and the sustainable management of heritage assets. Guidance and case studies for local authorities, public sector bodies and community groups on the transfer of ownership and the management of historic buildings, monuments or landscapes is available on the Historic England website including Pillars of the Community: The Transfer of Local Authority Heritage Assets (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/pillars-of-thecomunity/). In supporting access to green space and encouraging walking and cycling, extensions to the public rights of way network can help increase access to heritage assets and their improved interpretation and enjoyment. The provision of open space might also be linked to improving public access to historic landscapes in the vicinity.</p> <p>Social and community infrastructure may also include cultural facilities such as</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						<p>local museums. Investment may offer opportunities to widen and improve their use by existing and new communities as well as supporting the tourism economy. The IDP should identify historic buildings that are capable of delivering social and community based services and facilities which are in need of investment for their repair and or future maintenance.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>The historic environment and heritage assets can make a valuable contribution to the green infrastructure network and its wider functions; providing, for example, leisure and recreation opportunities, encouraging walking and cycling and strengthening local character and sense of place. Historic parks & gardens, archaeological sites, the grounds of historic buildings and green spaces within conservation areas can all form part of a green infrastructure network, as well as underpin the character and distinctiveness of an area and its sense of place. Other heritage assets can also offer a range of opportunities such as churchyards and the wider countryside including networks of 'green-lanes', common land and historic parkland.</p> <p>Funding</p> <p>In the context of the Community Infrastructure Levy, a wide definition of infrastructure continues to be promoted in terms of what can be funded by the levy and is needed for supporting the development of an area. This can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Open space: as well as parks and green spaces and green infrastructure networks, this might also include wider public realm improvements encompassing historic areas and townscapes possibly linked to a Heritage Lottery Fund scheme and drawing on relevant conservation area appraisals, management plans and characterisation studies; · Repairs and improvements to, and the maintenance of, heritage assets where they are an infrastructure item as identified by the 2008 Act, such as educational or sporting or recreational facilities which may be hosted in an historic building or area; · Maintenance and ongoing costs which may be relevant for a range of heritage assets, for example transport infrastructure such as historic bridges; and · 'In kind' payments, including land transfers which could include the transfer of an 'at risk' building to a new owner as part of a comprehensive regeneration scheme. <p>Development-specific planning obligations continue to offer further opportunities for funding improvements to, and the mitigation of, adverse impacts on the historic environment, such as archaeological investigations, access and interpretation, and the repair and reuse of buildings and other heritage assets.</p> <p>Historic England urges the local authority to ensure that the IDP gives</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						appropriate consideration to the full range of funding opportunities, including the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which can serve to support the implementation of a positive strategy for the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the area's historic environment and its heritage assets.		
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England	Sustainability Appraisal	Not Applicable	<p>Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan - Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>Historic England is the Government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). We champion and protect England's historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, enjoyed and cared for.</p> <p>Historic England has produced a document, which you might find helpful in providing guidance on the effective assessment of the historic environment in Strategic Environmental Assessments. This can be found at https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainabilityappraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/.</p> <p>In light of Historic England's response to the Local Plan consultation and our recommendations, Historic England will not be responding on the Sustainability Appraisal at this stage.</p>		
1002	David	Morris	-	5 Year Housing Supply	Object	<p>Under current the draft DCLG - Standardised Methodology - the calculation of housing numbers will change - leading to a reduction in the amount of housing needed in the borough. - From a current OAN of 265 dwellings per annum; the figure will be 212 on the proposed formulae. - This reduces the overage need from 2650 to 2120 over the plan period - a change of 530 dwellings. - - This reduction should be on the proposed greenbelt release sites. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Not Applicable	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been published alongside the Draft Local Plan, as part of the evidence base required by NPPF.</p> <p>In terms of the delivery of new highway infrastructure within the borough, the introductory chapter highlights the challenges that this brings:</p> <p>“the physical constraints of Rossendale mean that delivery of infrastructure can be significantly affected by the topography of the area. Flat or easy to develop land is at a premium. High levels of flood risk are a feature of the area. Because of the highly urbanised nature of the Borough it is challenging to introduce new infrastructure, such as bypasses or new roads without adversely affecting what is already built.”</p> <p>3.2 TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>The Transport section of the IDP refers to Lancashire County Council’s East Lancashire Transport Masterplan, prepared by Jacobs and published in December 2016. It states that this Study recommended that the following options should be progressed:</p> <p>Figure 3-1 - East Lancashire Transport Masterplan Options</p> <p>In terms of junction improvements on the A56, as stated in the IDP, Highways England recently completed a scheme to introduce traffic signals to control each arm of the A56 roundabout at Rising Bridge (A56 junction with A680). To clarify the position of Highways England in regard to the upgrading of the M66 to SMART motorway, the identification and prioritisation of improvements such as this fall within the scope of preparations for the second Roads Investment Strategy (RIS2). Following a period of public consultation during winter 2017/18, DfT and Highways England will each develop outline proposals for RIS2 during 2018, which will then be subject to an efficiency review by the Office of Rail and Road (ORR). Taking ORR’s advice on board, an agreed RIS2 will then be published in 2019. At that point, it will be known which major improvements such as this are likely to be funded during the period 2020-25. At this stage, the content of RIS3 (2025-30) isn’t known, with evidence-gathering preparations beginning for this from 2022 onwards.</p> <p>The IDP states that Highways England would be likely to resist the construction of new accesses onto its network in Rossendale in line with DfT Policy Circular 02/2013 ‘The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development’, because the scale of development would not be classified as strategic development in national terms. This statement is correct, in that the Circular sets out a presumption against new accesses and junctions being created on high-speed routes such as the A56(T), except at the plan-making stage where it can be demonstrated that it would facilitate ‘strategic, planned growth’. It is Highways England’s view that the scale and of these proposed allocated sites would not meet the criteria of being ‘strategic’ in the context of the Policy Circular / Highways England Licence. It is</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						<p>recommended that careful consideration is given to the access arrangements for all of the allocated sites and that Highways England is kept informed of this. The IDP refers to the geotechnical issues with the A56 embankment in Edenfield that would need to be addressed in any adjacent development proposals. This issue is discussed in this review under the Edenfield Policy of the Drat Local Plan.</p> <p>The IDP states that the Highway Authority is working with the Borough Council and Highways England to assess key transport issues within the Borough including modelling improvements at key locations. It states that the scope of the Study has yet to be finalised but will form a key component in the development of the Plan, with the following junctions identified by Highways England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Rising Bridge ☐ Todd Hall Road access (only if this left-in/left-out access to the northbound carriageway forms a route into the wider employment allocations E04 / E03) ☐ Grane Road (probably a lower priority; most influenced by the housing site on the corner of Grane Rd and Holcombe Rd) ☐ Haslingden Interchange / Tesco roundabout. ☐ A683 Rawtenstall Spurr roundabouts (in terms of queues back from the roundabouts and onto the A56). ☐ A56 / M66 'Junction 0' at Edenfield <p>Whilst the above statement acknowledges the fact that a transport study is required and will form a key component in the development of the Plan, as stated elsewhere in this review, it is now essential that this highways evidence base is produced as soon as possible, to enable Highways England to come to a view on the traffic impact of the Local Plan proposals on the SRN and thereby provide a full response to the consultation. Without it, there may be delays to future stages of the plan-making process. The production of an appropriate highways evidence base will also be used to inform future iterations of the IDP, which is a live document and can therefore be subject to revisions throughout the course of the Local Plan period.</p> <p>Please see appendix for figure 3.1</p>		
1614	Helen	Ledger	Sports England	Playing Pitch Strategy	Not Applicable	1. Evidence base – welcome reference to the playing pitch strategy. This is a key document and the local plan a key delivery mechanism.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Not Applicable	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>5.31 The DLP is accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). This notes that the Borough's infrastructure will be the subject of investment on a case-by-case basis as new development comes on stream. The purpose of the IDP is to identify the infrastructure which may be required. The IDP notes that this may provide a "...baseline for any contribution requests if the Council decides to pursue the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)...". The content and potential implications of the IDP is discussed below.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements</p> <p>5.32 The IDP is relatively high level and will be further developed as the emerging Local Plan is progressed. However, it is clear that a significant proportion of infrastructure identified within it is strategic in nature and that there is already a need for it. Peel agrees that new development must contribute to infrastructure provision. There are clear legal and policy parameters for how this can be achieved. Contributions must be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development proposed. It is unrealistic to expect that developments can fund new infrastructure without public sector investment where that infrastructure is strategic in nature and relates to existing capacity issues. The NPPF establishes clear tests in this regard; developer contributions must be "...fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development...". This test is enshrined within legislation. If the scale of the contributions which are sought for new infrastructure are not proportionate, it will undermine the viability of development.</p> <p>5.33 The immediate priority must be to assemble a robust and comprehensive IDP. This should include engagement with Government and infrastructure providers regarding the investment needed to secure growth in the Borough. This should include exploring options for public sector investment in strategic new infrastructure. Peel would welcome discussions with RBC in respect of this matter. This will inform the continued preparation of the IDP and determine the scale of obligations which may be required, having regard to development viability and relevant statutory and policy tests.</p> <p>Community Infrastructure Levy</p> <p>5.34 The introduction of CIL has the potential to raise questions and uncertainty for landowners and developers, which could deter investment. It is Peel's view that CIL may not form the most suitable vehicle for delivering the infrastructure required in the Borough.</p> <p>5.35 RBC will no doubt be aware that a national review of CIL has been undertaken on behalf of the Government. It has concluded that the current system for developer contributions is not as fast, simple, certain or transparent as intended. It therefore recommends the implementation of a new system which will bring back the use of Section 106 Agreements as the primary basis for delivering infrastructure to support development sites,</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						<p>particularly where they are strategic in nature. The Housing White Paper confirms that the Government is considering those recommendations and will announce its decision on how to proceed alongside the Autumn Budget. This renders the future of CIL somewhat uncertain.</p> <p>5.36 It is important that the process and mechanism(s) for infrastructure delivery are progressed before the emerging Local Plan is progressed to the next stage.</p>		
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd	Development viability	Not Applicable	<p>Development viability</p> <p>5.37 Peel provides comments on the viability evidence published alongside the DLP in a standalone representation which is included at Appendix 1 of this report.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd	The Green Belt Assessment	Not Applicable	<p>The Green Belt Assessment</p> <p>5.26 The preparation of the DLP and, in particular, the identification of proposed development allocations has been informed by the Green Belt Review⁴⁸ (GBR). It considers the contribution that specific parcels of land make to the purposes of the Green Belt and the potential degree of harm which might result from the development of that land. Peel notes, however, that the parcels of land which are considered in the GBA in many cases do not relate to the sites which were submitted for consideration via the “call for sites” process or the sites which have been selected for release by the DLP. As such, the findings of the GBR are not directly related to the potential development land available to meet the housing needs of the Borough.</p> <p>5.27 For example, land parcel ref. 25 in the GBR equates to a swathe of land south of Rawtenstall and north of Edenfield (see Figure 5.1 below). Peel has promoted the release of a small area of land to the north of that wider parcel (the merits of this site are discussed in detail in chapter 6). Given its relative size and attributes, that small area makes a much less significant contribution to the Green Belt purposes than the wider land parcel assessed by the GBR. It is therefore considered that the findings of the GBR should be revisited to consider the merits of potential development sites rather than wider parcels of land which are more strategic in nature.</p> <p>5.28 Notwithstanding the above, the methodology of the GBR in assessing specific parcels of land is considered to be broadly appropriate. It is, however, noted that in relation to the second purpose of Green Belt, the GBR considers both the extent to which a parcel maintains the separation of settlements which are physically separate and the role it plays in preventing further coalescence of settlements (or parts of the urban area) which have already merged to varying degrees. Peel does not agree with this approach.</p> <p>5.29 The NPPF clearly identifies that the purpose of Green Belt in this regard is to “...prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another...”⁴⁹. If two towns have already merged then the Green Belt cannot prevent them from merging, because it has already occurred. This is the case across various parts of Rossendale, in which many formerly separate settlements and communities have merged over time to form a single contiguous urban area. It is important that merging of settlements is seen in this context. It is acknowledged that Green Belt land can play a role in preventing further merging between settlements which have already coalesced. However, in such cases the contribution that the land makes to the ‘merging’ purpose cannot be considered “strong” because it can only prevent further merging and cannot maintain their physical separation. Land can only make a “strong” contribution to this Green Belt purpose where settlements are physically separate.</p> <p>5.30 As such, the GBR has insufficient regard to the nature of the form of the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	-----------------

urban area in Rossendale in considering the role of the Green Belt around the settlements. It should be amended in this regard to make clear how land that is between areas of the conurbation – rather than between separate settlements – has been assessed.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council	Sustainability Appraisal	Not Applicable	<p>Human health: To improve physical and mental health and well-being of people and reduce health inequalities in Rossendale</p> <p>The indicators included for monitoring within the SA Framework are to be commended.</p> <p>Life Expectancy</p> <p>As can be seen in Figures 15 and 16, within Rossendale life expectancy for males and females has generally been significantly below the England average since 2001.</p> <p>Figure 15xv: Life expectancy at birth (Male) Figure 16xvi: Life expectancy at birth (Female)</p> <p>Physical Activity/Physical Inactivity</p> <p>Public Health England has an indicator for measuring physical activity and inactivity in the adult population. Figure 17 shows that the rate of physically inactive adults in Rossendale is significantly above the England average and Figure 18 shows that excess weight in adults in Rossendale is also above the national average.</p> <p>Figure 17xvii: Percentage of physically inactivity adult – current method - Rossendale</p> <p>Figure 18xviii: Excess weight in Adults – Rossendale</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>In addition to these health indicators, we would recommend inclusion of the following:</p> <p>Excess weight in Adults (figure 18), and as mentioned earlier, excess weight and obesity in children (reception and year 6) in order to track the progress of policies such as the Hot Food Takeaway policy, which are partially aimed at addressing excess weight within the population.</p> <p>Indicators are available from the Public Health Outcomes Framework: http://www.phoutcomes.info/</p> <p>Transport: Improve the choice and use of sustainable transport in Rossendale and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) indicator</p> <p>As has already been stated in our comments on the Local Plan, Transport policy section, Rossendale has had KSI figures higher than the national average for 2012-2014 and 2013-2015.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>We recommend the inclusion of Public Health England's KSI indicatorxix within the transport section of the SA Framework.</p> <p>This indicator is also available from the Public Health Outcomes Framework: http://www.phoutcomes.info/</p> <p>Please see appendix for figures</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
1774	Melanie	Lindsey	The Coal Authority	Site Assessment Methodologies	Support	<p>Representation No.3 Site Assessment Methodologies Test of Soundness Positively Prepared: Yes Justified: Yes Effective: Yes Consistency to NPPF: Yes Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Coopeate: Yes</p> <p>Support – The Coal Authority is pleased to see that the site assessments for both the housing and employment allocations have been considered against criteria which include mineral sterilisation and land instability issues.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Not Applicable	<p>Infrastructure Issues: RCT note areas, see in bold, where present capacity ought to affect where and when development should take place.</p> <p>A. Education</p> <p>Current data provided by Lancashire County Council School Planning Team indicate that there is a projected shortfall of primary school places across the Rawtenstall and Ramsbottom areas within the next 5 years of the local plan. Secondary schools currently show a surplus across the district, Fearn is the main High School with available space. Currently LCC have indicated they are not actively looking for additional secondary schools sites and continue to monitor the housing to be brought forward to understand the impact across secondary schools in Rossendale.</p> <p>B. Transport</p> <p>The Highway Authority is working with the Borough Council and Highways England to assess key transport issues within the Borough including modelling improvements at key locations.</p> <p>The valley nature of the Borough and the high degree of urbanisation along main roads means that there is little option for widening or making junction improvements to the existing network. Significant congestion occurs in the peak periods around Rawtenstall especially on the Gyrotory which is expected to reach capacity by 2023; at the bottom end of Bank Street and at Tup Bridge junction. Waterfoot roundabout and Toll Barr, Stacksteads are also sites of significant congestion.</p> <p>There is currently no proposal for upgrading the M66 to a Smart Motorway and this would need to be considered for funding as part of next Roads Investment Strategy (RIS) which covers the period 2020-2025. However the route is one of those being looked at in the Transport for the North (TFN) Central Strategic Corridor Study which will feed into the overall TfN Strategic Plan due to be published in the summer of 2018.</p> <p>Highways England would be likely to resist the construction of new accesses onto its network in Rossendale in line with Circular DfT Policy Circular 02/2013 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development'. This is because the scale of development would not be classified as strategic development in national terms. Some existing junctions onto the A56, such as at Carrs Industrial estate, are substandard.</p> <p>There are geotechnical issues with the A56 embankment in Edenfield that would need to be addressed in any adjacent development proposals.</p> <p>C. Utilities</p> <p>Water and sewerage United Utilities has identified no in principle concerns regarding the proposed development.....may be necessary to coordinate the delivery of development with infrastructure improvements through planning condition. It is also important to note that not all development comes forward on allocated sites and therefore the cumulative impact of development can be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						<p>different in reality as a result of windfall sites.</p> <p>Electricity Specific development proposals within the Rossendale area are unlikely to have a significant direct effect upon National Grid's electricity transmission infrastructure. The local electricity supply network is operated by Electricity North West. The network is generally performing adequately but there are a number of substations which are operating at capacity, e.g in Edenfield and which will require enhancement before more major development can be accommodated.</p> <p>D. Health At the projected rate of population increase (assuming an equal distribution of growth) all the GP practices would be full in the first five years of the Plan. In practice the distribution of growth is likely to put the greatest pressure of growth on Bacup and Rawtenstall. The capacity of GP practices outside the area, e.g., in Ramsbottom were the proposed growth of Edenfield to progress, would also be a factor.</p> <p>As with much of the country Rossendale faces the challenge of an ageing population. Lancashire County Council plays a major role in delivering adult social care alongside the CCG. Delivery of this function is facing financial pressures with the potential to affect both the provision of new facilities and the quality of care.</p> <p>E. Emergency services There are no current plans to alter facilities but there is a recognised need to improve the performance of the Gyrotory in Rawtenstall, within which Rawtenstall Fire Station is located. This would require relocation of the existing fire station. NOTE living accom recently provided.</p> <p>F. Community Facilities Edenfield Community Centre RCT NOTE no Library in Edenfield – Ramsbottom???</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
1809	Alex	Rowe	Natural England	Habitats Regulation Assesment (HRA)	Not Applicable	<p>Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)</p> <p>Natural England has the following comments with regards to the HRA: The HRA has not shown how each policy and allocation has been screened out. Natural England would like to see a full audit trail and an explanation for why each policy and allocation will not have a significant effect. Changes in hydraulic conditions (4.7) Natural England agrees with the statements in the HRA but it could be an option to provide further explanation for why there are no impacts. Public access, outdoor sports and recreational activities (4.9) Recreational disturbance has not been addressed in the HRA because of the lack of available data. Further clarification is required to explain how the HRA proposed to address recreational disturbance. Physical modification (4.12) Further explanation is required for point 4.12.4 to explain why no part of the plan is likely to contribute to the pressure/threats of physical modifications. This could be because of the proximity of allocations, which requires further details. We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>Annex 1: Planning consultation: Draft Local Plan for Rossendale (Regulation 18) Location: Rossendale Assessing Impacts of Wind Farm Development on Blanket Peatland in England Project Report and Guidance (2009) by Maslen Environmental: 5.4 Siting of Wind Farms on Blanket Bog “The following guidelines should be followed: 1. Where there is a mixture of habitats the infrastructure should be concentrated on the non-blanket bog areas, as indicated by the depth of peat, rather than by contemporary vegetation. 2. In general infrastructure should avoid areas of deep peat (i.e. greater than 0.5 m depth). On many sites there are areas of deep and shallower peat – the deep peat should be avoided in the site design. There should be evidence in the EIA that deep peat has been avoided where choices exist. 3. Where the blanket bog is reasonably intact and not dissected by gullies which cut the full thickness of the peat, the roads should be located away from deep peat. 4. If roads do cross deep degraded peat they should constructed in a manner not to disrupt the flow of water through or over the bog, but to stem the flow through the gullies in favour of a wide spread over the peat surface. 5. The hydrological impact of a wind farm on degraded peat where the peat body is dissected into a number of separate peat areas may be less than on an</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						<p>intact bog, though if poorly designed can simply exacerbate an already bad erosive condition. The design of the wind farm layout, location of turbines, roads and mitigation measures has the potential to help or hinder the future restoration of the blanket bog.</p> <p>a. Construction of tracks crossing gullies has the potential to be used to partially block the gullies and to construct partial blocking of gullies, to reduce erosion, runoff and promote blanket bog restoration. Care will be needed to manage this geotechnically, to avoid peat slippage.</p> <p>b. The orientation of roads has the potential to be located either parallel or across the natural drainage through the peat, and consideration of the impacts of this needs to be made.</p> <p>i. Drainage associated with tracks located parallel to natural drainage, need to be designed so that there are checks in the drainage channels to reduce runoff rates and velocities to background levels.</p> <p>ii. Tracks perpendicular to natural drainage lines will disrupt the diffuse nature of flow, but may also impede flow which may be currently directed down erosional channels.</p> <p>The impact of this needs to be assessed in the EIA.</p> <p>6. It is very important that the mitigation measures indicated in the EIA are carried forward to the construction method statement and so implemented on site. For this purposes it is important that the mitigation measures are specific and quantified. Use of contractors familiar with working on peat sites is an advantage. The use of mitigation measures and proposed restoration should be controlled via a planning condition. Monitoring may also be specified in planning conditions.</p> <p>7. Provision should be made for the potential to incorporate restoration measures into the site design. These could include:</p> <p>a. Blocking of erosional drainage channels;</p> <p>b. Promoting of re-vegetation of degraded areas.”.</p>		
1809	Alex	Rowe	Natural England	Sustainability Appriasal	Not Applicable	<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>We have not reviewed the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) because of time constrains and instead decided to concentrate our advice by concentrating our efforts on key parts of the Draft Local Plan for Rossendale.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
1823	Janet	Baguley	Natural England		Not Applicable	<p>In relation to the Rossendale Borough Environmental Network Study by TEP (Jan 2017) one of my colleagues on our Uplands Team has had a look through and provided some brief comments which I hope you find useful:</p> <p>We strongly support the work being done on preparing an environmental network study for Rossendale which will be a valuable tool when allocating development and seeking opportunities to enhance the natural environment. The following comments identify some areas where the study could be strengthened/improved.</p> <p>We feel the study currently overlooks the important connection between the uplands and elsewhere in the borough. There is little reference to the importance of the upland areas for retaining water and slowing the flow through appropriate management/restoration. The study gives more attention to managing watercourses and the benefits of tree planting overlooking the extensive area of peatland in Rossendale. For management of some corridors action needs to start at the top of the hill. Appropriate management and restoration of peatlands on a catchment level will have benefits to water management, reducing flood risk, biodiversity & peoples enjoyment.</p> <p>The following paragraphs link to this matter:</p> <p>Para 10. sub-catchments only refers to woodland planting benefits – remember peatland restoration benefits.</p> <p>Para 19. valleys flood proofing - remember action needed in the uplands to achieve this.</p> <p>Para 21. policy relating to managing land to increase biodiversity should include reference to safeguarding priority habitats, reference to latter in 7.84/7.91.</p> <p>Para 5.17. benefits of green infrastructure reference to SUDS/urban GI, overlooks rural action i.e. management of water flow above valleys. Need combination of GI & land management in uplands to maximise benefits.</p> <p>Para 5.34. comment here regarding the challenge of risk of flooding illustrates the importance of managing the catchments, i.e. peatland to slow the flow.</p> <p>Para. 7.24. seems to overlook importance of holding back the water on the moors through appropriate management/restoration only referring to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Evidence Ba	Further comment
						streams /tree planting benefits. Para 7.81. does refer to managing land to retain water, reduce run-off etc. but main report doesn't expand on this. Report should refer to priority habitats. Para. 5.38 . does not list 3 SSSSIs correctly, names should be Lee Quarry, Hodge Clough & Lower Red Lees Pasture and West Pennine Moors at the time of the report was legally protected through notification.		
Number of comments						Evidence Base	16	

General Comments

Reference	General	General				
16	Diane	Neville	Ribble Valley Borough Council	Not Applicable	Do not wish to object to any of the Policies or Site Allocations. No issues for concern (with Ribble Valley).	Thank you for consulting Ribble Valley Borough Council. We have no specific comments to make on the policies or the site allocations. We acknowledge the efforts that have been made between our two LPAs in relation to duty-to-cooperate in order to continue our on-going working relationship and are satisfied that this duty has been met.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
17	Gary	Cunliffe	-		Not Applicable	after attending the river side today 27th july i have to say your plans and reality seem to be 2 very different things. your looking at adding 400 or thereabouts houses within whitworth and shawforth yet no extra facilities, schools or transport links outside of the cycle route which has now been pushed back from 2019 to 2020 according to your plans. let alone the little fact no one seems able to say who will actually maintain the cycle route. - - your evidence claims that no schools in whitworth are over subscribed, which is at the very least false or a blatant lie as both tonnercliffe and whitworth high school where refusing any more students the past year even from local residents! - - no new gp's or improvements to the roads and not even a hint of acknowledgement that the ONLY road through the valley gets bad at rush hour or whenever it gets dug up. the plan also states the busses run every 15 mins. sure mon to fri from 6am up to 7pm depending on direction they do. but after that its every half hour and saturday is similar sunday though every half hour between 9am and 9am give or take a few mins. - - the plan overall does seem to have been slapped together to have the most information possible while not giving straight answers or the correct information where needed. and no proper scope for the need for more jobs in whitworth just more housing which we have more than enough now with the lack of investment over the past decades. this needs a lot of work and possibly by local residents who know the area and its issues.		-
31	Rachelle	Whalley	-		Not Applicable	I feel the whole draft plan, it's language and navigation is not easily accessible to many of the people being consulted and this concerns me. - I am also very concerned that the council are taking a 'back door' approach to development, stating that planning will be approved quickly to those boosting development makes the valley attractive to large chain business taking away from the unique and unusual benefits of local shopping in Rossendale. This is something I feel should be exploited with more support for small independent businesses and financing. - Waterfoot (central) in particular is now needing an economic boost with no more takeaways or tattooists given planning permission and funding for the start up of new independent retailers. - This draft plan sees some parts of the valley left behind, and more importantly the layout and accessibility of this consultation means that the very communities you claim to want to engage are excluded.		-
65	Matthew	Devlin	-		Support	It's great to see Bacup having investment, plans and upgrades being considered. Keep up the great work!		I support the local policy plan!

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
68	J H	Teasdale			Not Applicable	<p>Enclosed is a list of your information documents regarding the publications of the local plan; with my personal comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing Market: - My 'In Laws' lived up Hall Carr, and I found no fault in the houses which they occupied; the last being a small house on Cherry Crescent. The current new estates seem to be all large houses, which to my mind, are built for people working in Manchester, not for local rate-payers!! 2. Westminster quotes Brown Field Sites . The 1891 Map of wgutewekk river (from Whitewell Bottom to Waterfoot) shows at least 10 factories which have now closed down. 3. Green Belt: - Why waste time by helping rich people break the law. 4.Floods: - westminster again!! The government has a local branch of the Water-Board. Make them do the work!! They must get the cash. 5. Gypsy & Fellow Travellers - can you afford to emply a man who will collect cash from the users of this site??? 6 + 7: Houses for our own Local People are what we need. 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment	
155	Jo	Furtado			Not Applicable	<p>1. Map</p> <p>The map accompanying the Draft Local Plan that I read online three days ago was very unclear.</p> <p>Yesterday I went to Whitworth Library, where the map was much better, though still unclear in one or two areas, and not altogether accurate. Firstly, it shows only two areas of shopping in Whitworth, one just south of Tong Lane and another around Station Road, Facit: it omits the shops around the junction of Market Street and Hall Street.</p> <p>Secondly, it shows the cycle path through Facit as continuous: it is not, because there is a stretch from the corner of Cowm Park Way North and Station Road heading north which does not exist, necessitating a diversion (signed) onto the A671 before re-joining the cycleway via a road opposite the bottom of Studd Brow.</p> <p>Both these things are trivial in themselves, but the fact that they exist feels of a piece with a much more significant omission which I'll come to later.</p> <p>2. Schools/GP surgeries</p> <p>The building of more houses implies a rise in the population. The DLP itself has nothing to say about the pressures on schools/GP surgeries. However, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that Whitworth schools have very little spare capacity: locally we are told that the High School is oversubscribed; as a parent/grandparent I have considerable experience of the traffic congestion/danger at school start and finish times; as an ex-teacher I suffered 19 years in an inadequate "temporary" portakabin when my school expanded its intake beyond its capacity to cope. I am told that our local GP surgery is full to bursting too.</p> <p>I am surprised that these fundamental issues have no place in the Draft Local Plan, which in many other ways is an admirably holistic piece of work.</p> <p>6. Online DLP</p> <p>Getting started is not easy -the user has to make some assumptions about which of those boxes to go to. If your aim is to encourage participation in the democratic process the front page should tell the user, step by step, what they should be doing. Once in, how sensible is it to present your page. 'n two columns, which requires the user to be constantly scrolling up and down! The process becomes even more fiddly because the columns are taller than the screen. Keep it simple - from the reader's perspective, not that of the person whose job it is to get the document onto the computer.</p> <p>7. Online questionnaire</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>Somewhere I read that the online questionnaire would allow me to comment on 10 issues, whether of policy or site allocation. I found getting started on the questionnaire difficult, but persisted. By question 33 I'd commented on five items, some very briefly, and the questionnaire said I'd used up 46% of my allocation. I added another page, taking me to q.38, where the comment was very brief, only to find that I was now at 85%. How? More to the point, it meant that the next page would ask me if I had anything else to add, signalling the end of my questionnaire, which thus did not allow me to comment on alii wished to comment on in any structured way. I wondered if I could delete the whole questionnaire and start again, but could not see a way to do that.</p> <p>I feel like I have wasted a lot of time, which is deeply irritating. The process makes me feel foolish, which I resent. The whole episode makes me wonder if there is an attempt, conscious or otherwise, being made to exclude from consideration all those of us who are not computer-savvy enough, which is annoying because I don't like conspiracy theories.</p> <p>I am a reasonably thoughtful, reasonably articulate resident of Rossendale, and this letter represents my contribution to the DLP consultation process. I ask three things: 1. That this letter be accepted as such. I accept that it is reasonable for someone in your team to rework the totality of my comments into a format that can be tallied according to your own structures. 2. That someone on your team acknowledges receipt of this letter, as presumably would be automatically the case had I proceeded to the end of the questionnaire and submitted electronically. I'd prefer receipt by mail, please. SAE enclosed. 3. That next time you do a consultation you work harder to make the process idiot-proof. (For the sake of clarity -/ am the idiot.)</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
167	Peter	Ruane			Object	<p>At reading the proposed Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) Emerging Local Plan for Rossendale and the proposals for Whitworth, I feel it reads rather like a wish list than a serious attempt at sustainable development. Although mentioning the historical background behind Whitworth's ribbon-like growth on either side of the A671 due to its geographical location, it then proceeds to ignore it in much the same manner as Planners in the past have failed to improve the infrastructure, (Paragraph 7+ 21 National Planning Policy Framework March 2012), and not improving the situation, which would have allowed growth that enhances Whitworth. -"The purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development. Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations. (Rt Hon Greg Clark MP Minister for Planning National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012 - Department for Communities and Local Government)</p> <p>The Emerging Local Plan (Policy HS 1) sets out how the criteria has been met and is therefore justified in changing the status of Green Belt to Greenfield. This can then be used to meet a Government target for House building, and not any local requirements- It provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. (Paragraph 1 NPPF March 2012 Department for Communities and Local Government).</p> <p>The Emerging Local Plan ignores Paragraph 79 of the NPPF March 2012 and the importance of Green Belt in preventing Urban Sprawl</p> <p>There is plenty of Newspaper coverage of how the current Council Leader and the current MP have recently returned from London with a reduction in the Governments' required figure for Rossendale. (Evidence that it is a Government rather than a Local need.)</p> <p>It may be 'stating the obvious', that in putting together this Emerging Local Plan, RBC has employed a number of people and spent a lot of money. In doing so they have generated a large number of documents for Residents to read and understand, to enable them to give the matter their full attention and offer an informed comment or objection. With this in mind, I would like to state my objections to the local plan specifically for the Whitworth Area, and in particular Site Ref SHLAA16001 and Site Ref SHLAA16002.</p> <p>I am a resident of Meadow Head ave and I have lived here since February 1978. I remember when the two areas (Site Ref SHLAA16001 and Site Ref SHLAA16002), were defined as Green Belt because of their unsuitability for development. (Inspector's Report September 1994 Gill. D and Sustainability Appraisal May 2017 {3.16.7})</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>The objections raised back then and their causes have not 'gone away', they are just as valid now. In fact, there are more reasons for maintaining the areas as Green Belt. The problems expressed then have multiplied rather than decreased. The junction of Tonacliffe Road and Tonacliffe Way is now a nightmare for parents dropping off their children at Tonacliffe School. Bus Services have decreased from Rochdale and Rossendale through Whitworth. A couple of years ago RBC threatened to remove the subsidy for evening Bus services through Whitworth, as part of a cost cutting exercise. Yet the Emerging Local Plan states there is an adequate Bus Service. Shift workers have to use their own cars or car sharing. There has been an increase in bicycle use and the last resort, Taxis, because there are no Buses available. The Schools, Tonacliffe School, St Anselms School, St Bartholomew's school, St Michael and St John School and the one High School are almost at capacity now. The planning area of Whitworth will show a limited number of places remaining across schools in that planning area If local schools are unable to meet the demand of a new development there is the potential to have an adverse impact on the local community, with children having to travel greater distances to access a school place. (Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017)</p> <p>There is one GP Surgery, one Dentist and one Pharmacy, NHS Clinics that were available when I first moved here are now gone. Pennine Acute and East Lancashire Hospitals are situated at Rochdale, Oldham, Fairfield, Manchester, Burnley, and Blackburn. Not what one would call Local.</p> <p>After the Community successfully got together in favour of keeping the Library open, Whitworth retains its Library.</p> <p>Local employment has reduced, meaning that employed residents have to travel further afield to their jobs. This has seen an increase in traffic on the single route in and out of Whitworth. (A671) The local plan adds to this burden without offering any alternatives .</p> <p>... .. creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; (Para 7 - NPPF March 2012.)</p> <p>The Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017 mentions in detail what will happen to the Rawtenstall and Rising Bridge end of the Valley, but sadly no mention of how we are to update and increase the ability of the Whitworth section of the A671 to deal with the projected influx of Ratepayers.</p> <p>Site Ref SHLAA16001 and Site Ref SHLAA16002 are misleading in that they make no mention of the Topography of both these areas. The Play areas are situated such that a child would have to cross Tonacliffe Road and the A671 to reach the play areas. Residents make full use of the open aspect of the Green Belt that surrounds them.</p> <p>Also, are the stated figures; Comments within 800m to playground to the south of Albert Mill (Site Ref SHLAA16002) and Access to a park or play area</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>access within 1.5km (approximately 1 mile) (Site Ref SHLAA 16001) for 'as the crow flies'? If so then the crow used by the planners must be thankful it didn't have to walk the distances given. It would certainly have complained about the extra distance caused by the 'up and down' terrain. Which also means that travel, for the Elderly and Disabled and young mothers with their prams, to and from, the 'local' amenities' will also involve increased use of a vehicle rather than 'shanks' pony'. 'The physical constraints of Rossendale mean that delivery of infrastructure can be significantly affected by the topography of the area.' (Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017)</p> <p>Paragraph 30 of the NPPF requires Local Plans to facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport. The Local Plan has no section devoted to transport in Whitworth, and has not used any supporting document, which addresses transport issues in the Whitworth area. (Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017)</p> <p>This particular local plan appears to be a response to central government's order to build new houses, (at any cost) rather than a recipe for sustainable development at a Local level.</p> <p>The Emerging Local Plan for Rossendale appears to ignore rather than comply with the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012: (Ministerial foreword Rt Hon Greg Clark MP Minister for Planning National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 Department for Communities and Local Government)</p> <p>Enough Case Law exists to say that alterations to a Green Belt need "Exceptional Circumstances," and preparation of a Local Plan does not, of itself, justify "Exceptional Circumstances," in order to affect a change from Green Belt to Greenfield.</p> <p>Policy EMP4 of the Emerging Local Plan has some interesting points; some of them could be applied to House Development inasmuch as;</p> <p>There is no significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring land uses and the character of the area by virtue of increased levels of noise, odour, emissions, or dust and light impacts, surface water, drainage or sewerage related pollution problems;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has an adequate access that would not create a traffic hazard or have an undue environmental impact; • The traffic generated does not have a severe adverse impact on local amenity, highway safety or the operation of the highways network; <p>This Emerging Local Plan suffers from a number of flaws, in that the government has insisted that local councils have the power to enforce the law against pavement parking.</p> <p>(https://www.gov.uk/government/news/freeing-pedestrians-from-pavement-parking-blight)</p> <p>Yet, without the residents being able to park on the pavements outside their homes, there would be no free flow of traffic along the streets defined in the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>plan as, suitable access roads, to the new developments. However modern and well designed the new streets are promised to be (Manual for Streets 2007 and Emerging Local Plan Policy TR4: Parking) in reality, they will have to interface with the existing problematic traffic system we have come to know so well. The A671 has an anaemic quality to its Cycle lanes as it passes through the Valley. Because of parked cars, pedestrians have to step onto the A671. We find in Whitworth the A671 can have pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles all adding to the 'furring of the Artery' that is the A671. Another reason for no pavement is the placing of Green and Blue bins. So placed to enable the Bin men to collect them safely. One officials' solution was for the pedestrians to "cross the busy road, walk the length of the blockage and re-cross the busy road." Nowhere in the Local Plan is there any mention of upgrading or enabling the existing system to deal with a modern flow of people and vehicles.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.39 of the Sustainability Appraisal (Lepus Consulting for Rossendale Borough Council May 2017) needs to be revised. The car is the main mode of transport that residents use to; " ... support its health, social and cultural well-being;" (NPPF March 2012)</p> <p>In the Emerging Local Plan, Horsefield ave, Meadow Head avenue and Belle Isle avenue are shown as access points. Meadow Head avenue is closed by a pavement and is therefore classed as a cul-de-sac. (http://www.dictionary.com/browse/cul-de-sac)</p> <p>Belle Isle avenue was 'closed' following the recommendation in the Inspectors report (1994) by trees and fences.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people: and improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.</p> <p>The 'Bin Lorry' reverses into Meadow Head ave and Belle Isle ave to safely collect the Bins. This is possible because the resident's cars are parked on the pavement. It is not possible to say that only one car is allowed at each Household, and therefore can park on their drive. Father can have a car, Mum can have a car, Number 1 child can have a car, and Number 2 child can have a car.</p> <p>Moreover, if mum or dad both drive vehicles due to their employment, these can be attached to the Household. Potentially 6 cars parked at one household. This doesn't include visitors.</p> <p>(Emerging Local Plan Policy TR4: Parking Be designed to ensure that the use of the parking provision would not prejudice the safe and effective operation of the highway network;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not dominate the street scene or detract from the character of the area;) 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>"Because of the highly urbanised nature of the Borough it is challenging to introduce new infrastructure, such as bypasses or new roads without adversely affecting what is already built. " (Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017) and Paragraph 7 National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 ... An economic role - contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; .</p> <p>Local Authorities, it seems, also have "Powers and Incentives to access and bring into use more empty homes, for example New Homes Bonus." The New Homes Bonus is currently paid each year for 6 years. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new-build homes, conversions and long-term empty homes brought back into use. There is also an extra payment for providing affordable homes.</p> <p>(https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/new-homes-bonus-provisional-allocations-for-2016-to-2017-and-consultation-on-reforming-the-bonus)</p> <p>The Communities and Local Government spokesman also stated that Councils have the flexibility to impose a Council Tax Premium of up to 50% (on top of the council tax bill), on properties that have been empty and substantially unfurnished for more than two years."</p> <p>(http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/02/03/number-empty-homes-hits-highest-rate-20-years-calling-question/)</p> <p>I haven't read of empty homes being included in the Emerging Local Plan in order to reduce the need for 'Urban Sprawl' or meet Government objectives.(Paragraph 79 of the NPPF)</p> <p>Paragraph 151 of the NPPF states that Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. The Ministerial foreword to the document clearly states that sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations. In attempting to release Green Belt, the Emerging Local Plan seems to be ignoring one of its attributes, which is an essential characteristic of permanence (i.e. for all generations to benefit from) and is instead 'cherry picking' information to meet the Governments instructions rather than Local Requirements.</p> <p>Imposition masquerading as negotiation.</p> <p>Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017 is at pains to point out the problems at the West end of the Valley while minimising any difficulties the East end will experience. It should be pointed out there are two High Voltage Power lines passing through Rossendale, not one as stated in the Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery July 2017. (National Grid High-Voltage Cable location) The one they didn't mention passes Site Ref SHLAA16001 and is within 100</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						yards of my residence. As I stated at the beginning of this objection, this Local Plan reads more like a wish list and I will go even further; when Henry Ford began mass producing Motor Cars he famously said, "You can have any colour you want; providing it's black!" The Emerging Local Plan is lacking in any credible attempt at Sustainable Development as far as Whitworth is concerned. It will however improve the revenue to RBC from the Residences of Whitworth helping them to develop the Town Centre of Rossendale, Rawtenstall.(Paragraph 23 National Planning Policy Framework March 2012) The emerging Local Plan seems to be lacking in studies of alternative sites. The one element missing from this Emerging Local Plan for Whitworth is 'Informed Choice'.		
286	Christina	Pieper	-		Object	Whitworth is already an overcrowded village. It is not suitable to build more houses it does not have the amenities. - It is a village not a town and can nor accommodate more house builds.	-	
295	T	Shore	Whitworth Action Greenbelt Group		Not Applicable	Would be interested in information of the action group and agree with the statements made about the village.		
468	James	Dalgleish			Not Applicable	- Policy R5, bullet point 1. I think that the word 'not' is missing. - Policy EMP3. I think that the title should read 'sites' rather than 'site'.		
472	Natalie	Miller			Not Applicable	From memory this is now the third time that we have had this review, does the council really have that much money to waste?		
473	Siobhan	Carney			Not Applicable	The pdf files you have provided online are not of sufficient quality to view in appropriate detail. Additionally, it is rather misleading for you to quote download times based on a 56k connection (20 year old technology). Large, unrealistic download times of nearly half an hour may discourage less technology-savvy people from clicking on the links. In reality, they only take a second to download on broadband. It is not particularly convenient for us to visit the maps at the locations you specify as we have two children under four and both work. Please can you make some higher quality maps available.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
479	Pat	Myers			Not Applicable	<p>I yesterday received a letter from yourselves dated 25th July in relation to the above. I sat down to read it today to find that our local venue, the Riverside, is available today to view these plans.</p> <p>I would suggest that if you are serious about consulting with the people of Whitworth we require a bit more notice, rather more advertising (as there hasn't been any) and a time to view which doesn't exclude most people who are working.</p> <p>I will be very surprised if the numbers attending tonight are high as 99.9% of people won't know about this.</p> <p>Can I request therefore that you re-book the Riverside (or an alternative venue eg Library, Day Centre), advertise the fact that people can look at the plan and do it at a time when people who are working can attend. If you are not willing to do this then you are not willing to consult properly.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
482	Paul	Bayliss			Not Applicable	<p>I would say that in my humble opinion the current infrastructure in the Whitworth area is already under constant pressure, a lack of obtainable medical facilities: Its common knowledge that trying to get an appointment at the local medical centre is already extremely difficult. Additionally education is always under pressure. The main thoroughfare through Whitworth is a nonstop flow of speeding and often dangerous traffic. The highways are constantly being dug up due to poor antiquated utilities, which causes further congestion on the roads. Of course when Market street is closed there is no other route through to Bacup and area's beyond. I hope you weren't responsible for the fiasco when they closed the road to demolish the mill, that was a debacle, so many different communications as to when the road was actually closed, in the end they had to use a fire engine to block one end of the road, which happened around midday as opposed to 6am or whatever the schedule was, how unprofessional was that, the demolition team had no hard hats and had no appropriate safety clothing, the same is to be said for the guys constructing the cycle. Which concerns me as the standard of contractors the council engage with.</p> <p>Therefore if the council truly believes in meeting sustainable development. ; meeting the needs of the present (which I don't think it does) without compromising the ability of future generations. Then before any consideration is given to providing additional housing the infrastructure needs to put in place before any housing developments are considered. It makes me laugh when you say we identifying infrastructure requirements well you don't need to ask private sector bodies et al. The residents of Whitworth know what the requirements are.</p> <p>Here's a simple question on providing for the present; why is there no proper park for children to play in Whitworth? We do not have an area of open space with a proper children's playground or an area where they learn to ride their bikes or run around or play football with their friends. That is a very basic amenity which children on this town do not have.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
500	John	Clements			Object	The policy will result in increased flooding resulting from increased tarmac and concrete areas on new estates - roads and driveways and roofs (coupled with climate change giving more rainfall and fiercer storms) Other problems:- Unacceptable: congestion on roads, medical centres and schools		Why does the council allow householders to dig up their front lawns to put down block stone paving. To double their car parking ? This has occurred at Nos 35 & 40 (Recently), and Nos 5, 16, 18, 20 (in the past) sand & weeds are in the cracks giving fast run off contributing to future flooding. Some councils do not allow this practice. Why does Rossendale BC given it's flooding record. Please make the point to government that the situation is their fault in allowing the population to increase. The only acceptable result for Rossendale due to the steepness of it's valleys is no new housing. If you are forced, insist on developers utilizing brownfield sites. If they refuse report them to government for being anti-social. Find a way of forcing them to use brownfield sites
525	Ann	Hodgkiss	-		Object	Such a questionnaire needs to be made more readily available for residents to complete with objections. - - It is hard to believe that the council propose to build on greenfield sites where there is far more opportunity to build brownfield, or regenerate. Infrastructure is rarely improved to accommodate changes, in the past for Helmshore, nothing has changed yet we have had approx. 150 dwelling development within a square mile causing issues for residents that the council ignore. - - There is little point in objections as the council will continue with the plan regardless, greed being the leader on the project. Unfortunately residents feelings and concerns are never taken into account. Makes one wonder why we ever bother to vote. You will be changing areas beyond recognition and ruining some beautiful places.		The wind farm refusal was the correct decision, shame the same human being cannot be on this council to see common sense.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
552	Alyson	Mousley	-	Local plan 17-26	Not Applicable	I vote for the option of organic growth protecting the environmental and social benefits of Rossendale. I do not agree with the go for growth idea. - - The building of the proposed number of houses (4000) is madness before the current infrastructure of the borough is updated roads, public transport, school, health care etc. - - I am specifically concerned about the huge number of houses proposed at the old Broadleys site. This road is already congested with traffic and local schools are over subscribed. - - Suggestion - - More should be made to bring empty properties into use. - For every 500 built the council need to provide social outdoor space especially for teenagers, every house builder should contribute 1% of its first sale price or valuation to this slush fund - All roads, payments & footpaths should be adopted/made good before next phase development is permitted. - Public transport needs to be improved. - Schools cannot cope with the parking (often badly) of parents more houses will make this worse unless safeguarding is improved around schools. - - To build a great property you need firm foundations and that's what Rossendale Council hasn't got yet!		Please can some consultations be in Crawshawbooth & during school hours. - You need to make the consultation reference obvious if you want us to use it.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment	
589	Stephen	Langridge			Not Applicable	<p>General comment,</p> <p>1. Whilst I understand the need to provide space for and control future development within the Borough, it is important to understand that the Borough is made up from several townships and communities, each of which have their own quirks and identities and as such, it would be wrong to ignore that individuality.</p> <p>The authority should resist dictats from on high to identify so much land for this or that without understanding the needs wants of those who have made the valley into the splendid place that it is.</p> <p>Rossendale is not, nor should it become, simply a suburb of the continuous concrete sprawl that Bury, Manchester and beyond have become.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>5. Pockets of land, I understand that if a housing development of under 100 houses takes place, then this is deemed as having no impact on local schools, doctors and other services. However, with developments such as Yarn Avenue, (off Holcombe Road) 60+ houses, Limewood Close (off Helmshore Road) 20+ houses and The Power Mill development (off Holcombe Road) then the accumalative effect is the same as a single 100+ development. Helmshore Primary School and Broadway Primary School are both running at full acapacity whilst Haslingden High School is running at or near full capacity. Where are the children from these new houses going to go to school? or Doctors? or Dentist?</p> <p>Lancashire County is already strapped for funds, how are additional places to be sourced or funded.</p> <p>If other pockets of land are identified by developers - e.g. the site of the recently demolished St. Veronicas Church in Helmshore - will this then allow for the removal of other pockets of already identified land from the local plan?</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
635	Ross	Hemsley	-	All	Support	I broadly agree with Option 3		<p>Rossendale is an amazing place to live and to work and is blessed with some unique and stunning landscape which should be protected. - - The fact that it is generally in a valley means that the amount of land available is finite and can only support so much development. - - If there is to be growth it must be made in a manner which can be supported by the surrounding infrastructure. Anybody trying to get to Haslingden or even worse Manchester in the morning is faced with long traffic queues and delays. Recently the traffic has backed up to Newhallhey roundabout several times as the M66 cannot cope with the volumes joining it from the A56 and A682 simultaneously. - - There has been talk of turning the railway into a commuter line, that is highly unlikely. - - I have always been a keen cyclist but despite talk of developing safe cycling routes the volumes of traffic just continue to rise, making cycling at any other time than early mornings at weekends extremely dangerous.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England		Not Applicable	<p>The NPPF makes it clear that the significance of heritage assets can be harmed through development within their setting. There is a requirement in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that 'special regard' should be had to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. It is also the duty of the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its conservation areas and their setting. Where potential development sites appear to include non-designated assets including the possibility for archaeology, their potential should be investigated and retention/exploration should be promoted.</p> <p>Consequently, before allocating any site there would need to be some evaluation of the impact, which the development might have upon those elements that contribute to the significance of a heritage asset including their setting, through undertaking a heritage impact assessment. The assessment of the sites needs to address the central issue of whether or not the principle of development and loss of any open space is acceptable. It needs to evaluate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What contribution the site in its current form makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage assets. For a number of these heritage assets, it might be the case that the site makes very little or no contribution. 2. What impact the loss of the area and its subsequent development might have upon those elements which contribute to the significance of those heritage assets. 3. If it is likely to result in harm, how might that harm be removed or reduced to an acceptable level. 4. If the harm cannot be reduced or removed, what are the public benefits that outweigh the presumption in favour of the conservation of the heritage asset? <p>The selection of sites for development needs to be informed by an up-to-date evidence base and the Plan should avoid allocating those sites which are likely to result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets of the Plan area. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, the Plan should consider how any harm might be mitigated. This could include measures such as a reduction of the quantum of development at a site, amending the types of development proposed or locating the development within another part of the site allocation. Such initiatives need to be fully justified and evidenced to ensure that such measures are successful in reducing identified harm.</p> <p>The allocation of sites for development may also present better opportunities for the historic environment. For example, new development may better reveal the significance of heritage assets or may provide an opportunity to tackle heritage at risk.</p> <p>Where relevant, policies for allocated sites may need to make reference to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>identified historic environment attributes in order to guide how development should be delivered. For example, this might require the policy to include detailed criteria or providing supplementary information with the supporting text.</p> <p>Comments on the Local Plan Site Allocations</p> <p>In view of the above, Historic England is concerned that there does not appear to be any robust assessment of the historic environment to accompany the site allocations. The information supplied by the Council's published report (Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites September 2017) to support this, provides little detail on how the above has been dealt with. It would be helpful if the report could detail the background information to accompany the summaries provided. For example, the report refers to whether something is deliverable or not, refers to the need for mitigation measures to be undertaken and that careful consideration is required to ensure that the development does not harm setting. Is there any evidence to back up the summary contained in this table? If the table refers to the acceptability only on condition of the mitigation measures, then there should be an assessment to support this statement. If so, what are the mitigation measures that would be required to remove any harm? This needs to be demonstrated within the report and detailed within the Plan.</p> <p>In view of this, Historic England is unable to comment on the proposed Housing Site Allocations contained in Policy HS2 and those included in EMP2 (Employment site allocations).</p> <p>Strategic Cross Boundary Issues</p> <p>Strategic cross boundary issues that affect the historic environment are issues that can only be effectively addressed at a larger than local scale and may cover the issues listed below, this is not an exclusive list and strategic issues will have to considered on an area by area basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · extensive designated and non-designated heritage assets, e.g. World Heritage Sites, historic landscapes, major heritage based tourism attractions, the management of which may impact upon more than one Authority · major quarries for building and roofing stone, e.g. Portland stone · major changes to green belt which affect the preservation of the setting and character of historic towns · major development proposals likely to affect important heritage assets in a neighbouring authority, e.g. major urban extensions, infrastructure proposals <p>These strategic issues will not necessarily and always be the same as the strategic polices for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment included in a Local Plan but are likely to be a sub-set of them. Indeed local circumstances may indicate that strategic approaches may not</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>always be needed. The sustainability appraisal scoping report should help to identify what is important for a particular plan area.</p> <p>Historic England strongly advises that you engage conservation, archaeology and urban design colleagues at the Council to ensure that you are aware of all the relevant features of the historic environment and that the historic environment is effectively and efficiently considered in the development management policies, in the allocation of any site and in the preparation of the SEA. They are also best placed to advise on local historic environment issues and priorities, including access to data held in the HER. This will ensure that there is joined up and robust approach is undertaken to historic environment issues.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment	
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England		Not Applicable	<p>Rossendale Local Plan – Regulation 18 consultation</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above. This response details the expectations of the Local Plan for Rossendale and the historic environment and also specific comments on the draft content of the document.</p> <p>Historic England is the Government’s statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). We champion and protect England’s historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, enjoyed and cared for.</p> <p>Historic England has produced a number of good practice advice notes on the historic environment, in particular the Good Practice Advice Note on the Historic Environment and Local Plans (http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historicenvironment-local-plans/), which provides supporting information on good practice in planmaking, and the Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-siteallocations-in-local-plans/) may be useful in the production of your Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan for Rossendale will be expected to include a proper description, identification and assessment of the historic environment and the supporting evidence base is expected to include heritage information. The Plan will need to demonstrate how it conserves and enhances the historic environment of the area and guide how the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied locally. This includes ensuring that the sites, which it is proposing to put forward for development, will assist in delivering such a strategy.</p> <p>Evidence base</p> <p>A sound local plan should be based on an up-to-date evidence base which includes reference to the historic environment. The Council needs to ensure that the evidence base needs to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · What contribution the historic environment makes to the character of the area, to its economic well-being and to the quality of life of its communities; · What issues and challenges is it facing and likely to be facing in the future; · What opportunities the historic environment offers for helping to deliver the other objectives in the Plan area. <p>When undertaking this exercise, it is important to bear in mind that it is not simply an exercise in listing known sites but, rather understanding their value to society (i.e. their significance). There is a need to identify the subtle</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>qualities of the Borough and its local distinctiveness and character which can easily be lost. There will need to be an assessment of the likelihood of currently unidentified heritage assets including sites of historic and archaeological interest being discovered in the future. It may also be necessary to identify heritage assets outside the Council's area where there are likely to be setting impacts caused by any development proposals put forward in the area. It is also important to bear in mind that some asset types are not currently well recorded. For example, the Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest in England, is thought to represent only around two thirds of sites potentially deserving inclusion. Evidence gathering can also help to identify parts of a locality that may be worthy of designation as a conservation area and identify assets that are worthy of inclusion in a local list.</p> <p>Potential sources of evidence include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · National Heritage List for England · Historic Environment Record · Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans · Local Lists · National and Local Heritage At Risk Registers · Historic Characterisation Assessments · World Heritage Site Management Plans · In house and local knowledge expertise <p>Where the evidence base is weak, the Council will need to commission additional work to ensure that the historic environment is adequately dealt with and can be used to inform the Plan.</p> <p>Spatial Portraits</p> <p>The Local Plan should include a proper description and assessment of the historic environment in the Borough and the contribution it makes to the area (NPPF, Paragraph 169).</p> <p>The Plan needs to describe the historical growth of the area and identify its historic environment. It should also clearly identify the different places their character and identity and the contribution it makes to all aspects of life in Rossendale. The Plan as drafted does not appear to include this.</p> <p>Local Plan Policies</p> <p>One of the twelve principal objectives of planning under the NPPF is the conservation of heritage assets for the quality of life they bring to this and future generations (NPPF, Paragraph 17). Conservation means maintaining what is important about a place and improving this where it is desirable. It is not a passive exercise. It requires a Plan for the maintenance and use of heritage assets and for the delivery of development within their setting that will make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>Local Plans should include policies to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the area and to guide how the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied locally. It is vital to include both strategic and development management policies for the historic environment in the local plan as the plan will be the starting point for decisions on planning applications and any Neighbourhood Plans that come forward are required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The policies for the historic environment will derive from the overall strategy to deliver conservation and enjoyment of the area's heritage assets for generations to come. These may be policies that concern themselves specifically with the development of types of heritage asset. But delivery of the NPPF objective may also require strategic policies on use, design of new development, transport layout and so on. Indeed every aspect of planning, conceivably can make a contribution to conservation. Plan policies in all topics should be assessed for their impact on the strategic conservation objective. Conservation is not a standalone exercise satisfied by standalone policies that repeat the NPPF objectives. The Local Plan should also consider the role which the historic environment can play in delivering other planning objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Building a strong, competitive economy · Ensuring the vitality of town centres · Supporting a prosperous rural economy · Promoting sustainable transport · Supporting high quality communication infrastructure · Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes · Requiring good design · Protecting green belt land · Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change · Conserving and enhancing the natural environment · Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals <p>In formulating the strategy it is advisable and often necessary to consider the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · How the historic environment can assist in the delivery of the vision and the economic, social and environmental objectives for the plan area; · How the Plan will address particular issues identified during the development of the evidence base including heritage at risk; · The interrelationship between the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and the other Plans policies and objectives; · The means by which new development in conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets might enhance or better reveal their significance; · How local lists might assist in identifying and managing the conservation on nondesignated heritage assets; · How the archaeology of the Plan area might be managed; · How CIL funding might contribute towards ensuring a sustainable future for 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>individual assets or specific historic places and whether or not certain heritage assets might need to be identified;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Whether masterplans or design briefs need to be prepared for significant sites where major change is proposed; · What implementation partners need to be identified in order to deliver the positive strategy; · What indicators should be used to monitor the effectiveness of the strategy. <p>Comments on the Local Plan Policies</p> <p>Historic England is concerned that the Plan policies do not contain policies that will deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment in Rossendale and to guide how the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied locally. The policies as drafted do very little to detail what elements of the Rossendale area will be conserved and enhanced including specific references to its historic environment and the Plan needs to be amended to detail this.</p>		
743			Whitworth Town Council		Not Applicable	<p>The Council also made the following general points about the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The consultation has come from a demand from central government to build 4000 new homes in Rossendale this figure has now come down to around 2600 but even at this level this figure is disproportionate to our current population. •The physical infrastructure is not sufficient to support all this house building. There have been several water leaks and power outages recently and this is a regular occurrence locally. More houses would put greater pressure on this infrastructure. •The main problem in Whitworth is the single road in and out and currently this is a problem for commuters who queue to travel southbound and northbound. More houses would mean yet more traffic on an already busy road with no alternative route. Additionally this flow of traffic causes the surface of the road to deteriorate quickly meaning it is regularly in poor condition and needing repair. •Rossendale Borough Council Forward Planning have been asked to produce plans to identify areas which could be built on, even if these areas end up on the Local Plan they maybe wouldn't go forward for development. •For a 4 bedroom house, you could anticipate 1.8 children, planning and building for a school takes around 7 years so this would need to be addressed urgently. Currently all the primary schools are busy and the local high school is oversubscribed already. These issues must be addressed. 		
890	Debbie	Stewart	-		Object	<p>Government policy is to protect and enhance the natural and historic environment in both rural and urban areas. A high level of protection should be given to the most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources - . I believe your policy goes against national policy</p>	no	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1011	Paul	Williams	-		Object	Power and water supply is only adequate now.		-
1069	andy	foster	-	2019-2034	Object	i dont want this to happen		-

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1120	David	Clements	-		Object	<p>I wish to object to the application as presented in the Local Plan for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly increased Danger of Flooding: We were flooded in Meadow Park, Irwell Vale on Boxing Day 2015 when nearly 3 feet of water entered our Bungalow. This was the result of ground and surface water from surrounding areas, Edenfield and Helmshore, not being able to get away because of the high levels of the Rivers Ogden and Irwell flowing through the Village. - Many developments in recent years in the higher reaches of the River Irwell and River Ogden, particularly the River Ogden in Helmshore, have exacerbated this situation. Very little has happened in the area in the past 2 years since the Floods to resolve potential flooding following heavy rainfall. With the proposed massive increase in housing in Edenfield, where water flows down the hills and through the porous railway embankment and into the bottom of the valley, plus more developments in Helmshore, and the resultant effects that brings, it is imperative that all new developments within the Rossendale Valley ensure that measures are taken to ensure that land and properties downstream do not suffer from inadequate removal of ground and surface water that these developments automatically bring; plus of course the additional pressure on the sewerage systems which are inter linked. Practical, robust and well maintained drainage systems need to be developed to ensure all are safe from flooding within the Valley. - Edenfield (HS2.71): The local infrastructure around Edenfield in terms of Roads, Doctors, Dentists, Schools etc is currently totally inadequate and therefore for a massive expansion in housing as currently proposed will mean that existing and new residents will not have the support services that are required. - Helmshore has similar infrastructure problems and Schools in the area already have classes that are full. - Increase in Traffic: We understand a number of key junctions within the Valley are being reviewed. This is far too simplistic. We currently travel through Edenfield on a regular basis at varying times of the day and it is currently very difficult because of the parking and the narrowing of the road at either end of the Village to drive through without any disruption. With the current very significant expansion in housing being proposed in Edenfield this will make a bad situation intolerable. - Helmshore also has traffic flow problems and the “mini roundabout junction” at the crossroads of Helmshore Road and Broadway is already very dangerous. - Within the Valley currently if ever there are Roadworks or an Accident the consequential knock-on effects and delays on the A56 / M66 and surrounding ‘alternative’ roads in Edenfield, Haslingden, Rawtenstall etc are significant, with the resultant ‘Gridlock’. Similarly within other areas of the Rossendale Valley such as Bacup, Waterfoot, Crawshawbooth etc there are significant delays on all roads, particularly at busy times. To increase the housing stock within Rossendale as proposed, will just exacerbate an already very difficult situation. - Public Transport / Parking: While those travelling are encouraged to use Public 		All included under Section 8.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>Transport the current services available fall well short of what is required. In addition currently there is far too little parking facilities to encourage those who travel out of the area to use Public Transport services as either part or the whole of their journey. - - Air Pollution: Currently with existing road problems there is too much slow moving and stationary traffic. With a significant increase in housing and hence the population as proposed, and the resultant increase in traffic problems, the Air Quality is going diminish even further with even more slow moving and stationary traffic, making a bad situation even worse. - - Doctors: There are already inadequate resources in the area and it is currently very difficult to get a GP appointment when required. With significant increases in the population and requirement for these services both existing and new residents will suffer even more. - - Dentists: For many years there has been a shortage of NHS Dentists in the area with problems trying to recruit more, so that many residents have already been forced to seek 'Private Services'. If given there are these problems with the current population in the area, for which a solution has not been found over many years, what is going to happen with significant increases in the population? - - Schools: A number of expansions to existing Schools has taken place in recent years particularly in the Edenfield area in order to respond to increasing demand for places, with unfortunately the consequential loss of some previously existing facilities for the Children. Massive increases in development in the area will mean these resources, currently struggling, will not be able to cope with these proposed increasing numbers. - - Green Belt / Conservation Areas: The Local Plan proposes changes to both the Green Belt and Conservation Areas: It is very important that these areas which were set up to protect and benefit local communities and residents are maintained and are not altered in order to allow further housing developments. - - - David Clements - Meadow Park, - Irwell Vale.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1124	Pauline	Clements	-	Edenfield (HS2.71) and Helmshore	Object	<p>I wish to object to the application as presented in the Local Plan for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Significantly increased Danger of Flooding: We were flooded in Meadow Park, Irwell Vale on Boxing Day 2015 when nearly 3 feet of water entered our Bungalow. This was the result of ground and surface water from surrounding areas, Edenfield and Helmshore, not being able to get away because of the high levels of the Rivers Ogden and Irwell flowing through the Village. - Many developments in recent years in the higher reaches of the River Irwell and River Ogden, particularly the River Ogden in Helmshore, have exacerbated this situation. Very little has happened in the area in the past 2 years since the Floods to resolve potential flooding following heavy rainfall. With the proposed massive increase in housing in Edenfield, where water flows down the hills and through the porous railway embankment and into the bottom of the valley, plus more developments in Helmshore, and the resultant effects that brings, it is imperative that all new developments within the Rossendale Valley ensure that measures are taken to ensure that land and properties downstream do not suffer from inadequate removal of ground and surface water that these developments automatically bring; plus of course the additional pressure on the sewerage systems which are inter linked. Practical, robust and well maintained drainage systems need to be developed to ensure all are safe from flooding within the Valley. - - Edenfield (HS2.71): The local infrastructure around Edenfield in terms of Roads, Doctors, Dentists, Schools etc is currently totally inadequate and therefore for a massive expansion in housing as currently proposed will mean that existing and new residents will not have the support services that are required. - - Helmshore has similar infrastructure problems and Schools in the area already have classes that are full. - - Increase in Traffic: We understand a number of key junctions within the Valley are being reviewed. This is far too simplistic. - We currently travel through Edenfield on a regular basis at varying times of the day and it is currently very difficult because of the parking and the narrowing of the road at either end of the Village to drive through without any disruption. With the current very significant expansion in housing being proposed in Edenfield this will make a bad situation intolerable. - Helmshore also has traffic flow problems and the “mini roundabout junction” at the crossroads of Helmshore Road and Broadway is already very dangerous. - Within the Valley currently if ever there are Roadworks or an Accident the consequential knock-on effects and delays on the A56 / M66 and surrounding ‘alternative’ roads in Edenfield, Haslingden, Rawtenstall etc are significant, with the resultant ‘Gridlock’. Similarly within other areas of the Rossendale Valley such as Bacup, Waterfoot, Crawshawbooth etc there are significant delays on all roads, particularly at busy times. To increase the housing stock within Rossendale as proposed, will just exacerbate an already very difficult situation. - - Public Transport / Parking: While those travelling are encouraged to use Public 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>Transport the current services available fall well short of what is required. In addition currently there is far too little parking facilities to encourage those who travel out of the area to use Public Transport services as either part or the whole of their journey. - - Air Pollution: Currently with existing road problems there is too much slow moving and stationary traffic. With a significant increase in housing and hence the population as proposed, and the resultant increase in traffic problems, the Air Quality is going diminish even further with even more slow moving and stationary traffic, making a bad situation even worse. - - Doctors: There are already inadequate resources in the area and it is currently very difficult to get a GP appointment when required. With significant increases in the population and requirement for these services both existing and new residents will suffer even more. - - Dentists: For many years there has been a shortage of NHS Dentists in the area with problems trying to recruit more, so that many residents have already been forced to seek 'Private Services'. If given there are these problems with the current population in the area, for which a solution has not been found over many years, what is going to happen with significant increases in the population? - - Schools: A number of expansions to existing Schools has taken place in recent years particularly in the Edenfield area in order to respond to increasing demand for places, with unfortunately the consequential loss of some previously existing facilities for the Children. Massive increases in development in the area will mean these resources, currently struggling, will not be able to cope with these proposed increasing numbers. - - Green Belt / Conservation Areas: The Local Plan proposes changes to both the Green Belt and Conservation Areas: It is very important that these areas which were set up to protect and benefit local communities and residents are maintained and are not altered in order to allow further housing developments. - - -</p>		
1160	Jody	McGarraghy	-		Object	<p>Any building work will cause many construction vehicles to enter & leave Whitworth, on the one single road we have through our village. This will cause major traffic disruption, noise pollution & damage to our already fragile roads. Should the building work involve housing, we already have a village of people with over subscribed schools, including one single high school & only one GP surgery. The demand this will place on public services that are already stretched, will be huge. Any building work will affect the local landscape & wildlife negatively on a huge scale. Many people in Whitworth were born here & have lived here all their lives, so know what is appropriate for the village in terms of growth & change, their views therefore need to be listened to & answered accordingly.</p>	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1201	Stephen	Anderson	N/A	Developer Contributions	Support	I was unable to locate anything within the Local Plan around Developer Contributions through S106 Agreements, CIL or any other form. - - Whilst viability is currently challenging within Rossendale for any type of commercial development, there are significant infrastructure issues which will come under increasing pressure through the life of the plan as noted in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan document. - - There are also development needs which private sector developers cannot necessarily address, such as affordable homes within marginal viability sites. - - A robust and targeted plan for developer contributions would therefore be valuable to begin to provide funding to address Rossendale's needs. - - Of particular personal interest is the poor state of heritage across Rossendale. Viability is particularly challenging in historic buildings and settings. Rather than compromising heritage assets, a developer contribution derived and heritage focused grant scheme, perhaps focusing in on buildings and site considered particularly 'at risk,' would permit these historically important parts of Rossendale to be brought forward and become positive assets for their local communities. - - Given the focus on the tourism potential of Rossendale within the emerging Local Plan, it would seem particularly important to conserve the historic environment as a key characteristic of the area and something which adds to its tourism potential.		On balance, the Draft Local Plan is the best and most well balanced option.
1222	Michael	Whitworth	-		Object	Whitworth is heavily over developed already with immense pressure on local services that are badly strained. It is located in a narrow valley and served by a single road in and out. The valley is so narrow for much of its length that even if the council had the will it could not put in a second road for access. It's possibly the worst site for development anywhere in the Valley and this plan takes no account of this.		This council is supposed to represent the view of the people it was elected to represent. The people of Whitworth are unanimous in opposition to further development in their village which has been already over developed given its location, and poor resources, services and communication links.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1223	Alwyn	Davies	-		Object	<p>The document does not have an introduction that explains to the reader what this document is and what its purpose. It fails to demonstrate that Rossendale Council has a vision of what it hopes to achieve from its local plan other than a haphazard and unjustified approach to allocating land for development across the borough. The council fails to outline a case for change as to why these changes are required or an options appraisal to enable people to have a voice in what they feel is required in terms of housing and employment needs which is disrespectful to the residents of Rossendale. Page 4 States: "Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise." It is not clear what is meant by this statement – does this mean that decisions regarding building on approved land within the local plan will go ahead without consultation? It is concerning those statements that have no context have been included in this draft plan. Page 5 Policy SD2: Urban Boundary and Green Belt – this section does not stipulate what the council's intentions are in relation to the protection of Green Belt land and what constitutes exceptional circumstances to build on Green Belt Land. - The document states: "All new development in the Borough, will take place within the Urban Boundaries, defined on the policies map, except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside setting which enhances the rural character of the area. The council does not stipulate what exceptional circumstances are or how a warehouse in a countryside setting will enhance the rural character of the area. Chapter 2: Employment Growth and Employment Page 30. Employment Levels have declined in Rossendale since 1997. This document fails to provide a context or evidence of declining employment levels in Rossendale. Information should be supplied to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that have led to the need to develop 27 hectares of employment land. - - There are a fundamental number of unanswered questions in relation to this for example: - • What is the current level of employment in Rossendale? - • Reason/rationale for current levels of unemployment in Rossendale? i.e. age, disability lack of jobs, which types of jobs? - • Wage levels for Residents of Rossendale are generally lower than average, is building more industrial, strategic and distribution centres going to improve this and how? - • Outcommuting to neighbouring authorities to work is a major issue for the council. Has the council considered that many career opportunities cannot be achieved within the borough i.e. working in a hospital, working in aviation, working within a court, working in theatre or entertainment, working for large retail stores that are only provided in large cities i.e. John Lewis, area sales manager positions etc. - • How many current vacancies are there to work in factories, offices, industrial storage in Rossendale? Are businesses in Rossendale able to recruit to all of their vacancies do we need more? - • How does this plan fit into strategic</p>		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>employment initiatives such as, Apprentice, Fit for Work, Work and Disables people, Lancashire Skills and Employment Strategy? - - I believe the council has not sought the views of the people of Rossendale in asking what they would like to achieve from employment opportunities and have made assumptions to justify those outlined in the local plan. I would argue that Rossendale Council does not have the needs of the population of Rossendale at heart through the development of these plans. - - Some statistics that may contradict the council's assumption that building warehouses is the answer to employment and encouraging individuals to work in warehouses in Rossendale are: - - • Lancashire County Councils (LCC) Working age population summary report identifies that only 61.8% of the population is of a working age. - • East Lancashire has seen the proportion of the population which is economically active fall in recent years and almost twice as quickly as in Lancashire as a whole. - • Employment rates amongst women In East Lancashire are significantly lower than the county and nationally in part as a result of ethnic mix within the population. - • Just less than 30% of the working population is economically inactive which reduces the pool of labour which local businesses can draw upon. Meaning that recruitment is already difficult without adding further businesses. - • The shift towards residents having higher skills is increasing at a significant rate. Are industrial buildings going to meet the demands for our residents? - • The Lancashire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment demonstrates that we have an aging population; our Children are thriving in school and this is continuing to improve and we will see an increase in 0-15 year olds over the coming years. This contradicts the council's assumption that we need to develop more employment opportunity based on demand. - - The council has come to the conclusion through one independent review that 27ha of land is needed for employment. I would like to pose the question to Rossendale Council – how are you assured based on 1 independent review that the scale of the proposed change and the impact that that this will have on resident of Rossendale that this is justified? - - The Local Plan fails to accurately and clearly outline what vacant space is currently available for the use of general, industrial or storage and distribution (classes B1, B2 and B8) across the borough. Thus the council cannot demonstrate the exceptional circumstances required to build on additional land including that on Greenbelt. The information within the Local Plan has clearly not been well thought out. - - On Page 31 the local plan references the Green Belt review which suggests that the recommendation is that building should take place on Green Belt land. This is significantly misleading as much of the land allocated within the local plan was not identified for release within the Green Belt review 2016. - - On Page 31 Policy EMP5: Employment Development in non-allocated employment areas it states that “New Small scale employment development will be permitted in areas where employment is not the principle land use provided that there would be</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>no detriment to the amenity of the area in terms of scale character, noise, nuisance, disturbance, environment and car parking. I would ask the council to stipulate the processes for coming to decisions. It could also be argues that this will mean that no land development will take place which I am sure will make everyone (who is not the local planning team) happy. - - I would conclude that the Chapter 2 Employment Growth and Employment has not been carefully thought out or considered by Rossendale Council. The lack of vision and case for change to justify the expansion for employment land is lacking and contradictory to all demographic information about the population of Lancashire and Rossendale. I fail to see how the expansion of employment land to Rossendale will bring anything more than more empty offices and buildings which do nothing to enhance the character of our valley. I would ask the council to retract unneeded plans and instead engage with the population of Rossendale to consult on employment opportunities on Rossendale need to look like in the future. I appreciate that this is harder than sitting behind a computer screen developing plans that nobody wants or needs. I would request that the council investigate how the Local Planning Team have been able to launch a draft consultation on a document that that been clearly not been thought out, lacks basic information and explanation and provides inaccurate, false and misleading information which opens the council up to significant (and perhaps legal) challenge.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1371	Daniela	Ripa	-	Spatial approach - Haslingden, Rawtenstall, Edenfield and Whitworth	Not Applicable	<p>I welcome the proposal to allocate land for employment development in Haslingden. However, I am of the opinion that, without prejudice to the site specific comments below, insufficient land is proposed to be allocated for housing in both Haslingden and Rawtenstall, the most readily accessible areas in the Rossendale Borough with good motorway and public transport links to Manchester, Lancashire and the wider Greater Manchester area. The allocation of land for employment in Haslingden and the promotion of employment opportunities should go hand in hand with the allocation of land for residential development and the creation of new homes in the Borough's two most accessible areas, Haslingden and Rawtenstall. - - The under provision of land for residential development in Haslingden and Rawtenstall leads to a resultant overprovision of land for residential development in other areas, namely Whitworth and Edenfield. - - Whitworth has significant accessibility constraints due to the fact it is linear in character - the Council's Adopted Core Strategy (2011, page 37) identifies this as a constraint ('.....with the main road a single carriageway so improvements are limited...'). Although it is part of Rossendale, the closest town is Rochdale to the south. There are only two routes to Rochdale from Whitworth: the A671, which leads to the junction of Whitworth Road with John Street, St Mary's Gate and Yorkshire Street - a signalised junction known as 'Townhead'; and the B6377, which leads to the junction of Falinge Road and Sheriff Street (a roundabout). At peak times and predominately during the morning (AM) peak, these junctions operate over capacity, with significant queuing of in excess of 20 minutes to pass through these junctions. Of particular concern is the roundabout, which from my observations appears to exceed absolute capacity in the AM peak. There is an added complication in respect of highway infrastructure as both of these junctions are in Rochdale and appropriate mitigation would therefore require input from Rochdale Borough Council. - - In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies a need for health and education facilities in Whitworth (the single local doctors surgery has over 900 patients registered and Whitworth primary school has very limited capacity), but no land is proposed to be allocated for health purposes and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan proposes education 'improvements will be dealt with on a case by case basis'. - - Edenfield is a village and its character would be irreversibly damaged should land be allocated for more than 450 homes in 2019-2034. Whilst I support the allocation of land for residential development in Edenfield in principle, the scale of the expansion proposed is excessive and should be reduced as it would result in significant harm to the social dimension of sustainable development through the disproportionate population increase relative to the existing population.</p> <p>I am planning professional and manage a team of development management</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment	
						<p>officers within a neighbouring authority, although I write this representation in my capacity as a resident of the Rossendale Borough. I have lived in the Borough since 1988 with the exception of intervening periods of work and study. In a professional capacity, I have experience in local plan processes both pre and post adoption of the National Planning Policy Framework and have previously accompanied an appointed Core Strategy Inspector on viewings of sites proposed to be allocated for development. - The Draft Local Plan (2019-2034) includes the allocation of land for development and the release of land from the Green Belt. - - This representation contains comments in support of some proposals within the Draft Local Plan (2019-2034) and in objection to others. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss these comments in more detail should this assist Rossendale Council in producing a robust Submission Version of the Local Plan that will withstand scrutiny at examination. - - In addition to the site specific comments, I would like the Council to consider the following two points: - - 1. The Rossendale Hospital Site has been redeveloped and its retention in the Green Belt no longer meet the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The Policies Map should be updated to reflect this development as it presently shows the now demolished Rossendale Hospital - it is therefore out of date. - 2. The land to the south west of parcel HS2.62 marked 'IWS' on the Policies Map should be allocated as a Recreational Area within the Green Belt. It provides a valuable area of informal recreation.</p>			
1430	Billy	Hanson	-		Not Applicable	<p>Good morning ,I am sending this email to enquire if there are going to be any leaflets sent out to the people of Bacup to inform them of the planned new houses to be built as I no lots of people are notgoing to be aware this is going on as is wat happened last year.I await your reply.</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1438	Jo-Anne	Donnelly	-		Object	<p>Infrastructure does not exist in Rossendale to support the building of any more houses. There are few school places (primary and secondary) available, doctors and dentists are not taking new patients and roads are in a bad state of repair and cannot take any more traffic. The new traffic management system in Rawtenstall failed to deal with all crossing areas and has left once major intersection dangerous and unusable by certain members of the public. Rawtenstall is usually at a standstill with roadwork's to try to fix the failing roads and delays are the norm in all surrounding towns. There was a plan to develop Rossendale as a centre of tourism but tourists will not come to walk in the hills if they have been built on. The direction has obviously changed so that all available land is used for housing and shopping malls. Rossendale has the opportunity to attract people from Manchester but only if a rail link is established as the bus is not a good enough option. Focus on bringing people in to the valley to improve the housing stock already here and force landlords to renovate instead of sitting on empty buildings. There are mills that can be converted and eye-sore buildings that can be knocked down to make way for housing, do not spoil the landscape. The heritage is being ripped out of the towns; restore these, don't rip them down to build glass monstrosities (bus station). Rossendale has great primary schools and an excellent Grammar school and wonderful scenery, with a rail link it could become an attractive place to move. Housing in Rossendale is affordable to everyone-anyone on a low income can afford to buy in many of the towns; they choose not to because of the look of neighbouring houses, but if landlords were made to renovate houses and bring them to an acceptable standard, those close by would sell and the overall appearance of the area would improve over time. Building new houses only masks this issue. More employment sites are desperately needed in Bacup and Stacksteads to cut the level of people claiming benefits in these areas; raising levels of income and standard of living which will lead to an improvement of these areas.</p>		The planning department are not able to effectively deal with the increase in work load and complexity of cases.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1457	Fiona	Buchanan	-	Regulation 18 Draft - Rossendale Local Plan (2019-2034)	Object	- I object to the use of Greenbelt land on principle. Current government policy - also objects to the use of greenbelt land unless in 'exceptional circumstances'. All opportunities to redevelop brownfield sites should always be considered first if further building is justified. - The one road through the town is already overburdened with the weight of traffic. - Local schools are oversubscribed as are the single doctors and dental surgeries. - Although Whitworth has already seen frequent new building the existing amenities have never been expanded to cope with the extra demand. Even sewers and drainage are already overloaded. - The increase in traffic of from more residents would add air and noise pollution and pose an increase risk to the safety of existing pedestrians and residents. - Some areas have had planning applications refused previously - the case against granting permission has only increased. - Further development and especially the loss of greenbelt land will have a considerable negative impact on local wildlife, some of which are endangered species. - Greenbelt land is in areas of questionable suitability for building. A recent new housing estate where planning permission was previously denied because the greenbelt land was considered unsuitable, has already started showing signs of subsidence in places. - There are numerous signs that the town has already exceeded capacity for the existing infrastructure and amenities. -		
1483	Shelia	Rowley	-	ENV1 EVN6 EVN7	Object	- - Infrastructure (no police, schools, no high school, roads, public transport, doctors, dentists, no hospital) - Width of roads (congestion) - Width and lack of paths (especially for the elderly, disabled and parents with prams and young children - Surface drainage problems, possible flooding in some of the areas (e.g. Bankside Lane) - Sewerage problems - Access roads - Traffic in and out of Bacup at peak times - Wildlife - Areas of natural beauty - Empty houses in Bacup -		
1508	Rachel	Cornwell	-		Object	I object to the whole of the "local" plan. The infrastructure of rossendale cannot cope with the extra thousands of houses proposed in the local plan. The roads are gridlocked at peak times now and schools are oversubscribed meaning classrooms are full to bursting. The "local" plan isn't for local residents and how to make things better for them. I have lived in rossendale all my life and feel as if these huge plans for our valley are taking away what character is left here and the plan is just making the valley into a massive housing estate sat at the end of the m66. Local plans should involve local people and what they want and this certainly does not do that. The houses are being built further and further up the sides of the valley and there will be no green fields left and rural Rossendale will be a thing of the past.		Drainage/run off and flooding is already a problem for the valley and I feel all this building will increase that problem.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment	
1575	David	Hempsall	Limey Valley Residents Association		Not Applicable	<p>On 11 September 2017, the association hosted a presentation given by Mr X, Principal Planner with Rossendale Borough Council. The LVRA is grateful to Mr Smith and to his colleagues who staged a roadshow at the Top Club, Loveclough in advance of the presentation as both events gave residents an insight into the consultation process surrounding development of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The LVRA appreciates that the current proposals must be seen in the context of pressure from central government which, at the time of writing, has still not published agreed criteria. The LVRA is mindful of recent press coverage in which Mr Jake Berry MP is reported as taking credit for the reduction in the demands made of Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) to provide for over 5,000 new dwellings to a total around 3,700. Given the area's topography, some further downward movement in expectations should be pursued.</p> <p>It will be recalled the LVRA came into existence in response to the development of RBC's previous draft strategic plan. In response to the planners' three options for the Rawtenstall area (which included Crawshawbooth, Goodshaw and Loveclough), the then-nascent LVRA tabled its own Option 4. It is the association's understanding that of all the responses to RBC's draft proposals then, over 35% came from what became the LVRA's area of operation. Since then, relations with RBC and its planners have matured, so that the LVRA sees itself now as the council's "critical friend". Far from being nimby-ish, the association sees merit in the notion of managed development.</p> <p>In this response, the association notes that in the SHLAA 2017, many sites shown in its predecessor reappear. Appendix E – Site Assessment – shows 26 sites offering some 572 houses. Of these several appear as land allocated for housing in Rossendale Draft Local Plan July 2017, HS2 Housing Site Allocation. The association has examined these in some detail and from its investigation, wishes to highlight three areas in particular.</p> <p>The LVRA is concerned by the proposals. The association's area of operation is one of ribbon development. As such, the association genuinely doubts its ability to absorb the scale of what is being considered.</p> <p>There are the self-evident issues of infrastructure: access to doctors, dentists and – for many – schools. These flow from the sole means of access being (directly or indirectly) the A682 Burnley Road. The association estimates conservatively at 400 x 2 per day the number of additional vehicle movements if all the schemes notified here were to be implemented. In the LVRA's view, the main road – and additional infrastructure – simply cannot bear this level of additional burden and especially so when, at the southern end, first Crawshawbooth and then Rawtenstall are pre-existing bottlenecks.</p> <p>In closing, the LVRA has ideas of its own which it is happy to share with planners. For example, the association – in collaboration with shop</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

proprietors in Crawshawbooth - would wish to see the now defunct public WCs in the village demolished to provide some (admittedly limited) new parking. This would relieve the community of an eyesore and RBC of any legacy commitment.

For example – and thinking outside the LVRA’s own “box” - Park & Ride might be considered for the New Hall Hey development. For example, Rossendale will remain a dormitory backwater unless and until ideas to reconnect Rawtenstall with Greater Manchester by rail are brought to fruition. And so on. The LVRA welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposals tabled by RBC and its planners and hopes most earnestly that consideration will be given to its recommendations.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment	
1592	Warren	Hilton	Highways England		Not Applicable	<p>1 INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1 PREAMBLE</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England, in accordance with the Licence issued by the Secretary of State for Transport (April 2015) and Government policies and objectives.</p> <p>Highways England's approach to engaging with the planning system is governed by the advice and guidance set out in:</p> <p>The Strategic Road Network Planning for the Future - A guide to working with Highways England on planning matters (2015).</p> <p>The document is written in the context of statutory responsibilities as set out in Highways England's Licence, and in the light of Government policy and regulation, including the:</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);</p> <p>Town and Country Planning Development Management (Procedure) Order (England) 2015 (DMPO); and</p> <p>DfT Circular 02/2013 The Strategic Road Network and the delivery of sustainable development ('the Circular').</p> <p>As a statutory consultee in the planning system, Highways England has a regulatory duty to cooperate. Consequently Highways England are obliged to give consideration to all proposals received and to provide appropriate, timely and substantive responses.</p> <p>Highways England's desire to be a proactive planning partner goes beyond this statutory role, but follows the spirit of the Licence, which stipulates that Highways England should:</p> <p>"Support local and national economic growth and regeneration"</p> <p>With regard to the preparation of Local Plans, Highways England's key guidance document, 'The Strategic Road Network: Planning for the Future' (2015) states:</p> <p>"The preparation of local plans provides an opportunity to support a pattern of development that minimises the need for travel, minimises journey lengths, encourages sustainable travel, and promotes accessibility for all. This can contribute to the achievement of environmental objectives and reduce the cost to the economy arising from the environmental, business and social impacts associated with traffic generation and congestion."</p> <p>Paragraph 65 sets out the role of Highways England take in facilitating this:</p> <p>"For all these reasons we are keen to contribute to the plan-making process. We can help you identify the most suitable locations for development that make best use of the capacity on the SRN, so encourage you to engage with us from the earliest stages of thinking."</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>This review also pays cognisance to Paragraph 67, which states: “In supporting and considering draft local plans, we will seek to influence the scale and patterns of development so that it is planned in a manner which makes best use of capacity on the SRN and will not compromise the fulfilment of the primary function of the SRN. Ideally, development locations should be chosen that would minimise the need for travel and facilitate the use of sustainable transport.”</p> <p>1.2 OVERVIEW</p> <p>WSP has been commissioned by Highways England to undertake a review of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan consultation documents. The documents to be reviewed include: Rossendale Draft Local Plan and Policies Maps; and Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Although the current adopted Rossendale Core Strategy (2011 – 2026) is not considered out-of-date, the Council is now required by the UK Government to prepare a Local Plan. The emerging Local Plan is intended to last over a 15 year period from 2019 – 2034 and will designate land and buildings for future uses to meet the Borough's needs and set out what developments should look like and how they should fit in with their surroundings. Once it is adopted, the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan was published in July 2017 and the consultation period for the document ends in October 2017. The Council has expressed its desire for a revised Local Plan to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in 2019 for examination, with formal adoption expected in 2020. Rossendale Borough Council is asking for comments on the Draft Local Plan and as a statutory consultee, it is Highways England's role to provide comments, raise potential issues and make recommendations where appropriate.</p> <p>1.3 THE SRN WITHIN ROSSENDALE</p> <p>In terms of the extent of Highways England's Strategic Road Network within the Borough of Rossendale, this consists of the A56 trunk road, which joins the M66 motorway at the southern boundary of the Borough at Edenfield and runs in a northerly direction on its route to join the M65 motorway at Junction 8. On its route, the A56 serves the core settlements within the Borough of Rawtenstall and Haslingden as well as the more dispersed settlements on the local routes that have junctions with the A56. All other roads within the Borough comprise the local highway network, under the responsibility of the local highway authority, Lancashire County Council.</p> <p>In terms of the A56 itself, as a trunk road it is of a modern, high standard comprising of dual carriageways with a national speed limit, with the exception of a 50mph single carriageway section on the curve at Haslingden and is comparable in character to a motorway.</p> <p>Against this background, and its vision to upgrade all trunk roads by 2040, Highways England's position is to take a presumption against supporting sites</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>that would necessitate new and dedicated direct accesses onto the A56. Indeed, given the high-speed nature of the A56, there would be a presumption against any new connections, with Highways England's focus instead being on upgrading the existing junctions on the route to improve safety and traffic flow. This position is supported by the DfT Policy Circular 02/2013 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development' which has a presumption against the creation of new junctions and direct connections to motorways and high-speed trunk roads except where it can be demonstrated that such connections are essential to deliver 'strategic, planned growth'.</p> <p>1.4 PREVIOUS COMMENTS BY HIGHWAYS ENGLAND ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN 2 (2015)</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council was in the process of developing its site allocations in 2015, known as 'Local Plan 2', but this work was subsequently abandoned. Highways England provided comments to the Council in August 2015.</p> <p>Whilst Highways England raised no objection in principle in the proposals, it was noted that the majority of allocated residential sites were located in Rawtenstall, while the majority of employment sites are allocated in the Haslingden and Rising Bridge area, along the A56 corridor. As such, it considered that there was potential for a significant increase in the number of trips accessing this short section of the SRN.</p> <p>At that time, the majority of allocated residential sites were on a relatively small scale, with only two sites exceeding 100 dwellings in terms of capacity. It was stated that the resultant impact on the SRN from residential developments would therefore be likely to stem from cumulative increases in traffic generated by many different sites, rather than from large individual sites. This point remains a valid consideration in this review of the Draft Local Plan site allocations, and is reiterated in the 'Housing' section.</p> <p>In terms of employment sites, five allocated employment sites were in excess of 2ha in area, and were therefore identified as having the potential to create a significant increase in the number of trips accessing the SRN. Several of the sites remain in the Draft Local Plan allocations, or are adjacent to other allocated sites. Hence, several comments made in the 'Employment' section of this review are similar to those made previously by Highways England in 2015.</p> <p>In terms of vehicular access to the employment sites, Highways England highlighted that the main access point from the sites should be from the local highway network, which is inherently safer than having a reliance on direct access to and from a high-speed trunk road like the A56. It was stated that access points and junctions on busy, high speed roads generate weaving and turning manoeuvres by drivers, impacting on safety and the reliability of journeys. As a consequence, developers of the sites should access their proposals via the local road network or existing junctions on the SRN.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>Highways England undertook some initial calculations using a spreadsheet based tool to assess the potential impact of the allocated sites on the SRN. The results of this indicated that the most significant pressure point would likely be the northern end of the M66, on the northbound carriageway between Junction 1 and the start of the A56(T), in the PM peak. The key junctions likely to be impacted by allocated site development traffic were identified as being the A56(T) / A680 roundabout at Rising Bridge, and the A56(T) / A680 / B6527.</p> <p>Highways England stated that they would welcome any further opportunity to comment on the emerging Local Plan and encouraged maintaining a close working relationship with Rossendale Borough Council to ensure that the Borough achieves its growth potential whilst maintaining the safe operation of the SRN.</p> <p>COMMENTS ON DRAFT LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS (2017)</p> <p>Highways England was provided with details of the potential housing, employment and mixed-use site allocations by Rossendale Borough Council on a confidential basis in advance of the start of the Draft Local Plan consultation. In response, Highways England provided comments to Rossendale Borough Council on 18th July 2017.</p> <p>In its response, Highways England expressed its concern over the lack of any highways evidence base supporting the Draft Local Plan or Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This was highlighted as being key to enable Highways England to gauge the impacts of the additional development upon the SRN and any associated network improvements required to facilitate it which (if outside of its existing programme of improvements) the Council will need to promote through its IDP. It was also stated that this should also take into account the effects of existing public transport provision as well as realistic assumptions on the timing and deliverability of future public transport provision in relation to the timescale of the Plan. The highways evidence was highlighted as enabling Highways England to identify and support a pattern of development that is sustainable, reduces the potential for creating congestion on the SRN and does not reduce the safety of the network.</p> <p>As a result of the above comment, Highways England advised that a body of highways impact evidence linked to the proposed site allocations is produced for review by Highways England before the draft land allocations can be finalised. In the absence of this evidence, Highways England highlighted that its response to the Draft Local Plan consultation would be likely to culminate in a recommendation that a suitable evidence base is produced. It stated that without this supporting evidence, the Local Plan is likely to be found unsound by an Inspector, which will result in delay later on.</p> <p>As is highlighted at the appropriate points in this review, it is apparent that the Draft Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been published for consultation without the required highways evidence base referred to above.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>As such, the comments made by Highways England to Rossendale Borough Council on 18th July 2017 remain valid and are reiterated in this review. The remainder of this report will take the following structure: Section 2: Review of Rossendale Draft Local Plan Section 3: Review of Rossendale Infrastructure Delivery Plan; and Section 4: Summary and Next Steps.</p> <p>4.1 OVERVIEW</p> <p>WSP has reviewed the Rossendale Draft Local Plan on behalf of Highways England and made a number of comments and recommendations regarding those policies that may have relevance on the operation of the SRN. The following paragraphs summarise our recommendations:</p> <p>☒ As a general point, no information is provided in relation to access arrangements. Due to the topography of the Rossendale Valley, in many places there are limited existing access points or opportunities, which creates pressure for new accesses onto the A56(T). It is known that some existing employment sites are served by outdated and substandard 'leftin/ left-out' access arrangements and any material increase in traffic using these as a primary access to new site allocations would be of concern. Policy Circular 02/2013 sets out a presumption against new accesses and junctions being created on high-speed routes such as the A56(T), except at the plan-making stage where it can be demonstrated that it would facilitate 'strategic, planned growth'. It is Highways England's view that the scale and of these proposed allocated sites would not meet the criteria of being 'strategic' in the context of the Policy Circular / Highways England Licence. It is recommended that careful consideration is given to the access arrangements for all sites and that Highways England is kept informed of this.</p> <p>☒ The lack of any transport evidence base in the Draft Local Plan or accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan means that it is not possible to conclusively comment on the suitability of an allocated site or whether there should be phasing or contributions towards additional mitigatory infrastructure. Production of this evidence is essential to enable Highways England to provide a full response to the consultation and without it, there may be delays to future stages of the plan-making process.</p> <p>☒ The production of an appropriate highways evidence base will also be used to inform future iterations of the IDP, which is a live document and can therefore be subject to revisions throughout the course of the Local Plan period.</p> <p>☒ Overall, as the Local Plan is further developed, Highways England requires that the following approach is taken by Rossendale Borough Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In order to fully evaluate the impact on the SRN, an impact assessment should be undertaken of the aggregate impact of all proposed allocated sites, alongside assessments of those individual allocations which are expected to 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>result in the most significant traffic impact;</p> <p>o Due to the extent of the local highway network within the borough when compared to the extent of the SRN, it is recommended that the local highway authority, Lancashire County Council take a leading role in assisting Rossendale Borough Council in preparing the required highways evidence base. Highways England will work collaboratively with both parties throughout this process. A key role of Highways England will be to review the evidence and to assist in developing solutions for any specific pinch points which are identified on the SRN.</p> <p>☒ Highways England should expect to be consulted on the emerging transport evidence documents and may need to be involved in the design of mitigatory measures where</p>		
1615	Darren	Tweed	Hyndburn Borough Council		Not Applicable	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the Reg18 Rossendale Local Plan consultation. I am emailing to confirm that Hyndburn Borough Council has no specific formal comments to make on the draft Local Plan. We are of the opinion that comments formerly provided to the 'Lives and Landscapes' consultation in 2015 have been taken into account adequately in preparation of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>We wish you the best of luck with the consultation process and continued progress towards Publication and Submission.</p>		
1619	Michael	Onley	Planning Sense NW		Not Applicable	<p>(...)On behalf of three client households I would advise that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusion has arisen during the public consultation process in respect of mis-identification of sites in the Higher Cloughfold – Newchurch corridor, and some clarification would welcomed (...) 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1623	Richard	Clowes	Transport for Greater Manchester		Not Applicable	<p>Thank you for consulting Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) on the development of Rossendale's Local Plan. TfGM recognises that growth can bring benefits to the wider region including Greater Manchester. However it is important to ensure the growth of the wider region can be managed within the capacity of the available infrastructure.</p> <p>TfGM welcomes Rossendale's focus placed on promoting sustainable transport solutions to address issues of congestion and air pollution, as well as locating development where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised .</p> <p>TfGM appreciates the challenges of accommodating growth. Significant housing and growth in Rossendale will generate additional demand on local and regional transport networks including the Strategic Road Network and Key Route Network within Greater Manchester due to the high levels of out-commuting. TfGM looks forward to working with Rossendale Borough Council and other stakeholders to address these challenges. While increased demand is symptomatic of growth, it can act as a constraint on future growth, and it is therefore essential to accommodate travel needs as sustainably as possible. It will therefore be important to ensure that the Local Plan emphasises that all future development should be designed in a way that prioritises and encourages sustainable and active travel options.</p> <p>I hope the above comments will be helpful in the progression of the Rossendale Local Plan, and I look forward to working together in future. If you wish to discuss any of the issues raised, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1635	Joan	Glanfield			Object	<p>I have a number of concerns relating to your local plan. I have seen all the plans, and there seems to be a lot of green spaces that are going to disappear. There are enough brown field sites in this valley you can use for these houses without using one inch of green belt land. I already sent you a list of some of them, and lets face it these houses are not for local people, none of them are,"affordable,"</p> <p>The other thing that concerns me is where are all the cars going to go, the mornings and home time are very bad NOW what on earth is it going to be like when over 2000 more homes are built here, that is at the very least 4000 cars. The traffic now is nose to tail. Nowhere on those plans did I see any information about this. How many more schools are you going to build, the children in the valley now cannot get into the schools of their choice, there parents are having to bus their children miles to school. Roads are blocked now, I am thinking in particular of Bank Side Lane, Bacup, ambulances, fire engines and local people who live up there struggle now, how on earth will they cope with the amount of houses you are proposing to build up there. This is not the only narrow road in the valley, so this is problem that is going to be repeated again and again.</p> <p>My conclusion is that you have not been out of your offices and walked this valley and seen what chaos your plans are going to cause without some significant better infrastucture being put in place. I suggest that you do this, you will find all the brown field sites and you will have a better idea of what will happen here if these plans go ahead.</p> <p>I would not like you to think the £4,000,000 has been forgotten, if that had not been,"lost," you would have no need to build so many houses, a lot of them are already here. They might not be the big posh ones you like, but at least ordinary valley people would have benefited from them. They would have been affordable.</p>		
1764			Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Support	<p>Conclusions on Strategic and Development Control Policies</p> <p>2.80 Overall, Taylor Wimpey are supportive of the Draft Plan, subject to the comments and suggestions above.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment	
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd		Not Applicable	<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>1.1 This representation is prepared by Turley on behalf of our client Peel Holdings (Land & Property) Limited (hereafter “Peel” or “our client”). It provides comments to Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) in respect of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan1 (July 2017) (‘DLP’) which is currently the subject of public consultation.</p> <p>Peel Group</p> <p>1.2 The Peel Group is a major investment company and is one of the leading infrastructure, real estate, transport and investment enterprises in the UK. Peel is a major investor, infrastructure provider, landowner and developer. We have major interests and assets across the United Kingdom. Our diverse network of businesses ranges from ports to airports; land to leisure; media to hotels; wind farms to shopping centres, nature parks to canals, residential sites to agricultural uses.</p> <p>1.3 Peel’s track record is one of delivering transformation and creating vibrant places through regeneration and innovation. We invest for the long term. For example, at MediaCityUK in Salford we delivered our £650 million investment in Europe’s largest construction project during the recession. Our £400 million investment in the Port of Liverpool will open up new export markets for the North.</p> <p>Peel Land and Property</p> <p>1.4 Peel Land and Property has extensive real estate assets which consist of 1.2 million m2 (13 million ft2) of investment property and over 15,000 hectares (37,000 acres) of strategic land and water throughout the UK, with particular concentrations in the North West of England, Yorkshire and the Medway. The breadth of Peel Land and Property’s assets covers transformational developments including MediaCityUK and Liverpool Waters. Our landholdings accommodate offices, retail and business parks, shopping centres, leisure and sports venues, residential developments, agricultural land and a ground rent portfolio.</p> <p>Peel in Rossendale</p> <p>1.5 RBC will be aware that Peel is the owner and/or promoter of the following sites for residential development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield • Land at Rossendale Golf Course, Helmshore <p>Background and Context</p> <p>1.6 Peel has consistently and historically engaged with the plan-making process for Rossendale. This has included the submission of detailed representations to the previous Core Strategy2 and the emerging Lives and</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>Landscapes DPD. The preparation of the Lives and Landscapes DPD was, however, abandoned by RBC on 9th December 2015 in favour of the preparation of a new full Local Plan. The current DLP is the first stage of consultation on the new Local Plan.</p> <p>1.7 Peel welcomes the progress which has been made on the emerging Local Plan and supports, in principle, the proposals for development within it. In particular, our client strongly supports the allocation of land at Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden, Haslam Farm in Rawtenstall, and Blackburn Road in Edenfield. It is noted, however, that additional work is required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is capable of meeting the full development needs of the Borough. This will necessitate the allocation of additional land for residential development, which is required to meet the Borough's identified housing needs. Peel has promoted additional land to that proposed for allocation in the DLP which can help RBC to meet those needs. It is also evident that additional work in respect of the evidence base will also be required.</p> <p>1.8 This Report provides detailed comments on the content of the DLP. Updated Development Frameworks in respect of the sites identified above will follow shortly. Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted for residential development in due course.</p> <p>1.9 A range of evidence base documents have been prepared by RBC and are published alongside the DLP. They are not, however, the subject of public consultation. It is considered that this approach is contrary to best practice as set out throughout the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>1.10 Peel considers that it is critical that evidence base documents are prepared with meaningful engagement with key stakeholders, including the development industry, to ensure that the evidence is robust and accurate. The lack of engagement is therefore a key flaw in the plan-making process for Rossendale, which could be rectified by public consultation on draft evidence base documents. This report presents some initial high level comments regarding key evidence base documents and is accompanied by a standalone critique of RBC's Viability Assessment³. Peel does, however, reserve the right to provide further comments on the evidence base documents and encourages RBC to ensure that they are all subject to formal consultation.</p> <p>Structure</p> <p>1.11 The remainder of this Report is structured as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2: Reviews the policy context for this representation. <p>2 Core Strategy Development plan Document: The Way Forward (2011-2026), Rossendale Borough Council (November 2011)</p> <p>3 Updated Economic Viability Study in Relation to Affordable Housing, Keppie Massie and WYG (June 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3: Makes comment on the need for a clearer spatial vision, 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>objectives and strategy in the Rossendale Draft Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4: Considers and comments upon the evidence of housing need for Rossendale, the growth options presented in the DLP, the delivery of types of housing and the plan period. • Section 5: Comments on the DLP's approach to the proposed release of land from the Green Belt and the allocation of development sites to meet the needs of the Borough. • Sections 6: Comments on other relevant policies of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan, particularly those which are pertinent to the Development Management process. • Section 7: Concludes the representation. <p>1.12 A Viability Assessment is provided at Appendix 1.</p> <p>1.13 Separate 'Site Opportunity' representation documents are submitted alongside this overarching representation in relation to each of the sites promoted by Peel for inclusion in the DLP.</p> <p>2. Policy Context</p> <p>2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the overarching policy context for the preparation of the emerging Local Plan. It is a material consideration for the plan-making process. In this regard, insofar as its policies are relevant to this representation, we highlight that the NPPF requires local planning authorities (LPA) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...boost significantly the supply of housing..." (paragraph 47); • "...ensure that their Local plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing..." (paragraph 47); • "...identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand..." (paragraph 50); • Ensure that their Local Plan incorporates "...sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change..." (paragraph 14); • "...plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area..." (paragraph 16). Indeed, the need for a Local Plan to be "positively prepared" is one of the four tests of soundness; • Ensure "...that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth..." (paragraph 19); • Ensure that Local Plans are "...aspirational but realistic..." (paragraph 154); • Ensure that their Local Plan not only meets needs but also responds "...positively to wider opportunities for growth..." (paragraph 17); and • Conserve and enhance the natural environment (paragraph 109). <p>2.2 In addition to the above, the NPPF highlights the importance of protecting Green Belt land from inappropriate development. However, it confirms that Green Belt boundaries can be altered in "...exceptional circumstances..." (paragraph 83) via the plan-making process. Such exceptional circumstances include an inability to meet development needs, as is currently the case in Rossendale.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>2.3 When releasing land from the Green Belt, LPAs should, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt which are capable of meeting longer-term development needs; • Satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period; and • Define new Green Belt boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. <p>2.4 We refer to other policies of the NPPF, as well as the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), elsewhere in this Report.</p> <p>Planning Policy and Guidance Changes</p> <p>2.5 In February 2017, the Government published its Housing White Paper, which reaffirmed its appreciation of the scale of the national housing crisis and the need for ‘radical, lasting reform that will get more homes built right now and for many years to come’4.</p> <p>2.6 On 14 September 2017, the Government published its proposals for consultation, titled ‘Planning for the right homes in the right places’. This incorporates a new methodological approach for calculating housing needs, with the Government publishing an indicative housing need figure for each authority in England based on the proposed method. The consultation period runs until 9 November 2017, with the Government setting itself the ambition of incorporating updates to current guidance alongside a revised NPPF in spring 2018.</p> <p>2.7 The new approach presents a stripped down set of methodological steps which continue to treat the 2014-based sub-national household projections (SNHP) as a ‘starting point’ before adjusting to take account of a single market signal, with the overall scale of adjustment capped at 40% above recently adopted housing requirements, or household projections if higher.</p> <p>2.8 There is evidently a high degree of uncertainty as to the extent to which current consultation proposals will be translated into statutory policy and guidance. On this basis we have presented high level views on the implications where relevant within the subsequent sections. These are presented without prejudice to the development of separate representations by Peel to the DCLG consultation.</p> <p>3. Vision, Objectives and Strategy</p> <p>3.1 RBC has begun the preparation of a new Local Plan for the Borough due to the clear need arising for future development. However, whilst the DLP is relatively wide-ranging, its vision, objectives and proposed approach are somewhat unclear. This is in part because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not establish a spatial Vision for the future of Rossendale, which identifies the key aspirations of the Borough and the goals which will have been fulfilled by the end of the plan period. • It does not identify strategic aims or objectives, which make clear what the Borough is seeking to deliver and achieve over the timeframe of the emerging 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It does not articulate a spatial strategy which sets out how and where the key aims and objectives of the Borough will be fulfilled in different locations within it. <p>3.2 The NPPF does not strictly speaking set out a requirement for a Local Plan to contain each of the above. However, they are notable by their absence and have the effect that the proposed purpose, direction and approach of the emerging Local Plan to meeting the needs of the Borough are somewhat unclear. Peel therefore encourages RBC to develop these aspects of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The Plan Period</p> <p>3.3 The NPPF identifies that Local Plans should "...be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon..." (paragraph 157). The DLP proposes to cover a plan period from 2019 to 2034. Whilst this is a 15-year time horizon, it is dependent upon the Local Plan being adopted in early 2019. RBC's Local Development Scheme5 (LDS) currently anticipates that the Local Plan will be adopted in March 2020. This will mean that it covers only a 14-year time horizon up to 2034. This is considered to be a conservative estimate given the prospect that the adoption of the Local Plan might be delayed at various stages of preparation. Peel therefore considers that the plan period should be extended to at least 2036 in order to ensure that it accords with the guidance set out in the NPPF or that the flexibility to extent the plan period as may be required due to delay is included within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>8. Summary and Conclusion</p> <p>8.1 This representation has been prepared by Turley on behalf of our client Peel in respect of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan. The representation made is in the context of Peel's ongoing engagement in the Rossendale plan making process.</p> <p>Draft Local Plan</p> <p>8.2 The progress of the emerging Local Plan is welcomed and the allocation of Peel's land at Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden, Haslam Farm in Rawtenstall, and Blackburn Road in Edenfield is strongly supported.</p> <p>8.3 It is noted, however, that additional work is required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is capable of meeting the full identified development needs of the Borough. This will necessitate the allocation of additional land for residential development. It is also evident that additional work in respect of the evidence base will be required.</p> <p>8.4 The representation considers the national policy context of the NPPF, Housing White Paper and Government consultation 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' which includes a new draft methodological approach for calculating housing needs. Of particular relevance are the NPPF</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>requirements to plan positively for growth through local plan making, and the considerations for alterations to Green Belt boundaries in order to meet development needs.</p> <p>8.5 Peel requests RBC develop aspects of the spatial vision, objectives and strategy in the DLP. A clearer approach to identify the key aspirations of the Borough during the plan period, objectives for delivery and the locations for achieving those objections would be welcomed.</p> <p>Housing Need and Supply</p> <p>8.6 The representation looks at the scale of housing need in Rossendale, as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and set out in the DLP. The impact of the Government's recent consultation on draft methodology for calculating housing needs is reviewed. Peel considers that the Council has assembled a robust evidence of housing needs in Rossendale and should use this as the baseline for the figures in the DLP.</p> <p>8.7 The growth plan option presented in the DLP provides for at least 265 dwellings per annum over the plan period. This aligns with the lower end of the range concluded within the SHMA, albeit covering a different period. It is considered that this would not provide for the higher levels of housing growth needed to grow the labour force and support future growth in the Borough's economy, given the SHMA's conclusion that 335 dwellings per annum will be needed to support a continuation of the Core Strategy's job target. In planning for housing need, and in the interest of supporting planned levels of job growth in the Borough, Peel recommend that the Council plans to provide housing to accommodate its evidenced need for 335 homes per annum.</p> <p>8.8 In relation to housing types, Peel considers that in order to support the objective of diversifying the housing stock towards larger, better quality dwellings, it is imperative that RBC directs allocations towards areas where this higher quality family housing can be viably delivered. A balanced spatial distribution is required which takes account of these qualitative factors and development viability, and delivering housing of the quality needed will likely require allocations in areas of higher market demand. Peel requests that addition housing allocations are made in areas that can support viable provision of family housing that is in demand.</p> <p>8.9 Given the timescales for process and adoption of the Local Plan, Peel recommends that the plan period be extended to 2036, to allow for a 15 year timescale post adoption. Housing delivery targets and allocations would need to be increased accordingly.</p> <p>8.10 The representation reviews in detail the DLP's presented development needs in the Borough against the extant housing land supply and proposed allocations. A significant 'gap' is identified of approximately 1,518 dwellings based on the housing requirements for the plan period (4,425 dwellings for the period to 2034) and the potential supply identified (2,907 dwellings).</p> <p>8.11 The Draft Local Plan proposes areas for release from Green Belt, allowing</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>for a delivery of a further 715 dwellings. It is therefore evident that the Green Belt releases proposed by the DLP need to be more than doubled if the emerging Local Plan is to be found sound. Releases for at least another 803 dwellings are required, before taking account of the requirement for flexibility and safeguarded land, as well as matters relating to the scale, location and type of development needed.</p> <p>8.12 Peel strongly agrees with RBC that there are clear exceptional circumstances (as defined by NPPF para 83) to undertake targeted Green Belt release in order to make land available for development to meet the Borough's needs. Indeed, the release of such land is critical if the Borough is to grow sustainably and deliver its ambitions for growth.</p> <p>8.13 Peel supports the release of green belt land in the Borough to meet development need and requests that further land is proposed for release in order to provide the necessary supply to meet the anticipated economic and housing growth demands.</p> <p>8.14 It is noted that the DLP is overly reliant on small sites and has overestimated the potential housing delivery which can be secured from the extant land supply. The inclusion of reserve sites in the plan is recommended, to reflect the risk of non-delivery of sites in the supply, as is the identification of safeguarded land to take account of longer-term development requirements beyond the plan period.</p> <p>8.15 Peel requests that the DLP makes provision for additional housing allocations, including larger plots and reserve sites, in order address this.</p> <p>8.16 The critical need to develop an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is highlighted. Peel agrees that new development must contribute to infrastructure provision; as such, requirements must be in line with legal and policy parameters and with contributions proportionate to the scale and nature of the development proposed. The proposed introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy is not supported as the most suitable vehicle for delivering the infrastructure required in the Borough; the Government review of the CIL system should taken into account by RBC.</p> <p>8.17 Peel welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy / developer contribution requirements as they emerge.</p> <p>8.18 Development viability is reviewed in detail at Appendix 1. Proposed Development Opportunities</p> <p>8.19 In relation to Peel's land interests in the Borough, this representation considers four sites which have been subject of previous Development Frameworks and representations in the context of the Local Plan development. Updates to these frameworks will be provided to RBC in due course, setting out a clear vision and proposals for the development of these sites.</p> <p>8.20 'Site Opportunity' representations submitted alongside this report</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>provide an initial review of the development opportunities, including details of the site and its location, consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA) and planning policy; and a Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review which forms part of the evidence base to the DLP.</p> <p>8.21 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted for residential development.</p> <p>8.22 Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden: Part of this site has been allocated for housing development in the DLP. Peel supports this allocation. The SHLAA identifies the remainder as having potential for development, but with landscape impact as the major constraint; the DLP proposes it remain within Green Belt. Peel considers that the site can be developed with sensitivity to landscape features, and together with the allocated site, there is potential for a logical extension to the west side of Haslingden. The updated Development Framework to follow this representation will further illustrate the opportunity for the development of this site and give comfort that it should reasonably be released for development.</p> <p>8.23 Peel requests the designation of Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden in its entirety as a housing allocation.</p> <p>8.24 Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall: The northern part of this site has been allocated for housing development in the DLP. Peel supports this allocation. The SHLAA identifies the remainder as having potential for development in 6-10 years subject to addressing site constraints. The Green Belt Assessment has included this land within a far larger plot extending to the south. The land to the south has a greater value in Green Belt terms, and considering the Peel site in isolation, release for development would not have a significant impact on the Green Belt. Peel supports the SHLAA conclusion and considers that the site should be included as an allocation in the DLP to meet the Borough's housing needs. The updated Development Framework to follow this representation will further illustrate the opportunity for a comprehensive development at Haslam Farm.</p> <p>8.25 Peel requests the designation of Land at Haslam Farm in its entirety as a housing allocation.</p> <p>8.26 Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield: This site is within the HS3: Edenfield DLP housing allocation, proposed for release from Green Belt. Peel supports this allocation and is preparing an updated Development Framework to illustrate the development opportunity. Peel is committed to working with the other landowners within the allocation as required by the policy and in order to achieve quality in placemaking.</p> <p>8.27 Peel supports the designation of Land at Blackburn Road as a housing allocation.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>8.28 Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield: The SHLAA identifies the Site as having potential for development, subject to mitigating site constraints; the DLP proposes it remain within Green Belt. Peel considers that the site can be developed with sensitivity to landscape and heritage features, and together with the large scale allocation to the west (HS:3 Edenfield), there is potential for this site to form part of the extension to the village. The updated Development Framework to follow this representation will further illustrate the opportunity for development of this site and give comfort that it should reasonably be released for development.</p> <p>8.29 Peel requests the designation of Land at Burnley Road as a housing allocation.</p> <p>8.30 Rossendale Golf Course: This site is a more recent development opportunity being promoted by Peel, and has hence not been considered in the SHLAA or DLP. The site could reasonably for a discreet extension to the village of Helmshore. The Development Framework to follow this representation will further illustrate the opportunity for development of this site and give comfort that it could reasonably be released for development.</p> <p>8.31 Peel welcomes further discussion on the land at Rossendale Golf Course as a housing allocation.</p> <p>Development Management</p> <p>8.32 The representation makes a number of comments on the proposed development management policies of the DLP. Of note, Peel requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing and open space / garden requirements should be considered on a site by site basis and reference viability measures. • Requirements for contributions to playing pitch provision should be adequately flexible and relate to site context and viability • Design policies should not be simplified and less prescriptive • Policy relating to biodiversity should be amended to reflect NPPF • Removal of the proposed 2:1 tree replacement policy • Removal of the requirement for electric car charging points in all developments • Removal of maximum parking standards, in line with NPPF <p>Please see appendix</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1771	Mohammed	Ali Ahmed	Lancashire County Council		Not Applicable	<p>2 Comments Relating to Education</p> <p>Section 14 of the Education Act 1996 dictates that Lancashire County Council's statutory obligation is to ensure that every child living in Lancashire is able to access a mainstream school place in Lancashire. Some children have Special Educational Needs for which they access school provision outside of Lancashire. Special Educational Needs provision is managed by LCC's SEND Team and is not covered by this response. The Strategy for the provision of school places and school's capital investment 2015/16 to 2017/18 provides the context and policy for school place provision and schools capital strategy in Lancashire. Over the coming years, Lancashire County Council and its local authority partners will need to address a range of issues around school organisation in order to maintain a coherent system that is fit for purpose, stable, and delivering the best possible outcomes for children and young people.</p> <p>Pressure for additional school places can be created by an increase in the birth rate, new housing developments, greater inward migration and parental choice of one school over another. If local schools are unable to meet the demand of a new development there is the potential to have an adverse impact on the infrastructure of its local community, with children having to travel greater distances to access a school place.</p> <p>In a letter from the DfE to all Chief Executives, the Minister of State for Housing and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Schools jointly stated that 'where major new housing developments create an additional need for school places, then the local authority should expect a substantial contribution from the developer towards the cost of meeting this requirement'.</p> <p>The SPT produces an Education Contribution Methodology document which outlines the Lancashire County Council methodology for assessing the likely impact of new housing developments on school places, where necessary mitigating the impact, by securing education contributions from developers. In order to assess the impact of a development the School Planning Team consider demand for places against the capacity of primary schools within 2 miles and secondary schools within 3 miles. These distances are in line with DfE travel to school guidance and Lancashire County Councils Home to School Transport Policy.</p> <p>Planning obligations will be sought for education places where Lancashire primary schools within 2 miles and/or Lancashire secondary schools within 3 miles of the development are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already over-subscribed, • Projected to become over-subscribed within 5 years, or • A development results in demand for a school site to be provided. <p>This latest consultation follows on from information provided to Rossendale</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>Borough Council planning officers by the School Planning Team, to be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) July 2017. In the response SPT set out the challenges facing school provision across the district of Rossendale and the spatial area it covers.</p> <p>To enable further understanding of the challenges ahead, Lancashire County Council recently met with Rossendale Borough Council planning officers to discuss the issues and the location of strategic and non-strategic housing developments and the demand of new housing developments on the current infrastructure.</p> <p>The purpose of the liaison meetings is to understand the overall scale of housing, and the phasing across the life of the local plan from planning officers at Rossendale Borough Council. In return SPT provide the current provision across the mainstream schools, primary and secondary. The latest meeting took place on 11 September 2017; at the meeting it was highlighted the need for additional primary education places across the district. The situation across Rossendale and across East Lancashire where hot spots have emerged due to a combination of circumstances and now there is an urgent need to create additional places. Achieving additional places can be created through the expansion, or unlocking potential within existing space, and/or the potential need for a new school to meet the demand.</p> <p>The meeting was also attended by a representative from LCC Pupil Access Team who provided an overview of the issues of school placement across the district. The current situation is that many of the primary schools are at capacity with only a selected few with some capacity. The situation has been further compounded by additional children migrating in to the area who have not been in the Lancashire education system previously. Pupil Access are concerned an increased number of children are not obtaining their first choice of school and have to make key decisions over the intake criteria.</p> <p>The main areas of concern are close to the strategic site at Edenfield and developments in Whitworth, Waterfoot and Crawshawbooth and Bacup, however the majority of primary schools across the district are currently at capacity with new housing coming forward that will impact on the current and long term provision of schools located close to the developments.</p> <p>Currently there are 31 primary schools across the district, 28 of them are classed as outstanding or good by Ofsted, with three requiring improvement or inadequate. Lancashire County Council's policy would be to only expand schools good or outstanding schools and require schools falling below this to be classified as good before any expansion options would be considered.</p> <p>The situation in secondary schools follows the same pattern with most of the schools at capacity with only Fearn's showing to have capacity, however the school currently has an inadequate Ofsted rating. Parental choice may result in the remaining schools to be at or over capacity. Lancashire County Council continue to work closely with Fearn's to resolve the situation, however this</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>can take time.</p> <p>The shortfall across the district is based on the 5 year Housing Land Supply supplied by Rossendale Borough Council annually and inputted in to the housing forecast; this assumes all of the housing will be delivered, applying a worst case scenario of all dwellings to be 4 bedroom until additional information is received at reserved matters stage. School Planning are able to forecast with some confidence up to 5 years, beyond this certain assumptions are applied.</p> <p>The forecasting information provides Rossendale Borough Council with the information there will be the requirement for additional school sites or expansions to existing schools, and the need of developer contributions through Section106 agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy CIL to fund infrastructure projects. In particular the development at Edenfield which is subject to master planning and identifies a need for a suitable school site within or close to the development and look to planning officers at Rossendale to negotiate this matter with developers of the site and ensure the site meets the needs to develop a new school.</p> <p>The situation across the district of Rossendale requires a detailed review based on the understanding of the Rossendale Borough Council housing site allocations 2017 – 2032. The issue of capacity within mainstream schools is becoming an issue within Rossendale and across East Lancashire with several hot spots emerging based on the housing to be brought forward, impacting on the education infrastructure. Housing developments remains the main contributor, however, inward migration from bordering districts and the migration of foreign nationals to fulfil employment gaps has resulted in additional impact not taken into account as part of the SPT housing forecast. Lancashire County Council continue to liaise with the district council to understand and address the situation and on would like to thank Rossendale planning officers for the continued engagement.</p> <p>3 Comments Relating to Health</p> <p>Rossendale Borough Council has requested input from the Public Health Wider Determinants Team at Lancashire County Council into the development of Rossendale's Emerging Local Plan. This briefing is in response to this request for Public Health advice.</p> <p>The comments have been drafted using evidence available at the time of writing and seek to examine how the planning policies can maximise their potential to improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities in Rossendale.</p> <p>This document will make numerous references to the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). The 2015 IMD also allows us to view deprivation by electoral ward and this can assist us in understanding the geographic areas affected by deprivation. 1 ward in Rossendale, Stacksteads ward, sits in</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>national decile 1 which puts it in the 10% most deprived nationally. National decile 2 includes wards that are in the 20% most deprived nationally. 2 wards in Rossendale feature in decile 2. These are Irwell ward and Worsley ward. The IMD 2015 provides us with subdomains of deprivation, several of which are considered in more detail within this document. The seven domains that contribute to the IMD are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income • Employment • Health Deprivation and Disability • Education, Skills and Training • Barriers to Housing and Services • Crime • Living Environment <p>Built and natural environments are key environmental determinants of health and wellbeing and the National Planning Policy Frameworkii recognises that "the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities".</p> <p>The document 'Rossendale Draft Local Plan' includes a range of policies that have the potential to contribute to improvements in health and wellbeing and reductions in health inequalities. For this potential to be maximised it is important that the proposed policies are adopted universally across Rossendale but also delivered proportionately dependent on need.</p> <p>The document 'The Marmot Review: implications for Spatial Planning'iii explains that 'in order to reduce the steepness of the social gradient in health, actions must be universal, but with a scale and intensity that is proportionate to the level of disadvantage. This is called proportionate universalism. Greater intensity of action is likely to be needed for those with greater social and economic disadvantage, but focusing solely on the most disadvantaged will not reduce the health gradient, and will only tackle a small part of the problem. Action is needed to improve health for all, but must be focussed proportionately more for those lower down the gradient, with the aim that all have the health Outcomes of the most advantaged - this is called "levelling-up."'</p> <p>As we can see in Figure 2, the majority of Rossendale's electoral wards sit within deciles 1 and 2 in the Health and Disability domain of the Index of Multiple Deprivation – this places most of the borough within the bottom 20% nationally.</p> <p>PHE: "The charts below show life expectancy for men and women in this local authority for 2011-2013. Each chart is divided into deciles (tenths) by deprivation, from the most deprived decile on the left of the chart to the least deprived decile on the right. The steepness of the slope represents the inequality in life expectancy that is related to deprivation in this local area. If there were no inequality in life expectancy as a result of deprivation, the line</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>would be horizontal".</p> <p>Figure 3v: Life expectancy: inequalities in Rossendale</p> <p>In order for the Rossendale Local Plan to achieve its potential in improving health and wellbeing and tackling health inequalities it is important that the policies it proposes reflect a commitment to this approach. 'The Marmot Review: implications for Spatial Planning' recommend this with a specific focus across the social gradient on the policy areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Improving active travel ☑ Improving good quality open and green spaces ☑ Improving the quality of food in local areas ☑ Improving the energy efficiency of housing ☑ Support locally developed and evidence-based community regeneration programmes <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>As a general principle, policies that relate to the 5 areas above should be written with the aim of improving health outcomes for the whole population, with a particular emphasis on the areas of highest need (as evidenced by the Index of Multiple Deprivation and overarching health indicators). We recommend that this principle is embedded in the review process as the Local Plan is revised and updated.</p> <p>Public Health and JSNA data and intelligence should be used to further inform the local plan evidence base for health and wellbeing. Planners and public health practitioners should work in partnership with regard to the outcomes of increasing life expectancy and reducing health inequalities.</p> <p>Further Relevant Data and Intelligence: Social Isolation</p> <p>With changing family and community structures and an ageing population, increasing numbers of people, especially older adults, are becoming socially isolated or lonely. Chronic social isolation can reduce life expectancy by an equivalent amount to smoking, with chronic loneliness increasingly recognised as having far reaching consequences for the health and wellbeing of both individuals and wider communities.</p> <p>Figure 19xx: Households in Rossendale at risk of Social Isolation by Quintile</p> <p>Using Mosaic to model social isolation Lancashire County Council estimates that currently there are approximately 1,100 socially isolated households in Rossendale.</p> <p>As the map illustrates, these households are concentrated around Rawtenstall and Bacup. Furthermore, figure shows that Rossendale has a significantly higher than average proportion of older residents living in deprivation.</p> <p>Figure 20xxi: Index of Deprivation for Rossendale by Income, Child Poverty and Older People</p> <p>Future developments in Rossendale should give consideration to how the design of environments promotes physical activity in older people and reduces</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------------

isolation.

Please see appendix

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment	
1774	Melanie	Lindsey	The Coal Authority		Not Applicable	<p>Background on the Coal Authority</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a Non-Departmental Public Body sponsored by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. The Coal Authority was established by Parliament in 1994 to: undertake specific statutory responsibilities associated with the licensing of coal mining operations in Britain; handle subsidence claims which are not the responsibility of licensed coalmine operators; deal with property and historic liability issues; and provide information on coal mining.</p> <p>The main areas of planning interest to the Coal Authority in terms of policy making relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The safeguarding of coal in accordance with the advice contained in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England, Scottish Planning Policy in Scotland, and Minerals Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales; •The establishment of a suitable policy framework for energy minerals including hydrocarbons in accordance with the advice contained in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England, Scottish Planning Policy in Scotland, and Minerals Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales; and •Ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduces the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England, Scottish Planning Policy in Scotland, and Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales. <p>Background on Coal Mining Issues in Rossendale</p> <p>Surface Coal Resources, Development and Prior Extraction</p> <p>As you will be aware, the Rossendale area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These resources cover approximately 36.55% of Rossendale.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process.</p> <p>Coal Mining Legacy</p> <p>As you also will be aware, Rossendale has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities.</p> <p>Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and</p>			

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas.</p> <p>Within the plan area there are approximately 851 recorded mine entries and around 148 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority. A range of other mining legacy features are present including a mine gas site, past surface coal mining, recorded shallow coal workings and unrecorded shallow coal workings..</p> <p>In total The Coal Authority High Risk Development Area covers approximately 19.59% of the Council area. Mining legacy is therefore a significant issue in the context of Rossendale.</p> <p>Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. No development should take place over mine entries even when treated.</p> <p>Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. The presence of mine entries can be a constraint as new development should not be permitted over or within the influencing distance of a mine entry.</p> <p>As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these comments. The Coal Authority wishes to continue to be consulted both informally if required and formally on future stages.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1775	Tom	Whitehead	16 different groups		Not Applicable	<p>REPRESENTATION TO THE ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN, DATED 9 OCTOBER 2017</p> <p>Please accept this representation on behalf of a collective of individuals and community groups who came together to resist the Scout Moor Windfarm extension proposals (Rossendale), and the Rooley Moor Windfarm proposals (Rochdale).</p> <p>Following these two successful campaigns, as well as campaigns against other individual turbine proposals locally, the group's purpose has evolved and now includes resisting inappropriate wind turbine development in the wider north-Manchester uplands, including land in Rossendale, Bury, Rochdale and Blackburn with Darwen.</p> <p>The group has serious concerns as to the draft Rossendale Local Plan policies pertaining to wind turbine development, and these are elaborated on below. Requests to amend policy are highlighted blue for ease of reference.</p> <p>A schedule of the signatories to this submission is set out at the foot of this representation.</p> <p>REGIONAL IMPORTANCE OF THE 'UPLANDS' By way of a context, the October 2016 draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) identifies "the north Manchester uplands" as a regionally important landscape, for the benefit and utility of people from the wider city region (Policy GM10). The uplands provide a valuable visual, environmental and recreational resource to the region, and are precious in their very 'open-ness'.</p> <p>Whilst Rossendale is not within Greater Manchester, its administrative area lies intimately between and around the GM authorities of Bury and Rochdale, and the moorland and upland in Rossendale's south-western sector (notably Scout Moor and the moorlands north and east of Ramsbottom) function inescapably as part of this greatly valued Greater Manchester regional upland resource. To demonstrate this regional importance, the draft GMSF policy said: "The distinctive upland landscape, including large scale sweeping moorlands, pastures enclosed by dry stone walls, and gritstone settlements contained in narrow valleys, will be protected and enhanced as part of the wider Pennine area extending to the north and east of Greater Manchester.</p> <p>The achievement of the following priorities will be particularly important:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significantly extend the area of active blanket bog, both through the protection of existing sites and the restoration of degraded areas, thereby helping to retain and capture carbon, support priority species and habitats, improve water quality, retain water, manage run-off and reduce soil erosion; 2. Enhance the full range of moorland habitats as part of an ecologically connected network, including improving upland meadows, to support increased wildlife populations and enable them to adapt to climate change; 3. Maintain the sense of remoteness, protect historic landscape features, and enhance views of and from the area, as key aspects of local distinctiveness, tranquillity and identity; 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>4. Enhance public access and promote the enjoyment of the landscape, in a manner compatible with conserving the environmental and historic qualities, thereby supporting a high quality of life, healthy lifestyles and the attractiveness of Greater Manchester for visitors.”</p> <p>Whilst in draft, this policy was included in the GMSF from the outset, and clearly demonstrates a recognition at the GM level the value of these uplands. This position reflects the position of Natural England, who identify this area as within the South Pennine Character Area.</p> <p>Given this regional significance, the north Manchester uplands are to be read as one collective of spaces, despite the considerable expanse of area they occupy, and despite straddling various different local authority administrative areas.</p> <p>LOCAL PRECEDENT & LANDSCAPE VALUE</p> <p>The decisions of three recent planning applications for turbines or groups of turbines within this GM uplands area have been taken at either Secretary of State or Planning Inspectorate level. We identify these decisions below, and in each instance, summarise the reason for refusal: 1. Scout Moor Windfarm Extension (DCLG reference APP/B2355/V/15/3139740; refused at SoS call-in; decision dated 6 July 2017); the proposed development would be visible from Ramsbottom and surrounding Bury settlements. The SoS observed that "the proposal sits within an area of valued landscape because of its openness, tranquillity and attractive views", and "would introduce prominent views of turbines where none currently exist"; in concluding, the Secretary of State factors in to the planning balance the energy-generation benefits of the proposal, and yet concludes in "weighing the benefits of the scheme against the likely harm...the planning balance falls against granting planning permission". The SoS also gave considerable weight to the level of opposition expressed by 'Affected Communities' (a term introduced by the June 2015 Written Ministerial Statement for onshore turbine development). 2. Rooley Moor Windfarm, Rochdale; reference 14/00877/FUL, determined 25 June 2015. Reasons for refusal included "Rooley Moor is specifically identified as 'unenclosed moorland' with a wild and tranquil landscape character. The proposed development of twelve turbines would have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area, from both short range and longer distance views and both individually and cumulatively when viewed with existing and proposed wind farm developments in the area."</p> <p>3. Turbine at Gatehouse Farm, Bamford Road, Ramsbottom (Turn Village), Bury, BLO ORT; appeal reference: APP/B2355/W/16/3152975, dated 29 November 2016. The inspector found that 'the totality of harm would not be outweighed by the environmental benefits'. It is clear that, despite claimed energy-generation benefits of turbine development, the adverse landscape impacts of such developments across this north-Manchester upland area clearly outweigh any claimed benefits. Given the regional significance of the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>north-Manchester uplands, these recent decisions give considerable weight towards the policy commentary set out below.</p> <p>Signed on behalf of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rooley Moor Neighbourhood Forum • Holcombe Society • Bury Rural Inequalities Forum • Ramsbottom Heritage Society • Prickshaw & Broadley Fold Area Community Group • Rossendale Harriers club • Friends of Rooley Moor • Whitworth Residents • Turn Village Residents • Townsend Fold Residents • Affetside Society • Lane Head residents group • Edenfield Village Residents Association • Rochdale & Bury Bridleways Association committee • Rural Rossendale Trust Accommodation Providers • Norden Area Forum 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1777	Adam	Brennan	United Utilities		Not Applicable	<p>Thank you for your consultation seeking the views of United Utilities as part of the development plan process.</p> <p>United Utilities aims to facilitate sustainable development whilst safeguarding our service to customers; and assist in the development of sound planning strategies, to identify future development needs and to secure the necessary long-term infrastructure investment.</p> <p>We wish to build a strong partnership with all stakeholders to aid sustainable development and growth within the North West. We aim to proactively identify future development needs and share our information. This helps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure a strong connection between development and infrastructure planning; deliver sound planning strategies; and inform our future infrastructure investment submissions for determination by our regulator. <p>Water and wastewater services are vital for the future well-being of your community and the protection of the environment. When developing your future planning policies and supporting documents it is important to consider the impacts on its community and environment and ensure infrastructure capacity is available.</p> <p>United Utilities can most appropriately manage the impact of development on its infrastructure if development is identified in locations where infrastructure is available with existing capacity. It may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery of infrastructure in some circumstances.</p> <p>United Utilities has commented on previous stages of the Draft Local Plan preparation. Our response to your Council's previous planning policy consultations; planning applications; pre developer enquiries and planning policy liaison meeting comments are still valid and should be taken into consideration when developing your Local Plan and supporting policies.</p> <p>United Utilities now wish to submit comments to the Council for consideration as part of its Draft Local Plan which runs until 5pm on Monday 9th October 2017. The Local Plan is a key planning document for Rossendale, setting out the Development Management Policies which will be used to determine planning applications, including the allocation of sites to deliver specific types of development, over the plan period 2019-2034.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>United Utilities wishes to highlight that we will seek to work closely with the Council during the Local Plan process to develop a coordinated approach for delivering sustainable growth in sustainable locations.</p> <p>We note that the Local Plan is proposing a number of large development sites. We would like to emphasise that new development should be focused in sustainable locations which are accessible to local services. We will be able to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>most appropriately manage the impact of development if it is in locations where there is access to infrastructure with capacity. As more information becomes available on development proposals such as the approach to surface water drainage and the timing for the delivery of development, which is often only available at the planning application stage, it may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery of infrastructure. Many of the rural areas of the Borough will be supported by infrastructure which is proportionate to its rural location. Therefore disproportionate growth in any settlement, especially small settlements, has the potential to place a strain on existing water and wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>Generally Greenfield sites have limited or no supporting water supply and/or sewerage infrastructure assets; they may be adjacent to existing infrastructure assets that are located on the fringe/limits of the existing water supply and/or sewerage infrastructure networks which are of a small diameter and have limited capacity to support additional capacity. Providing supporting infrastructure to Greenfield development sites could result in the need to upsize the existing assets to support the additional capacity needs; therefore this may result in a need for a co-ordinated approach to phased development in line with any supporting infrastructure works.</p> <p>We would therefore ask any future developer(s) to contact United Utilities as early as possible to discuss water and wastewater infrastructure requirements for specific sites, to ensure that the delivery of development can be co-ordinated with the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>We wish to highlight our free pre-application service for applicants to discuss and agree drainage strategies. We cannot stress highly enough the importance of contacting us as early as possible. Enquiries are encouraged by contacting: Developer Services - Wastewater Tel: 03456 723 723 Email: WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk Website: http://www.unitedutilities.com/builder-developer-planning.aspx Developer Services – Water Tel: 0345 072 6067 Email: DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk Website: http://www.unitedutilities.com/newwatersupply.aspx</p> <p>In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, we also wish to highlight the importance of surface water draining in the most sustainable way. The hierarchy to be investigated by a developer / applicant when considering a surface water drainage strategy is set out below in the following order of priority:</p> <p>a) An adequate soak away or some other adequate infiltration system, (approval must be obtained from local authority/building control/Environment Agency); or, where that is not reasonably practicable; b) Attenuated discharge to watercourse (approval must be obtained from the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>riparian owner/land drainage authority/Environment Agency); or, where that is not reasonably practicable;</p> <p>c) Attenuated discharge to surface water sewer (approval must be obtained from United Utilities); or, where that is not reasonably practicable;</p> <p>d) Attenuated discharge to combined sewer (approval must be obtained from United Utilities).</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>We trust the above comments will be afforded due consideration by the Council in the preparation of its Local Plan. United Utilities would welcome the opportunity to meet with Rossendale Borough Council to discuss our response in detail.</p> <p>In the meantime, if you have any queries or would like to discuss this representation, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1781			Rossendale Civic Trust		Not Applicable	<p>1. Overview – Local Plan’s local history:</p> <p>A. 4 years Delayed Progress: Rossendale Civic Trust, after seeing Rossendale Borough Council deliver a Core Strategy well before others such as Bury and Blackburn, then saw progress slowed by reduced staffing and politically driven policy changes, and note these 2011 Planning Inspector’s expectations:- Report to Rossendale Borough Council by Roland Punshon BSc Hons, MRTPI an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government 10 October 2011...concludes that the Rossendale Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the borough over the next 15 years. The Council has sufficient evidence to support the strategy and can show that it has a reasonable chance of being delivered.....</p> <p>24. PPS12 requires that the CS should provide a policy basis for at least 15 years from the date of adoption. The Council expects adoption to take place in 2011 and, in line with the guidance, the plan period ends in 2026. I have taken into account concerns that, by the time the Council’s Site Allocations DPD is prepared and adopted, only about 13 years of the plan period would remain.....</p> <p>25. The fact that the Site Allocations DPD may not be in place until 2013 should not prevent the Council from giving pragmatic consideration to development proposals before that time.....</p> <p>B. RCT, after RBC’s 15 September reply to Freedom of Information Request – FOI/3684 on LOCAL PLAN POLICY 2 – DENSITIES DELIVERED 2011-2015, came to conclusion. Rossendale could soon be “built out” with low density developments surely not in accordance with the Local Plan’s Core Strategy, nor a way to deal with our national need to build for an increasing and not that rich population; and a need to take note of Census occupancy figures.</p> <p>C. RCT then saw 24th February 2016 the formal Notice of Withdrawal of draft Local Plan Part 2 “Lives and Landscapes” and:-</p> <p>3 Mar 2016 - We have started a campaign “Keep Rossendale Valley Green” and our Council Leader Alyson Barnes has written a letter to David Cameron ...</p> <p>The Tory Government want to build over 5,000 new houses in Rossendale. We know that there is a national housing shorting and we want to play our part but the number of new houses is just too much for Rossendale to cope with. Rossendale is set in steep valleys which leave little room for building. Large areas of green belt land will need to be built on to accommodate 5,000 houses.</p> <p>We have started a campaign “Keep Rossendale Valley Green” and our Council Leader Alyson Barnes has written a letter to David Cameron asking him to reverse his government’s decision to force the Council to build houses that will damage our Valley forever.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
						<p>We want as many people as possible to join the campaign and so we are asking you to add your name to Alyson's letter asking David Cameron to reconsider. You can sign the letter and read more about the campaign at: http://www.keepprossendalevalleygreen.co.uk/</p> <p>D. RCT now see, from Jake Berry MP Rossendale and Darwen 14 September 2017:-</p> <p>One of my priorities at the last election was to defend our local countryside from over development so I'm really pleased to confirm that our local housing figures, which have caused such controversy are set to be dramatically slashed. There was outrage last year when plans were published to build up to five thousand new houses across the Rossendale Valley, when the Council controversially selected playing fields, countryside and football pitches for development.</p> <p>Under the Government's new plans announced today, currently being consulted upon, Rossendale will see it's housing figures cut by over half from the plans previously proposed by Labour. The numbers for Blackburn with Darwen Borough council have also been reduced.</p> <p>I'm delighted that after raising this issue at the highest levels that I've been able to get the housing figures reduced to protect more of our local green spaces. Rather than playing political games, I've got on with the job, working on a cross-party basis and I'm so pleased that we have succeeded. This is a victory for everyone here in Rossendale & Darwen.</p> <p>Given the reduction we have managed to secure - I'm calling on the Councils to now suspend any proposal to remove land from our green belt and prioritise new developments on brownfield and former industrial sites. The Government's new figures apply from April 2018 and are subject to consultation but they confirm that the number of new homes required for Rossendale over the next 10 years has been reduced to just 2,120 and the numbers for Blackburn with Darwen have been cut to just 1,530.</p> <p>RCT note how practicalities must not stand in way of politics.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	General	Further comment
1789	Jackie	Copley	CPRE		Not Applicable	<p>1. The Lancashire Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE Lancashire) is pleased to comment on Rossendale Council's draft Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation document.</p> <p>2. CPRE as the leading countryside charity is an advocate of plan-led 'sustainable development', with a focus on urban concentration, so that harm to the countryside and green space in urban places is minimised. We recommend the use of sustainable development to make the best use of existing infrastructure and to halt built intrusions into rural landscapes.</p> <p>3. Of course, we want to see the Borough's needs properly planned as this leads to more sustainable development than sporadic speculative development especially in rural areas. Rossendale's countryside is a natural asset of considerable local pride and enjoyment to residents, businesses and visitors.</p> <p>4. Yet every year our countryside is under increasing threat from development, and despite commitments from both national and local Government to protect it, beautiful countryside is 'unnecessarily' lost. CPRE campaigns for the re-use of available, previously used land, where not of environmental value, in advance of sacrificing our green fields. Once countryside land is built, it is gone forever.</p> <p>5. The adoption of a 'sound' local plan will help Rossendale Council allocate enough land for new development in sustainable locations. We wish the forward planning team every success in this challenge and we set out comments to specific policies below: (please see specific policies)</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>25. CPRE Lancashire wishes Rossendale's Forward Planning Policy Team every success with progressing the Local Plan documents. We hope that the value of previously developed land to the delivery of new jobs and homes will be effectively realised in the document to save 'preventable' countryside and green space loss, especially Green Belt designated land, so that it will be protected and enhanced in the future.</p> <p>26. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>		

Number of comments General

51

Monitoring

Reference	Monitoring	Monitoring			
731	Emily	Hrycan	Historic England	Not Applicable	The Plan should include details on how the historic environment will be monitored.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Monitoring	Further comment
1812	Philip	Carter	Environment Agency		Not Applicable	In relation to the proposed criteria for monitoring the implementation of the plan, the following information could also be used to track plan progress and measure success:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to an objection from the Environment Agency 		

Number of comments Monitoring

2

New Policy

Reference	New Policy	New Policy
-----------	------------	------------

1775	Tom	Whitehead	16 different groups		Support	<p>Proposed New Policy</p> <p>We propose a policy covering all the upland areas, explicitly recognising the value of the open-ness in accordance with draft policy GM10 of the GMSF, and how incongruous structures, such as turbines, would be considered inappropriate development and refused planning permission We propose a policy that all existing turbine development is to be regarded as inappropriate development, that there is a presumption to reinstate the open-ness of the uplands, and that upon expiry of planning permission in each instance there shall be a presumption against renewal of those consents.</p> <p>This group will work constructively with the LPA through its Local Plan review to ensure that that a robust defence is made of the open-ness of these uplands. Parallel representations will also be made the local plan reviews in neighbouring authorities, and to the GMSF.</p> <p>Signed on behalf of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rooley Moor Neighbourhood Forum • Holcombe Society • Bury Rural Inequalities Forum • Ramsbottom Heritage Society • Prickshaw & Broadley Fold Area Community Group • Rossendale Harriers club • Friends of Rooley Moor • Whitworth Residents • Turn Village Residents • Townsend Fold Residents • Affetside Society • Lane Head residents group • Edenfield Village Residents Association • Rochdale & Bury Bridleways Association committee • Rural Rossendale Trust Accommodation Providers • Norden Area Forum 		
------	-----	-----------	---------------------	--	---------	--	--	--

Number of comments New Policy

1

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	New site	Further comment
New Site Proposed by Consultee								
Reference	New site	New Site Proposed by Consultee						

69	P.L	Massey			Not Applicable	<p>Futhermore to our brief conversation at the open day held at futures park on february 4th to consider the draft local plan.</p> <p>I enclose a plan of the lot of land I referred to situated on Booth Road.</p> <p>I submitted an outline planning application for this site in January 1992 when I was informed that the land was within an area of green belt and therefore the application was refused.</p> <p>I would suggest that it is now not perhaps appropriate that this strip of untidy and derelict land between two blocks of existing housing should remain undeveloped particulary as the current draft local plan is considering possible sites for future housing.</p> <p>I would be pleased if you could give consideration to the site being included for housing in the local plan and I look forward to receiveing your comments on this possibility.</p>		
----	-----	--------	--	--	----------------	--	--	--

Please see plan in appendix

164	Philip + Tilly	Hellawell			Support	<p>Dear Natalie,</p> <p>Thank you for your time on the telephone earlier today.</p> <p>Following our conversation and as promised, I am enclosing an indicative plan of our field adjoining Todmorden Road. It has the benefit of straightforward and uncomplicated access from Todmorden Road and so it appears to make sense to consider its inclusion in your latest consideration of potential for housing and is right next to land already included in the recently published long range plan for the Borough's housing needs. The difference is that our field is much more accessible.</p> <p>I should add that access to Bull Hall Barn's field would, I imagine, involve partial use of the very narrow lane to Bull Hall. That also raises the difficulty of a high, collapsing retaining wall supporting the lane behind the 2 semi detached houses(Chapel Villas). That lane is at a raised level and directly looks towards the rear bedrooms of the two houses just a few feet distant and at the SAME level..</p> <p>You could expect an understandable concern by the owners of both houses on both material counts.</p> <p>That alone may merit a planner visiting to inspect these predictable issues.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt and we'd love to hear whether and how we might progress our suggestion. If so we would approach our lessor who we believe may be interested in collaboration.</p>		
-----	----------------	-----------	--	--	---------	---	--	--

Please see attachments in appendix.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	New site	Further comment
461	Lee	Jeys			Support	<p>Dear Sir / Madam</p> <p>Representations on Emerging Local Plan Land south of Lumb Village, Ramsbottom, Bury, Lancashire</p> <p>We are instructed by Lee Jeys to submit these representations objecting to the omission of his land as a housing allocation for up to 5 dwellings in the emerging Local Plan. A site location plan accompanies these representations, and the site's location is marked (very crudely) by the red asterisk on the extract from the draft Proposals Map below.</p> <p>Mr. Jeys' land is well known to the Council and has recently been the subject of an allowed appeal in respect of a timber building constructed for the purposes of working and storing wood (ref: APP/B2355/C/15/3139574).</p> <p>We contend that this is a brownfield site that ought to be released from the Green Belt and allocated for up to 5 houses.</p> <p>In the spirit of openness, we acknowledge that the appeal Inspector presented a contrary view concerning the status of the land in her paragraph 16 : 'The Council takes issue with the contention that the land is a previously developed site. Whilst the site in the past accommodated several buildings, including a mill, these buildings were demolished in the 1990's. Over the years the land has become largely covered over by vegetation and has the character and appearance of woodland, open clearings and riverbanks. Whilst there is some evidence of foundations, fragments of walls, roads and hardstandings these industrial remains are such that they have blended into the landscape. Having regard to the definition of "previously developed land" at Annex 2 to the Framework I am inclined to agree with the Council that the site cannot be regarded as previously developed land.'</p> <p>Notwithstanding that, we continue to maintain that the land is previously developed and that the Inspector's judgement in that regard is flawed. Inspectors can and do of course reach incorrect judgements, as evidenced by a long series of legal challenges that have overturned appeal decisions.</p> <p>Our client's stance is that much of his land is indisputably brownfield. Very large expanses of stone and concrete foundations and walls are evident, and while the site may appear verdant in parts, that is very much around its periphery. The Council presented historic photographs of the site as part of its appeal evidence, which offered the appearance of dense woodland on the site. What those photographs do not reveal is that that 'greenery' was little more than a sea of Himalayam Balsam and small, poor quality self set saplings struggling to grow through narrow gaps in the foundations of the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	New site	Further comment
						<p>former mill. It is also worth highlighting that our client operated on the advice of the Forestry Commission, and associated correspondence was presented in support of the above appeal.</p> <p>It is also worth highlighting that Himalayam Balsam is an invasive weed, and carries a particular threat close to rivers and streams (as in this case). The following advice is reproduced from the website of the Royal Horticultural Society :</p> <p>What is Himalayan balsam? Introduced to the UK in 1839, Himalayan balsam is now a naturalised plant, found especially on riverbanks and in waste places where it has become a problem weed.</p> <p>Himalayan balsam tolerates low light levels and also shades out other vegetation, so gradually impoverishing habitats by killing off other plants. It is sometimes seen in gardens, either uninvited or grown deliberately, but care must be taken to ensure that it does not escape into the wild.</p> <p>Appearance Himalayan balsam is a tall growing annual, 2-3m (6-10ft) in height. Between June and October it produces clusters of purplish pink (or rarely white) helmet-shaped flowers.</p> <p>The flowers are followed by seed pods that open explosively when ripe.</p> <p>The problem Each plant can produce up to 800 seeds. These are dispersed widely as the ripe seedpods shoot their seeds up to 7m (22ft) away.</p> <p>The plant is spread by two principal means;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most widespread distribution tends to be by human means where individuals pass on seed to friends • Once established in the catchment of a river the seeds, which can remain viable for two years, are transported further afield by water <p>As such, while our client has openly cleared parts of his land, it is important that the LPA does not labour under the impression that he has removed a rich Tolkeinesque ancient woodland. He has simply sought to remove a serious, unattractive and dangerous problem, which if left would have spilled out into the adjacent countryside and further downstream.</p> <p>Notwithstanding any debate about greenfield versus brownfield (and bearing in mind that the Council is in the process of proposing the release of far larger and greener / more attractive swathes of Green Belt land elsewhere in the Borough), we suggest that the site is ideally suited for a small, bespoke, high quality housing scheme – up to 5 large detached dwellings of excellent design and strong sustainability credentials. Such a development would not only make a</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	New site	Further comment
						<p>meaningful and much needed contribution towards Rossendale’s housing land supply, but it would also efficiently and sustainably reuse what we continue to maintain is brownfield and unsightly land, and could cross subsidise environmental improvements through tree and ecological mitigation and maintenance.</p> <p>The site barely fulfils any meaningful Green Belt function. Aside from being barely visible, it is unattractive in appearance, with large expanses of concrete, stone footings and remnants of walls and other structures. Public views towards the site from the wider Green Belt are very limited / glimpsed, such that the site does not read as part of the wider open landscape or countryside. It is essentially a self contained mini-parcel that does not fulfil a wider Green Belt role, and - unlike some of the other sites that are being proposed by the Council for release - it is not readily visible from wider vantage points and does not fulfil the purposes of Green Belt designation.</p> <p>Considering the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF, we comment as below :</p> <p>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p> <p>A small, discrete and high quality housing scheme would not result in the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area. The site is an ideal site for release from the Green Belt, for reasons of its self4 containment; its relationship with Lumb as a small but sustainable settlement; its clear, defensible boundaries; and its lack of overall visibility. The careful and sensitive design of much needed homes, with substantial areas of open space that adjoin the adjacent Green Belt could not sensibly be seen as ‘urban sprawl’.</p> <p>To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>We acknowledge that – in two dimensional (plan) form - the wider parcel of Green Belt (of which the site forms a minute part) plays an important role in preventing the merging of built up areas, but the specific role the application site plays in that is negligible, and certainly when the site and context is considered in three dimensions. The erection of up to 5 houses on the site (having regard to its limited visibility and substantial boundary features) will be barely perceptible when considering both the actual and perceived gap between settlements.</p> <p>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>The site does not read as part of the wider countryside, partly because of its poor and largely brownfield condition, and partly because it is barely visible from any public vantage point. Building houses on this site would not therefore constitute material encroachment into the countryside.</p> <p>To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	New site	Further comment
						<p>The site does not fulfill any role in preserving the setting or character of any town.</p> <p>To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p> <p>It is very evident that, while the emphasis correctly remains on reusing brownfield land, there is insufficient brownfield land to accommodate the future needs of the Borough. The extremely low brownfield target (20%) set out in the emerging Plan is testament to that, as is promotion of sizeable Green Belt sites across the Borough. The emerging Local Plan recognises that :</p> <p>‘Previously developed (brownfield land) has been identified wherever possible but the supply of sites without significant constraints within urban areas is limited.’</p> <p>As such, we contend that retaining the application site within the Green Belt plays no part in the encouragement of the recycling of derelict or other urban land.</p> <p>In conclusion, we contend that the site is an excellent site for release in respect of its self-contained nature; its clear defensible boundaries; its relationship with the established residential area (Lumb); its relative lack of constraints; its modest scale and the modest amount of new houses proposed (up to 5 homes); its lack of visibility from the wider Green Belt and most public vantage points; and in turn the limited extent it ‘reads’ as part of the wider Green Belt in respect of its openness.</p> <p>We anticipate that the LPA might point to §55 of the NPPF, which indicates that new housing should not be approved in ‘isolated’ locations. We suggest that the site should not be viewed as isolated in the true sense, simply because it does not form part of a settlement. The site was, of course, home to a major mill that was constructed close to homes for its workers. The site has a ready made vehicular access well suited to serve a small number of homes.</p> <p>The aerial image above shows the site in relation to the settlement of Lumb (to the north). The 100 metre line marks the distance from the centre of the site to what we understand to be a recently built new dwelling approved under application ref: 2014/0335 at Vale Lodge, Lumb. While we have failed to extract the details of that application from the Council’s website, the following description confirms that a new dwelling was approved in this location : ‘Demolition of part of existing dwelling house and construction of proposed new detached dwelling while retaining remainder of Vale Lodge as a separate detached dwelling. (Design and details of proposed detached house as approved scheme 2014/0127) [approved on 7 October 2014].</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	New site	Further comment
						<p>The relevance of that planning permission is that the LPA clearly did not consider that new dwelling at nearby Vale Lodge to be in an 'isolated' location. Had it done so, that application would have been refused. Our client contends that his land is no more or less 'isolated' than Vale Lodge.</p> <p>The aerial image above also shows the proximity of the site to the closest property in Edenfield (marked by the 200 metre annotation).</p> <p>Our client's site is served by mains water immediately at its periphery, with an electricity transformer. Foul sewerage could readily be accommodated in septic tanks, and we understand that the current nearby cottages pump their foul up to a treatment plant. We therefore suggest that this site should not be considered 'isolated'.</p> <p>The site is readily available and owned by a single willing owner, and is ideally suited to accommodate the type of housing required in Rossendale within the next 5 years, as is recognised by the emerging Local Plan :</p> <p>'The SHMA particularly highlights a need for larger, aspirational property types in Rossendale to rebalance the stock away from small terraced properties and reduce the high levels of outmigration to adjoining areas.'</p> <p>We therefore request the Council to give due consideration to the release of this site from the Green Belt and its allocation for up to 5 houses.</p> <p>We look forward to confirmation of receipt and validation of these representations, and please do not hesitate to contact Richard Gee at these offices if anything further is required.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments.</p>		
465	Christine	Lamb		Brearley St garage	Support	Christine Lamb came in and was asking again about the Brearley St garage colony site in Stacksteads. She and Jackie Oakes are really keen to have it included in the Plan because there are continuing problems with vandalism, etc. It seems the northern half is owned by Together Housing but the remainder is unregistered. As we are now open to sites of 5 houses and over she thought it could now be reconsidered.		
639	Roy	Lister	-		Not Applicable	(...) - Please try and concentrate on developing any Brownfield sites along with redundant buildings and former Industrial sites. - - SUGGESTED SITES:- - 1) The old Poundland store site on Newhalley Rd. - 2) The old Broadley Factory site on Burnley Road (A682) - 3) Land opposite the bottom of Woodcroft St. (A682) The old White Factory site. - 4) Land at the old Social Services day care centre on Haslingden old road. - (This building has been closed for over two years at least) - 5) Site of "Horncliffe House" on Bury Rd. (Ex A56) Closed and in disrepair. - 6) Site of former Holmfield Garage on Burnley Rd (A682) - -	-	

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	New site	Further comment
740	Linda	Bohen			Support	I wish to submit a development site to your attention for consideration for housing when consulting on the draft Local Plan. Please see appendix for attachments		
944	N/A	N/A	Britannia Hotels Limited	HS2	Object	Land to the south of east of Tonacliffe Way / Meadowhead Avenue should be allocated for housing development. - - The land is identified on the accompanying drawing (Prestwich Design Group drawing No.01-Rev.A) as Site 2, being about 0.5 hectares of land. The site has in the past enjoyed the support of the local authority officers and Members for housing development, but was lost to an unexpected Green Belt designation. It remain one that is suitable for housing development and has potential to accommodate in the order of 15 units. The landowner is a willing and well financed developer, ready to bring the land forward for development that can contribute towards meeting the current shortfall in the Borough's housing development numbers The relatively small scale development in this location is readily accessible from Tonacliffe Way and would be a logical extension to an existing area of housing, which can be accommodated without adverse visual or other impacts small. Please see appendix for attachment.	No	
1550	Shelley	Carter			Support	The Brownfield area on Burnley Road (A671) which is currently occupied by the derelict Leisure Hall would be an ideal social housing site, as it is within walking distance of Bacup town centre. Another Brownfield site on Burnley Road (A671) is even nearer to Bacup town centre. This is the derelict Waterside Mill which is to be included in the Bacup Town Centre Conservation Area. I personally think that it's unlikely that this site will ever be used for commercial purposes in the future. Due to the present state of dilapidation and the cost of repairs to bring the building into use, its only hope for preservation would be to convert it into apartments, as in the case of Ilex Mill at Rawtenstall.		
Number of comments					New site	8		
Site Not Allocated								
Reference	Site not allocated		Site not allocated					

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
14	Cameron	Chattle	N/A	SHLAA16299	Object	<p>Please could you answer the following questions and provide my information requests. - - The current land use as is stated as Open Space but it is actually Designated Open Green Space for recreational usage only - please confirm. - - Availability - - Please confirm who in the councils opinion owns the land, it appears that it is multiple ownership with private and public ownership and the landowner is willing to deliver residential units? - would this not breach the covenant agreement as the land was gifted to the "landowners" and is not re saleable? - - Please could the council forward a copy of the covenant to myself for perusal as a public document. - - There is a public right of way across the land (not a presence) that is defiantly not informal and is used by a large number of people on a daily basis. a database of people can be collated if requested at a later stage. - - This is the site of the former site storage for the original developers (Mercers) and on completion was used as the main culvert for drainage from the Sports Centre fields and the Designated Open Green Space has this been considered at this stage ? - I also believe there to be substances from the site that where "buried" on departure by Mercers Development which seemed to be a standard occurrence then? - - The Conclusion by the SHLAA is there is no availability study? - - The land is suitable now? - - The site has good access? current residents have to park on the road which would therefore have to be widened to take the influx of extra traffic? - - They conclude that this site should not be part of the SHLAA assessment due to the covenant restrictions yet the council see fit not to discard it ? - - Are the council actually taking on board any credence from this independent assessment that has more than certainly be paid for through tax payers money or are they looking at the high value market area (£190 to £210/ sqm) to make their decisions? - - It would be advisable in "my opinion only" to take professional advice and use the SHLAA findings. As recent history shows the councils track record with housing and development projects is to say at least inept and at huge cost to the people of Rossendale. - - I look forward in anticipation of your comments and information. - - Kind regards -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
67	Adam	Taylor		SHLAA16072	Object	<p>with ref the above document that was recently published on the Rossendale Local Plan 2019-2034, I wish to voice my objection to this proposal. There are several points in the report that would suggest this has not been thought through properly. Firstly, the land suggested is not public land, and is not currently in a derelict condition. Its home to a farm/riding stables and grazing business. The proposal also states that the landowners intentions are “unknown or not willing to release the site” - coupled with the fact its being used on a daily basis suggests that its not available. Access to the site is via a single width unmade private road, which passes directly behind the houses at the top of The Moorlands. Any building work is going to require years of noise, heavy machinery, constant wagon deliveries, road widening, and dirt/mud everywhere. The unmade road would need widening to accomodate two lanes of traffic, and this could entail the removal of a large number of trees from the woodland directly behind The Moorlands. This increased road size, and traffic will also reduce the current levels of privacy. This would be a huge problem for anyone living on The Moorlands, severely impacting upon both quality of life and the property valuations. One of the factors in deciding to buy my house on The Moorlands is because when the searches were done (only two months ago). There was no suggestion the land behind would ever be anything other than farmland. Road access in Weir is already very restricted. There are only two minor roads that feed traffic from the estate onto the main road, so all traffic from the entire village pass through The Moorlands or Heald Lane. Adding a new estate behind The Moorlands will only increase the already busy traffic flow so that not only will it be in front of the houses, but also passing directly behind as well. Add to this the Burnley Road is just a few metres away to the west and suddenly a relatively peaceful backgarden will become almost unusable because of the road noise and exhaust fumes.. Facilites in Weir are almost non-existent. No doctors, shops, schools. There is one primary school located on the main road at the lower end of Weir, but i doubt it has the capacity to accept many more pupils. The road does become incredibly congested at school start/end times. More pupils will mean more congestion and an increased risk of traffic related accidents. The nearest shops and Doctors surgery are almost two miles away. Bus services in Weir are very limited. The result is that private car journeys have to be relied upon for everything, so adding a new estate will multiply the number of journeys being made. A walk around the existing village reveals that almost every house owns at least two cars. Thus it can be surmised that for 62 proposed new properties 120 cars will</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>be adding to the traffic.</p> <p>The wider Rossendale area may also be affected by increasing the traffic to and from Weir. The nearest access to the motorway network is approximately 6 miles northwards, 8 miles away westwards, or over 10 miles to the south. The roads in all those directions are single lane carriageways that are always busy. There is very little scope for adding more traffic without causing major holdups for everyone. There are also few alternate routes due to the geography of the region.</p> <p>Although i have not yet experienced a winter in Weir, several people have told me how snow is more of a problem than for other lower lying towns. When others get rain, Weir gets snow, and the first signs of snow mean many people park their cars on the main road to ensure easier road access. Again, adding more cars will exacerbate the current problems and could impact on the Gritters ability to ensure the roads remain clear!</p> <p>I completely disagree with the assesment that the land is viable for long term development. There are far too many improvements required to the current infrastructure and to the village as a whole that would require funding and implementing before such a proposal could be considered.</p> <p>Shops, schools, better road networks would all need to be in place.</p> <p>And i haven't even mentioned the negative impact all of this would have on the landscape, and the surrounding natural habitats.</p> <p>One of the challenges set out on the Lancashire County Councils Environment Directorate "Woodland Vision, 2006" document relates specifically to the Enclosed Uplands area of Rossendale: "Protect the open character of the upland summits" - building a new estate at the highest point in Weir certainly does nothing to achieve that goal!</p> <p>It also states amongst the Opportunities for Enclosed Uplands:- Enhance the habitat mosaic of the Enclosed Uplands Landscape Exploit opportunities for woodland creation on less viable agricultural landholdings.</p> <p>So the land being earmarked should be considered for Woodlands, if its not viable as agricultural land (which it is currently being used as). the document can be read online at http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/191686/Composite-1-5.pdf regards</p>		
334	Joe	Littlewood	-	Land adj to Guide Court	Object	<p>Development of Land adjacent to Guide Court, (Rawtenstall side) ? Pimhole. I only moved in August 2016. I gather an application for development was refused in 2015. My neighbour at X Guide Court advises me that the main reason for rejection was potential flood peril. I fully support the views that he offers.</p> <p>Inadequate Infrastructure. Destroys Village characture.</p>		Not at the moment.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
463	Sean	Taylor		SHLAA16314	Object	Hello, thank you. I am still keen to pursue the residential possibility in the future. I believe the green belt boundary should begin at my boundary with Langwood since it cannot be stated reasonably that my land is green belt, considered to be open countryside, when it has residential development on 3 of its 4 sides. However, I understand there is more goes into these decisions that just that and the parcel considered included neighbouring land and my land was not a consideration as a standalone parcel. Thanks for your helpful links,		
466	Sharon	Brown		Between Meadows Drive and Thirlmere / Ullswater	Support	<p>I wanted to let you know that I am pleased to hear that the Council have decided not to action the plans to build 11 houses between Meadows Drive and Thirlmere/ Ullswater and that the site is currently not being taken forward to build on.</p> <p>i sure, on making this decision, the Council have taken into consideration the following points:</p> <p>The historic English Heritage site, Goodshaw Chapel, which is visited by people from all over the World. Visitors come to the graves, researching their family tree and taking part in special ceremonies. I have even seen burials taking place. It is a very peaceful area.</p> <p>Families are frequently seen playing football and enjoying the open space. Rossendale Valley is a very beautiful place to live that I am proud to be a resident of, but I also want to protect areas that are popular to visitors. I often see hikers walking along 'the back lane' marvelling at the views and families walking down the lane to the local primary school in Crawshawbooth. In the afternoon, they walk back up the lane to go home. They take this route as opposed to the busy main Burnley Road because it is such a beautiful area, their children can run on in front without the worry of heavy traffic.</p> <p>The Council may not be aware but the area is very popular with the Jewish community who like to come to Rossemdale on the X43 bus for a day out. They walk along the lane to the Reservoir, they are appreciative of the lovely Rossendale countryside. I hope the Council and myself never become complacent and always find ways of promoting and protecting this wonderful visitor attraction, The Rossendale Valley.</p> <p>If Councillor Farrington has plans to plant bulbs, weed this area to further enhance its beauty, I would be happy to get involved.</p>		
471	Veronica	Rees-Davies		Back of Goodsure Ave.	Support	I am writing to send my whole hearted thanks for denighing building of new houses on the back of Goodsure Ave. by Goodsure Chapel, Loveclough. We were particularly worried as we live in x Chapel View. Loveclough.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
478	Sara	Young		SHLAA16096	Not Applicable	I am a little confused by the new local plan in relation to a plot of land near to my home. Could you please advise if the area of land – ref SHLAA16096, off heap moss farm/greens lane– is still being considered as a building plot. I cannot see it on the ROSSENDALE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN Regulation 18 Consultation but have found it on Appendix E sites assessment. Could you please advise.		
483	Nabil	Isaac		Pinfold site	Not Applicable	Email received 21/08/2017: Hello I would like to inquire whether Pinfold site in Edenfield is included in the current consultation or not? We reside at BL0 0GL and we strongly oppose removing it from green belt as will destroy the scenery as we do regular walking along Burnley Road. Also water drainage pours into the low level land protecting our house from flash flooding.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
490		Vines, Jackson & Preston		SHLAA16180	Not Applicable	<p>Land at Marl Pits, Newchurch Road, Rawtenstall</p> <p>We are instructed by Mr M Vines, Mrs K Vines, Mrs L Jackson and Mrs A Preston (as joint owners) to submit these representations objecting to the omission of their land as a housing allocation in the emerging Local Plan. We contend that this is an accessible and sustainably located site that ought to be allocated for up to 60 dwellings. The site's location is marked (very crudely) by the red asterisk on the extract from the draft Proposals Map below.</p> <p>A separate location plan is enclosed, as produced by RGP Architects (drawing ref: 04). That shows the full and precise extent of our client's landownership, and superimposes the proposed settlement boundary extracted from the draft Proposals Map. It will be noted on the RGP drawing that almost the entirety of our client's land falls within what is proposed to be the amended settlement boundary. That is welcomed by our client.</p> <p>This is clearly an excellent housing site. It is located sustainably on the edge of the built up area, close to established housing of good quality and value. The fact that the site currently falls just outside the defined settlement boundary is noted, but so too is the proposed 'extension' of the settlement boundary on the draft Proposals Map to include the overwhelming majority of our clients' land. That 'extension' is welcomed and supported, but our clients maintain that that represents only stage one of what ought to be a two stage process – namely that the site calls to be allocated specifically for housing (in much the same way that the Council has treated other comparable sites – for example, nearby site ref: HS2.53).</p> <p>It is worth noting that highways-related advice from DTPC has confirmed that – from a technical perspective – a safe and efficient access into the land can readily be delivered.</p> <p>In the Core Strategy (CS), the site does not fall within any designation. The Proposals Map extract below marks the site (red arrow), and it will be seen that it falls just outside (to the north of) the defined Urban Boundary (marked by the dark red line). The eastern section of the site falls within the large green area associated with the leisure centre. Policy 2 of the Core Strategy outlines the housing requirement in Rossendale over the plan period, with a target of 247 dwellings per year stated. In the CS, the aim is to achieve 65% of new residential development on previously developed land (PDL) (and so, by definition, 35% will be on greenfield sites), and encourage higher density development (50+ dwellings per hectare) in sustainable locations, including those within or adjacent to Rawtenstall. A minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare across the borough will be expected.</p> <p>In that regard, it is interesting to note that the draft Local Plan is suggesting a much lower 20% target for brownfield land, which is further recognition of the need to release greenfield land if the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>Borough's housing needs are to be accommodated. Our client contends that the Council ought to be releasing their site in advance of the numerous Green Belt and other arguably less sustainable sites that are being promoted for housing elsewhere in the draft Plan. The site was of course considered as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments 2015, and as the assessment form demonstrates that – in spite of scoring a '0' for access as "a major constraint" (which we consider to be incorrect, based on dedicated highways advice from DTPC) – it was proposed to be allocated for housing as a 'Phase 2' site. That assessment / conclusion is clearly helpful in taking matters forward, and is a further reason why this land should be the subject of a housing allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is ideal to accommodate the type of housing required in Rossendale, as is recognised by the emerging Local Plan : 'The SHMA particularly highlights a need for larger, aspirational property types in Rossendale to rebalance the stock away from small terraced properties and reduce the high levels of outmigration to adjoining areas.' We therefore request the Council to give due consideration to the allocation of this site for up to 60 dwellings. We look forward to confirmation of receipt of these representations, and please do not hesitate to contact Richard Gee at these offices if anything further is required.</p> <p>Please see appendix for attachments</p>		
498	John	Barnes		SHLAA16343	Object	<p>Re the plans for the future development for Rossendale Borough Council. I enclose "2" two plans of land that has been requested by three developers for future development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land at Rising Bridge road, suggested for 24/26 no old peoples, one bedroom bungalows? 2. Land for housing/industrial development. Please look to the inclusion of these land for the future development. <p>Thanking you. Please see appendix for attachments</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
535	Claire	Downes	-	shlaa16395	Not Applicable	I have contributed to the previous consultation (July 2015). It appears that the land which concerns my family ie 'The Land at Moorland Rise, Haslingden' (H92 in the previous consultation) has now been safeguarded as Green Belt in the new consultation proposal. I firmly support this and thank the planning team for their recognition of the value of the Greenbelt land for the community. - - The land to the East of Moorland Rise, behind Moorland Cottages, and stretching towards the new development at the Rossendale Hospital site is highly used recreational land, benefitting walkers, dog owners, cyclists and horse riders. It is beautiful and highly visible across the valley. It is lightly farmed and contains a wide variety of wild flowers and wild life. - - Development of the land would be a great loss to the local community and would blight the landscape for ever. I believe that this particular area has already carried enough of the burden of local development with the many houses on the Rossendale Hospital Site and the proposal of further housing developments behind Kirkhill Rise and adjacent to the current Hospital development. - - - - -		I appreciate that you have to find a certain amount of land for new housing. Skyline/highly visible developments in our beautiful valley should be avoided at all costs, as should the destruction of the countryside by profiteering landowners/developers eg
606	M	Hargreaves		Goodshaw Lane	Object	I object most strongly to the possible boundary change on Goodshaw Lane, Goodshaw. According to the planning officer at the meeting in Kay St. Baptist Church the change has been requested by 'three or four people' presumably the land owners who want to make the area an even more attractive proposition to developers. Any such change brings the appalling prospect of even more traffic on a narrow, single track already dangerous road which is used by numerous children going to and from school, walkers, cyclists and people taking their pets to the recently opened kennels. Goodshaw Lane becomes almost blocked and parking totally impossible when St mary's the remaining church of england church in the area is used for services, baptisms, weddings and funerals. At most times emergency service vehicles have a difficult task trying to negotiate both Goodshaw Avenue and Goodshaw Lane ---- without the prospect of more traffic. Site reference SHLAA16196 Suitability ---Comments ---Goodshaw Lane is at high and medium risk of surface water flood risk. Anyone using the lane after a 'downpour' will acknowledge the truth of this.		
618	DENISE	SYKES	-	land between Blackwood Road and Greens Lane Stacksteads	Not Applicable	I am relieved that the land between Blackwood Road and Greens Lane Stacksteads has not been included as suitable for development in the local plan . The area has poor access and drainage would be a problem . The land is a valuable green space with benefit to wildlife . - It is sad that the land is currently unused , it is valuable grazing land which could be utilised by livestock owners in the area		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
677	Phil	Ramsden	Lindon Park Development Park Road s Ltd	site off Lindon	Not Applicable	In summary, this representation has commented upon and highlighted concerns regarding various policies within the Draft Local Plan, with particular reference to the Representor's site off Lindon Park Road, Ewood Bridge, Haslingden. - - The Representor is of the view that the proposed and allocated sites in the Draft Local Plan need to be fully reviewed to ensure unnecessary pressure is not put upon existing urban areas and the associated infrastructure. In addition, a degree of flexibility should be incorporated into policies HS4, HS5 and HS6, with a particular emphasis in ensuring the sustainability and viability of development. - - The Representor proposes a change of designation of their site off Lindon Park Road from Green Belt to Housing, which could reduce the pressure on urban areas and their infrastructure and reduce the overall amount of greenfield land which must be allocated for development. Such a change in allocation would be suitable given the extant planning permission for housing which exists on the site and would be particularly useful in meeting housing targets, given the borough's history of poor delivery rates due to lack of suitable, viable and available development sites. -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
756	John	Simpson	-	SHLAA16306	Object	There appear to be some discrepancies about this site. - On the site assessment, the area is given as 2.14 hectares and the plan shows the entire area of open land between Helmshore Road and York Avenue. On the Corrected Policies Map 2017 with street names, the site is given no designation, reference number etc. apart from one part of it being shaded green for Green Infrastructure. What exactly is the area which it is proposed to be given over to housing? - In terms of legal constraints on the site, it should be remembered that, according to Rossendale Borough Council's own records, at least 2.7 acres of the site (about 1.09 hectares) was to be left as an open space for play etc. as a substitute for that part of Victoria Park that was to be lost to the Haslingden by-pass. Unless the Borough Council intends to renege on this agreement, the area available for possible housing development is about 1.05 hectares, not 2.14. -		RBC should concentrate on the conversion of former commercial property in towns into residential properties: - 1. High street shopping has changed with the number of supermarkets in the valley and online shopping. Towns do not need the same number of shop units. Banks etc which are closed are never going to reopen as banks and so again could be converted into apartments (at least in part, e.g. the upper storeys of the former Barclays Bank in Haslingden). - 2. This would reduce the need to build on so much of the Green Belt as is proposed, especially if, as is alleged, central government has reduced targets for the number of new houses that have to be built. - 3.Flats etc. would be more affordable for first time buyers, single people (one in three people in the UK now live alone) etc. - 4. Such developments provide a realistic attempt to address the problem of the homeless, which three and four bed-roomed houses etc do not. -
764	Chris	Aspin	Helmshore Local History Society	SHLAA 16306	Object	When the Haslingden By-pass was built, a section of Victoria Park was lost. The land at Helmcroft was opened up in compensation.		Helmshore has more than enough houses. More would place an extra burden of the local schools and the Health Service. More cars, more problems.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
783	Lucinda	Dudarenko	-	SHLAA1616249	Object	Regarding Green Belt Land at Haslam Farm Ref: H23 Townsend Fold - - Would you kindly consider my objections to the above land being removed from its present 'Green Belt' status. Whilst I am aware that you are obliged by a Government directive to build houses, I am also aware that there are lots of Brownfield sites available around the valley and I respectfully say these should be considered first before robbing people and the future generations of what little green space we have. This area in particular is, in my opinion, too small to be used for any other purpose than what it is used for namely 'it is grazing animals and a beautiful wildflower meadow. It has a plethora of wildlife (Hares, Bats, Rabbits, Foxes, Badgers and many different species of bird) All this would be lost if you closed this gateway into Rawtentall. - - Another major consideration would be logistics – namely entry and exit onto the site. The site on one side is too steep and the other side too narrow (and both ways Dangerous!!!) Parking on Bury Road especially in Winter is nigh on impossible, the first sign of frost and cars from the neighbouring hilly roads have to find space somewhere on Bury Road, if – as is proposed – 45 properties are build most of which would own one vehicle (maybe two) it would cause even more congestion on a massive scale. - - Schools places would also present a problem; it is a genuine concern for parents to find a place for existing children without adding to the situation with more youngsters to find places for. - - Visitors coming into Rawtenstall on the train (hopefully to spend money here) would I'm sure rather see the entrance to a lovely market town than a 'housing estate'. We have already lost out cottage hospital and what was replaced by the Asda monstrosity. If this goes on I fear for our cricket pitches. - - But seriously this small 'Green Belt' site at Haslam farm is like the lungs of the valley and should be left alone for everyone to enjoy.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
784	Doris	Paul	-	SHLAA16249	Object	The land at site ref H23 Haslam farm is currently legally designated as 'Green Belt' and I feel very strongly that it should remain so. It is currently grazed by sheep and provides a good harvest of meadow hay at least twice a year. I is a haven for native wildlife and It provides a beautiful backdrop to the East Lancashire Railway and the Irwell Sculptor trail, it is, without doubt, a beautiful gateway into the valley. - - Whilst I appreciate the need for the expansion of housing stocks in the next decade it would be tragic to trade in the 'Green Belt' of our green and pleasant land. Lancashire (and Rawtenstall) as a backbone of the Industrial Revolution still has a more than adequate number of Ex Industrial/Brown field site to more than supply the required number of properties as laid down by central government directives before we sacrifice the 'Green Belt' sites which are the lungs of our communities. - - The site itself is very steep and surrounded by protected trees (over 100 years old!). I personally feel access will be an issue especially in the Winter months when Bury Road is already clogged with vehicles who cannot ascend the hills of the surround housing developments, I just fail to see how Townsend fold could cope with this extra traffic. - - There are certainly currently insufficient school places within the catchment area and the lack of local employment opportunies will only exacerbate the already congested motorway links into Manchester and the surrounding cities. -	-	
944	N/A	N/A	Britannia Hotels Limited	SHLAA16003	Object	Land to the south of Bar Terrace, Tonacliffe should be allocated for housing development. - The land is included as part of SHLAA site 16003 and identified on the accompanying drawing (Prestwich Design Group drawing No.01-Rev.A) as Site 1, being about 0.6 hectares of land. - The site has in the past enjoyed the support of the local authority officers and Members for housing development, but was lost to an unexpected Green Belt designation. It remain one that is suitable for housing development and has potential to accommodate in the order of 23 units. The landowner is a willing and well financed developer, ready to bring the land forward for development that can contribute towards meeting the current shortfall in the Borough's housing development numbers - The relatively small scale development in this location is accessible from Bar Terrace and can be accommodated without adverse visual or other impacts small. Please see appendix for attachment.	No	
980	Julie	Cawtherley	-	SHLAA16295	Object	The infrastructure is not strong enough to accommodate more houses.		There are too many housing developments being considered. The infrastructure is Helmsore can not accommodate the new residents

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1017	Martin	Cain	-	SHLAA16282	Support	This site was identified in the report as brownfield whilst being situated in the greenbelt It has been omitted from the proposed list of developments for inclusion in the plan for Rossendale . - However as there are buildings(housing) opposite and buildings (Tor View School) on either side.The later of which is constantly being developed, as growth in pupil numbers would support.The geographic location of the proposed plot I would suggest represents an ideal infill site in this area without any serious encroachment of the greenbelt.Minimal alteration to the boundary would be required. - Land adjacent which is also in the greenbelt was recently released for use as a lorry storage area Alden Green on Manchester Rd (Slaters ?) - The proposed release of greenbelt land in Edenfield will certainly have a greater impact on the landscape than this proposed release and it would appear this proposal has already met with a great deal of anger and opposition. - - In light of the above it would appear there is little or no consistency as to how these decisions are arrived at. - - I would also query the site development area which is shown as 0.18 hectares.This I would challenge as an error.The land area being offered is approximately 1.5/2 acres which would accommodate 10/20 units whilst falling well within the usual density allocation. - The site is ideally place for all local amenities and the infrastructure required to support such a development.Whilst having minimal visual impact on the area and approach into the valley.Having mentioned this to local residence I would suggest there would be minimal opposition to development. - - There is in addition a further 4.5 acres of which has not been offered but part or all of this could possibly be utilized if it was felt appropriate. - I would therefore ask you to reconsider this offer and include it in the proposed development site listings.		I would be grateful if you can acknowledge receipt of my application and a response to the queries raised. - Many Thanks
1019	Rachel	Dulson		SHLAA16302	Object	Helmshore is not equipped for additional homes to be built. Roads and schools are inadequate for the current population already. Current issues have not been addressed and now you are planning to throw even more people into the mix, as well as the disruption to traffic flow that building work brings. - Build us a new school, improve our roads and perhaps once that is done, redevelop the existing old buildings that are abandoned and in disrepair and then think about building new homes.	no	
1019	Rachel	Dulson		SHLAA16295	Object	Helmshore is not equipped for additional homes to be built. Roads and schools are inadequate for the current population already. Current issues have not been addressed and now you are planning to throw even more people into the mix, as well as the disruption to traffic flow that building work brings. - Build us a new school, improve our roads and perhaps once that is done, redevelop the existing old buildings that are abandoned and in disrepair and then think about building new homes.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1045	Keith	Loughlin	-	SHLAA 16105	Support	<p>PLEASE NOTE THIS WEBSITE EXCLUDES THE POSSIBILITY TO INCLUDE ASSOCIATED PHOTOGRAPHIC AND OTHER DOCUMENT FILES I INTENDED TO INCLUDE, THERFORE I HAVE ISSUED THE FULL DOCUMENT VIA EMAIL ATTACHMENT, DIRECT TO THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT - - - Rossendale Local Plan Consultation Summer 2017 - Commenting on a policy - - The comments below are provided as SUPPORT to the conclusion of the SHLAA in relation to site identified as No 16105 (Waterbarn Chapel, Rakehead Lane and adjoining land Stacksteads). The conclusion states: “not developable or not to be included in the SHLAA” and describes its development potential as, “not suitable”. The SHLAA justification references that the land as “high surface water flood risk” and is also “contrary to the Playing Pitch Strategy”. - The Chapel itself being a derelict Grade II listed building with graveyard, as described under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - list entry number 1361948, and the land being a long-term substantial greenfield area well used by resident and other bodies. - - 1. CURRENT POLICY AND DEIGNATION - The site is currently designated as “Recreation” in guidance (Local Plan Policy E2 of the “Continuation of Local Plan: Saved Policies through the Core Strategy DPD” document, dated 2010) and is registered with Sport England as an active sport facility (Site ID 1208540). It has been used as such for over 100 years by the local community, and a great loss if allowed to be developed. In fact the Council’s own commissioned Playing Pitch Strategy, dated April 2016, for the borough recommends protection of all existing facilities due to a shortfall in sporting provisions. - - 2. FLOOD RISK - The Environment Agency has produced maps indicating an area of high degree of flood risk of the land and the attached map indicates their view of degrees of risk of flooding from low to high. Their “high risk” area indicates a minor percentage of the site area and is reflected in the Local Plan assessment criteria sections. - However, actual flooding of the land which has recently, and physically occurred, was more extensive than that indicated by the Environment Agency (document excluded by this website) - - The photo below shows the land actually flooded during Storm Eva on Boxing Day 2015 (taken from the north side of the land – River Irwell to left of photo) the result of which ultimately flooded existing Victorian terraced properties bordering the north boundary to a depth of some 2-3 feet(photos excluded by this website) - - 3. SITE ACCESS – (graveyard / sight lines / Jnctn of Brandwood Rd and Newchurch Rd) - The only vehicular access available within the ownership boundaries of the site (Chapel and Land) requires an access point to link with an existing highway situated over the open land to the side and behind the Chapel, which would also have to cross the existing graveyard (whose remains are numerous and include a Rawtenstall notary, Lord Tricket, a peer of the realm). Due to the juxtaposition of high neighbouring walls and the Chapel building itself this junction will fall foul of Tables A & B of the</p>		None

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>Development Control Advice Note 15 for Vehicular Access Standards, which show the “sight-lines” required at junctions. Development would also impact the number of vehicles using an existing restricted width junction between Brandwood Road and Newchurch Road. - - - 4. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SITE DENSITY / OWNERSHIP - I note the SHLAA indicates housing numbers on the site as “Yield Calculated 32”, but also “Yield Proposed by Applicant 42”, as per an initial proposal block plan; which I understand was discussed with Planners by a previous owner, as part of a pre-application meeting. You may be aware the site has recently changed ownership, having been sold via a property auction site in early September 2017 to a company called TMJ Contractors Ltd, based in Ashton-under-Lyne (contact telephone: 0845 634 0096). Therefore, it is now uncertain what the current owners propose for development numbers and therefore assumptions made in the SHLAA need to be removed/corrected. (document excluded by this website) -</p> <p>5. Eco Viability - Chapter 4 of the Core Strategy DPD document adopted in 2011, and in particular AVP2 covering Stacksteads, inter alia, states “The area’s distinct sense of place is to be retained and enhanced, with vacant sites and buildings to be occupied and open spaces retained “. By changing land use from Recreation to Housing does not support the spirit of this directive. - - Item No 6 of Policy 2 of the Core Strategy DPD, states that housing development should safeguard “the character of established residential areas from over-intensive and inappropriate new development”, and Item 7 requires the prioritising of “the development of previously developed land. However, development of un-allocated greenfield land will be permitted where: - i. It is for 100% affordable and/or supported housing schemes; or - ii. It forms a minor part (upto 15% of overall site size) of a larger mixed use scheme or major housing proposal (10+ dwellings) on previously developed land or - iii. It delivers a significant social, economic, or environmental benefit” - Item 3 of Policy 3 of the same DPD document states development in “ ...Stacksteads... will be permitted having regard to ... capacity of infrastructure” - Item 2.a of Policy 4 of the same DPD document states that affordable/supported housing should be “a minimum of 30% on Greenfield sites over 8 dwellings...” and in 2.c “unless otherwise agreed with the Council, a relaxation of the above requirements will only be considered if ... development being financially unviable ... based on viability assessment approved by the Council.” - I contend that the proposal to allow development fails to comply with all of the above criteria of existing/adopted Core Strategy DPD documents, as the character of the area will be significantly affected by the loss of such a large and well used community space; the local road infrastructure is insufficient to take additional vehicles; the other local infrastructure facilities are insufficient e.g schools, businesses, replacement recreational space etc; the area is well catered for in affordable housing as Together Housing have a large stock already and any such proposed additional</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						stock ("100% on un-allocated greenfield land") would skew the mix with existing standard residential facilities - - 6. Other Factors - The land has been used several times by the Helicopter Emergency Service for major trauma cases from nearby industrial facilities. There is no other facility near to these industrial sites, and loss of this open space negates this optional and vital use. - - 7. Conclusion - - In lieu of all of the above I would request the SHLAA conclusion remains intact and not changed to facilitate change of use of the land from its current designation, and thus allow any development of housing. - -		
1060	Stephen	Davies	Resident	SHLAA16295	Object	I agree housing needs to be built. But there are no plans to support infrastructure in the area. Grane road for example has a lot of traffic issues since joining up to the M65. Another 160 homes on that road trying to get out and in to the development will be a nightmare. Also there are plenty of brown field site to build on especially in Blackburn. Helmshore is a village we pay premium prices for homes in the area to have this life style we don't not want it spoilt. Large firms/ housing contractors build quick homes cutting corners all the time. Where are the children going to go to school with all schools in the area full and some of our children already having to travel to bury for school.		We need homes but well thought out planned homes. With good investment in roads, gp surgeries, schools, parks etc. We can not keep cutting into our countryside for the sake of making shareholders rich they don't love here we do please don't have the wool pulled over your eyes for all our sakes and children's.
1060	Stephen	Davies	Resident	SHLAA16302	Object	I agree housing needs to be built. But there are no plans to support infrastructure in the area. Grane road for example has a lot of traffic issues since joining up to the M65. Another 160 homes on that road trying to get out and in to the development will be a nightmare. Also there are plenty of brown field site to build on especially in Blackburn. Helmshore is a village we pay premium prices for homes in the area to have this life style we don't not want it spoilt. Large firms/ housing contractors build quick homes cutting corners all the time. Where are the children going to go to school with all schools in the area full and some of our children already having to travel to bury for school.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1106	sheila	newton	-	SHLAA 16218	Support	I would also like to comment on 2 further sites which were included in the SHLAA but are not currently up for consultation in the plan. - These are SHLAA 16218 site of the Kenross factory. - And SHLAA 16217 land North of Goodshawfold Road. - I am very glad to see that these sites are not being considered in the plan, initially because they are outside the urban boundary. They are also on the West side of Burnley Road which the council has undertaken to protect from development and are in close proximity to a Conservation area. (...) SHLAA 16218, the Kenross site is part greenfield but mainly Brownfield and is an active employment site which the Council surely needs to retain as it currently has only 16.4 hectares of B class in the borough and needs to increase this to 27 in the course of the plan. If this large site were to go to housing, the strong precedent already set in protecting the West side of Burnley Road would be lost and it is known that there are already unscrupulous owner/developers in the area who would leap on the bandwagon to develop an equally large site hypothetically resulting in total decimation for the village of Goodshawfold.		
1106	sheila	newton	-	SHLAA 16217	Support	I would also like to comment on 2 further sites which were included in the SHLAA but are not currently up for consultation in the plan. - These are SHLAA 16218 site of the Kenross factory. - And SHLAA 16217 land North of Goodshawfold Road. - I am very glad to see that these sites are not being considered in the plan, initially because they are outside the urban boundary. They are also on the West side of Burnley Road which the council has undertaken to protect from development and are in close proximity to a Conservation area. - SHLAA 16217 is greenfield, forming an open buffer zone delineating the Conservation area with open views to the moors.		
1254	Sian	Davies	-	SHLAA16305	Object	Objection to loss of green spaces in Helmshore		
1290	Deborah	Chapman	-	SHLAA16295	Object	The village of Helmshore has been steadily expanding and merging into Haslingden. The green spaces are disappearing and the character of the landscape is changing. These proposed developments will be detrimental to the environment and the wildlife in the area. The Greens lane site is already congested at school times and there is a wealth of wildlife on the golfcourse (I hear a rumour about more proposed building along the golf course backing onto Cherry Tree Way). There are foxes, hedgehogs, too many bird species to mention. - - The roads and parking are at a premium in this area. The land at Snig Hole and Curven Edge are places where children play - more houses would mean more traffic and parking problems. A new park has just been built and crossing as it was dangerous and parking at Snig Hole along Station Rd (Bowl Alley) is a problem already. - - The Grane site backs on to Grane Road which is already completed congested and a rat run to the M65. The road network, , drainage, schools and amenities cannot take any more in this area. The council do little to look after the area - - building more houses mean we would loose the beautiful walks around here.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1290	Deborah	Chapman	-	SHLAA16302	Object	The village of Helmsore has been steadily expanding and merging into Haslingden. The green spaces are disappearing and the character of the landscape is changing. These proposed developments will be detrimental to the environment and the wildlife in the area. The Greens lane site is already congested at school times and there is a wealth of wildlife on the golfcourse (I hear a rumour about more proposed building along the golf course backing onto Cherry Tree Way). There are foxes, hedgehogs, too many bird species to mention. - - The roads and parking are at a premium in this area. The land at Snig Hole and Curven Edge are places where children play - more houses would mean more traffic and parking problems. A new park has just been built and crossing as it was dangerous and parking at Snig Hole along Station Rd (Bowl Alley) is a problem already. - - The Grane site backs on to Grane Road which is already completed congested and a rat run to the M65. The road network, , drainage, schools and amenities cannot take any more in this area. The council do little to look after the area - - building more houses mean we would loose the beautiful walks around here.		
1290	Deborah	Chapman	-	SHLAA16305	Object	The village of Helmsore has been steadily expanding and merging into Haslingden. The green spaces are disappearing and the character of the landscape is changing. These proposed developments will be detrimental to the environment and the wildlife in the area. The Greens lane site is already congested at school times and there is a wealth of wildlife on the golfcourse (I hear a rumour about more proposed building along the golf course backing onto Cherry Tree Way). There are foxes, hedgehogs, too many bird species to mention. - - The roads and parking are at a premium in this area. The land at Snig Hole and Curven Edge are places where children play - more houses would mean more traffic and parking problems. A new park has just been built and crossing as it was dangerous and parking at Snig Hole along Station Rd (Bowl Alley) is a problem already. - - The Grane site backs on to Grane Road which is already completed congested and a rat run to the M65. The road network, , drainage, schools and amenities cannot take any more in this area. The council do little to look after the area - - building more houses mean we would loose the beautiful walks around here.		
1294	Michael	Chapman	-	SHLAA16295	Object	These developments will alter the community feel of Helmsore. - The school infrastructure isn't suitable. - The green belt should be protected. - -		
1294	Michael	Chapman	-	SHLAA16302	Object	These developments will alter the community feel of Helmsore. - The school infrastructure isn't suitable. - The green belt should be protected. - -		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1299	David	Bemment	-	SHLAA16380	Object	There is too much development in and around Helmshore, The roads cannot cope with an increase in traffic volume.		I vigorously object to any further development in and around Helmshore. - The majority of the open spaces have been built on and the few remaining ones should be left alone, especially the one off Curven Edge, SHLAA16288. This area has been used by children as a play area since I moved here in 1990 and before that. - The local roads are gridlocked in the mornings and late afternoons, any increase in traffic volume would be intolerable. The other routes out of Helmshore are gridlocked as well e.g. Grane rd, M66 and Haslingden Rd. - The schools are full already and children from Helmshore can't always get into a school in Helmshore. - I think the development of Helmshore as a suburb of Manchester has gone far enough. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1299	David	Bemment	-	SHLAA1691	Object	There is too much development in and around Helmshore, The roads cannot cope with an increase in traffic volume.		I vigorously object to any further development in and around Helmshore. - The majority of the open spaces have been built on and the few remaining ones should be left alone, especially the one off Curven Edge, SHLAA16288. This area has been used by children as a play area since I moved here in 1990 and before that. - The local roads are gridlocked in the mornings and late afternoons, any increase in traffic volume would be intolerable. The other routes out of Helmshore are gridlocked as well e.g. Grane rd, M66 and Haslingden Rd. - The schools are full already and children from Helmshore can't always get into a school in Helmshore. - I think the development of Helmshore as a suburb of Manchester has gone far enough. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1299	David	Bemment	-	SHLAA16287	Object	There is too much development in and around Helmshore, The roads cannot cope with an increase in traffic volume.		I vigorously object to any further development in and around Helmshore. - The majority of the open spaces have been built on and the few remaining ones should be left alone, especially the one off Curven Edge, SHLAA16288. This area has been used by children as a play area since I moved here in 1990 and before that. - The local roads are gridlocked in the mornings and late afternoons, any increase in traffic volume would be intolerable. The other routes out of Helmshore are gridlocked as well e.g. Grane rd, M66 and Haslingden Rd. - The schools are full already and children from Helmshore can't always get into a school in Helmshore. - I think the development of Helmshore as a suburb of Manchester has gone far enough. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1299	David	Bemment	-	SHLAA1692	Object	There is too much development in and around Helmshore, The roads cannot cope with an increase in traffic volume.		I vigorously object to any further development in and around Helmshore. - The majority of the open spaces have been built on and the few remaining ones should be left alone, especially the one off Curven Edge, SHLAA16288. This area has been used by children as a play area since I moved here in 1990 and before that. - The local roads are gridlocked in the mornings and late afternoons, any increase in traffic volume would be intolerable. The other routes out of Helmshore are gridlocked as well e.g. Grane rd, M66 and Haslingden Rd. - The schools are full already and children from Helmshore can't always get into a school in Helmshore. - I think the development of Helmshore as a suburb of Manchester has gone far enough. -

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1299	David	Bemment	-	SHLAA1630	Object	There is too much development in and around Helmshore, The roads cannot cope with an increase in traffic volume.		I vigorously object to any further development in and around Helmshore. - The majority of the open spaces have been built on and the few remaining ones should be left alone, especially the one off Curven Edge, SHLAA16288. This area has been used by children as a play area since I moved here in 1990 and before that. - The local roads are gridlocked in the mornings and late afternoons, any increase in traffic volume would be intolerable. The other routes out of Helmshore are gridlocked as well e.g. Grane rd, M66 and Haslingden Rd. - The schools are full already and children from Helmshore can't always get into a school in Helmshore. - I think the development of Helmshore as a suburb of Manchester has gone far enough. -
1311	Joanne	Mellody	-	SHLAA16295	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1311	Joanne	Mellody	-	SHLAA16305	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1311	Joanne	Mellody	-	SHLAA16302	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1313	Jonathan	Hunt	-	SHLAA16305	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1313	Jonathan	Hunt	-	shlaa16302	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1313	Jonathan	Hunt	-	SHLAA16295	Object	Helmshore is already saturated with houses, causing driving and pedestrian hazards due to compromised visibility because of numerable parked cars on narrow streets, Please use the power entrusted to you by the electorate wisely and protect the green spaces for the sake of our environment and the mental health and wellbeing of Rossendale's population.		
1337	Andrew	Holt	-	SHLAA16295	Object	I feel these developments are to large & would add to the ongoing congestion on the Edenfield bi pass leading to the M66 & on the already busyGrane Rd. - - Whilst I accept housing may be needed this should be on brown field sites but also aligned to improvements in infrastructure which currently is not being developed	-	
1337	Andrew	Holt	-	SHLAA16305	Object	I feel these developments are to large & would add to the ongoing congestion on the Edenfield bi pass leading to the M66 & on the already busyGrane Rd. - - Whilst I accept housing may be needed this should be on brown field sites but also aligned to improvements in infrastructure which currently is not being developed	-	
1345	Gerard	Greenhalgh	-	SHLAA16305	Object	This is a slow creep into the open countryside. - Holcombe Road is a natural boundary to Green Belt development.		Not at this time
1345	Gerard	Greenhalgh	-	SHLAA16295	Object	This area leads onto the local countryside it would destroy this area of unspoilt beauty. - It would have a severe impact on the area and spoil the start of the rural countryside. - Access is restrictive to this area so will impact on the roads. - Don't build on unspoilt countryside!!		Not at this time
1355	Rebekah	Haworth	-	SHLAA16302	Object	The area recently average speed check cameras have be implemented to improve the safety of the road, if you have ever tried to exit Holcombe road in peak traffic to either head to Blackburn or Haslingden you would would appreciate the 160 extra houses would only add to this problem. - I also am concerned by how local schools will be able to accommodate extra pupils. I myself moved closer to our local primary school, as I know that year on year there is increasing pressure on children to get a place in a good ofsted rated school, and each year there are more and more stories of children having to travel to ramsbottom as they have not been able to get a place in their local school. - Also currently our nearest NHS dentist is in rawtenstall a few miles down the road, and to try and get a appointment within a week at my local GPs is almost impossible. I am not against building more housing, however the current infrastructure will not support these extra houses. And will only lead to further problems.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1355	Rebekah	Haworth	-	SHLAA16295	Object	The area recently average speed check cameras have be implemented to improve the safety of the road, if you have ever tried to exit Holcombe road in peak traffic to either head to Blackburn or Haslingden you would would appreciate the 160 extra houses would only add to this problem. - I also am concerned by how local schools will be able to accommodate extra pupils. I myself moved closer to our local primary school, as I know that year on year there is increasing pressure on children to get a place in a good ofsted rated school, and each year there are more and more stories of children having to travel to ramsbottom as they have not been able to get a place in their local school. - Also currently our nearest NHS dentist is in rawtenstall a few miles down the road, and to try and get a appointment within a week at my local GPs is almost impossible. I am not against building more housing, however the current infrastructure will not support these extra houses. And will only lead to further problems.	-	
1371	Daniela	Ripa	-	playing fields for development in Whitworth	Support	I recently attended the Draft Local Plan (2019-2034) consultation event at Futures Park and would like to extend my thanks to X (Principal Planner), who was approachable, welcoming and helpful to myself and other members of the public at this event. - - I understand that the Council resolved to withdraw the Draft Local Plan Part 2 – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2015) on 24th February 2016 and commence work on a new local plan to replace the Adopted Core Strategy (2011). - - The withdrawn Draft Site Allocations document proposed the allocation of land currently used as playing fields for development in Whitworth. Playing fields provide a valuable resource for communities, making a significant contribution to the social dimension of sustainable development and the health and wellbeing of local communities. I welcome the omission of these proposals from the Draft Local Plan (2019-2034).		
1381	Andrew	Lord	Haslingden Cricket Club	SHLAA16284	Support	Haslingden Cricket Club would like to correct some of the information held on this assessment (SHLAA16284) as it is either incorrect or incomplete. - - Land ownership; The land is owned predominantly by HCC and the landowner is willing to release this site for development. - - Recreational Value; the site is not a playing pitch currently in use by the club and hasn't been used as such for many, many years. - - Conclusion, Justification; Intentions of the landowner (as above). The land is not in active use as a cricket practice area and should therefore be considered available in our view.		Would appreciate confirmation of receipt of these corrections and happy to discuss further if necessary

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1406	Ian	Cameron	Haslingden Cricket Club	SHLAA16284	Support	<p>Haslingden Cricket Club are fully support of the allocation of the land to the rear of our club being selected for potnetial housing development. - - We are however currently concerned with the conclusions reached in the most recent consultation document issued (that unfortunately we did not receive until this weekend) and we would like to correct a number of the assumptions used which should mean a revised conclusion would be reached highlighting this as suitable piece of land for development and in the shorter term. - - The corrections / amendments are as follows : - - Land Ownership - the land is owned predominantly by Haslingden Cricket Club and the landowner is willing to release this site for development. (In fact the sale and development of this land is absolutely vital to securing the long term future of the club). - - Recreational Value - the site is NOT currently a playing pitch or practice area in use by the club and in fact the land has not been used as such for many years (since mid 1980's). The area currently is surplus to our requirments and is an ongoing cost to the club as it is simply maintained by the club in order to prevent the piece of land becoming an eyesore to our members and just as importantly to our neighbours. - - Conclusion - we do not believe the conclusion reached of "not suitable" is correct. As noted above the justifications for this is given that the intentions of the land owner are unknown and also that the land is in active use as a cricket practice area. these two justifications are incorrect as described above and they need correcting and amending please.</p> <p>Email received 09/10/2017: First of all, apologies for the lateness in sending this email. Unfortunately it was not until this weekend that we had been made aware that the piece of land situated to the rear of our cricket club had been included within this consultation document. On reading the document, we are also concerned in relation to the conclusion reached regarding our land and the justifications given for this decision in relation to the unknown intentions of the landowner and that the land is in active use as a cricket practice area. As noted in my survey response, the landowner (HCC) is willing to release this site for development and seeks to use this opportunity to secure the long term future of the Cricket Club (explained more fully below). Secondly, the piece of land is NOT in active use as a cricket practice facility and hasn't been as such for a vast number of years (since mid 1980's). The quality of the surface and drainage is in fact inadequate for a cricket practice facility. The land is currently just an ongoing cost for the club as we spend time and money simply maintaining the general appearance of the land in order for it not to become an eyesore to our members or to our neighbours. As noted on my online survey response to the Rossendale Local Plan Consultation Summer 2017, this is a further email to explain in High Level</p>		We will send a separate email in relation to the land and the current position of the club to outline our aspirations to you in terms of how we believe we are best to secure the long term future of Haslingden Cricket Club and how this will help us to improve our facilities and make them sustainable for future generations to enjoy. - We would be happy to discuss this further and would appreciate confirmation of receipt of these corrections.

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>terms our aspirations and plans at HCC in order to secure a long term sustainable future for cricket to be played at Bentgate ground.</p> <p>Our aspiration is to be able to demolish the existing pavilion and to rebuild a new sustainable and modern structure built from long lasting and hard wearing materials that will be suitable for the next several generations of cricket players, members, supporters and visitors and which will allow better access for all. This new facility has to facilitate better access for all and be 'more fitting' for full cross community participation. This project would possibly allow for a repositioning of the pavilion (including changing rooms) and allow for better car park planning than we have at present. Running alongside the pavilion issues is the fact that our cricket pitch itself is also in need of 'refurbishment' including drainage works and the levelling and gradual relaying of the main cricket square. Our groundsman's store is also in need of refurbishment and some of our essential ground keeping machinery is also ageing. Of course there is a massive potential cost to all of this which is impossible to finance from 'normal' activity.</p> <p>As such, we see the potential sale of the surplus and redundant land to the rear of the club as 'key' in being able to achieve this and protect the provision of cricket at HCC for the long term. Such a sale would allow for the works above to be done and should also provide a 'war chest' to allow the future executive officers of HCC to maintain all the facilities appropriately. We might also be able to benefit from some new members from the new neighbours to our rear.</p> <p>As the first step in this process, the club have been forward thinking and even in the absence of any grant funding, at considerable expense and with great credit to our members and supporters we have self financed the construction of a state of the art practice all weather practice facility on a small piece of surplus land near to Grasmere road. (This is within the bottom right hand corner of the red marked area on the plan shown in the consultation document). This still leaves a large piece of surplus land remaining and ensures that the club have practice facilities available effectively all year round in addition to our playing field itself.</p> <p>Why do we have the need to do this ?</p> <p>On site we currently have a large Pavilion (extended since original construction) which incorporates a members bar area, function room, kitchen, two sets of male & female toilets and upstairs changing rooms. The original part of the structure was built in the early 1970's and this was extended in the 1980's. It is a largely wooden structure with an exceptionally large flat roof. Due to the structure insulation is poor and with wooden exterior walls and a large flat roof, heating this building and maintaining it is very costly and time consuming and a drain on resources. Realistically it has a very limited lifespan remaining. The changing rooms are situated upstairs with the only access via</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>an external staircase. This means there is no realistic access for mobility restricted players and there is only one shared shower area meaning it is difficult to accommodate and integrate female cricketers. The building was constructed and extended before any of the current guidelines for disability access and as such this gives us further issues to overcome.</p> <p>Our playing field needs attention – the square (where the wickets are cut) requires works to be done and we are also experiencing drainage issues on the outfield. Whilst there are grants available from time to time for improvement works, these are not guaranteed and this work needs addressing in order to maintain the standard of cricket field required for a club participating in one of the best amateur cricket leagues in the UK.</p> <p>I hope this gives a useful high level background to the position at HCC. We can ensure you that we would be happy to discuss this further with yourselves such that we can work together to preserve the long term future of cricket in Haslingden and provide a site for new housing.</p>		
1424	Pamela	Beech	-	SHLAA16305	Object	<p>I find it hard to believe that Rossendale council are planning to take away designated green spaces, which have been in place for many years. - The outlined plan for green belt land to have housing built on it is disgraceful. - They say there is a housing shortage in the Rossendale area, perhaps if the council looked at the many empty houses in the area and encouraged building company's to look at these rather than continually wanting to build new. - The Helmshore area is already over populated, the schools are over subscribed with children having to travel some distance to attend school. The traffic congestion in the area is getting worse, what should be a 20 minute drive to work takes me 40, 20 mins just to get out of Helmshore. - The proposed site at sing hole, I feel would lead to many accidents, even with the new crossing it is still a challenge to cross the road, 3 weeks ago when taking my granddaughter to the park when waiting to cross a bus was going so fast I did not think he was going to stop, he slammed is breaks on, then as we crossed a car over took the bus and nearly ran us down. - This would be even worse with cars trying to get out of the entry as well. - - Rossendale golf club seem to think that every time they run out of funding that it is ok to try sell off land and build houses, maybe they should look at the accounts team who manage there finances. - The impact of houses been built on the golf course, will affect not only the population increase but will have a major impact on the wildlife. - - Therefore as a resident of Helmshore I strongly object to the proposed plans. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1424	Pamela	Beech	-	SHLAA16302	Object	<p>I find it hard to believe that Rossendale council are planning to take away designated green spaces, which have been in place for many years. - The outlined plan for green belt land to have housing built on it is disgraceful. - They say there is a housing shortage in the Rossendale area, perhaps if the council looked at the many empty houses in the area and encouraged building company's to look at these rather than continually wanting to build new. - The Helmshore area is already over populated, the schools are over subscribed with children having to travel some distance to attend school. The traffic congestion in the area is getting worse, what should be a 20 minute drive to work takes me 40, 20 mins just to get out of Helmshore. - The proposed site at sing hole, I feel would lead to many accidents, even with the new crossing it is still a challenge to cross the road, 3 weeks ago when taking my granddaughter to the park when waiting to cross a bus was going so fast I did not think he was going to stop, he slammed is breaks on, then as we crossed a car over took the bus and nearly ran us down. - This would be even worse with cars trying to get out of the entry as well. - - Rossendale golf club seem to think that every time they run out of funding that it is ok to try sell off land and build houses, maybe they should look at the accounts team who manage there finances. - The impact of houses been built on the golf course, will affect not only the population increase but will have a major impact on the wildlife. - - Therefore as a resident of Helmshore I strongly object to the proposed plans. -</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1424	Pamela	Beech	-	SHLAA16295	Object	<p>I find it hard to believe that Rossendale council are planning to take away designated green spaces, which have been in place for many years. - The outlined plan for green belt land to have housing built on it is disgraceful. - They say there is a housing shortage in the Rossendale area, perhaps if the council looked at the many empty houses in the area and encouraged building company's to look at these rather than continually wanting to build new. - The Helmshore area is already over populated, the schools are over subscribed with children having to travel some distance to attend school. The traffic congestion in the area is getting worse, what should be a 20 minute drive to work takes me 40, 20 mins just to get out of Helmshore. - The proposed site at sing hole, I feel would lead to many accidents, even with the new crossing it is still a challenge to cross the road, 3 weeks ago when taking my granddaughter to the park when waiting to cross a bus was going so fast I did not think he was going to stop, he slammed is breaks on, then as we crossed a car over took the bus and nearly ran us down. - This would be even worse with cars trying to get out of the entry as well. - - Rossendale golf club seem to think that every time they run out of funding that it is ok to try sell off land and build houses, maybe they should look at the accounts team who manage there finances. - The impact of houses been built on the golf course, will affect not only the population increase but will have a major impact on the wildlife. - - Therefore as a resident of Helmshore I strongly object to the proposed plans. -</p>		<p>I feel that before any further decisions are made the people of Rossendale should be given the opportunity to speak. And given advance notice of any plans so they have time to reposond unlike this consultation which has not allowed people time to respond.</p>
1427	Lee	Kershaw	-	SHLAA16295	Object	<p>This land is in open countryside it is not a field surrounded by houses. what happens next do we build in the next field to it then the next.</p>		<p>We live in a beautiful part of the World, packing houses onto any bit of spare land just so that we can say to the Government that we have completed our quota is a bloody crime. If we are not careful we will become another suburb of Manchester.</p>

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1465	SEE AGENT DETAILS	SEE AGENT DETAILS	B AND E BOYS LIMITED	HS2	Not Applicable	<p>PLEASE SEE SUBMITTED REPRESENTATION REPORT.</p> <p>Email received 11/10/17:</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) is preparing a new Local Plan which will guide the future planning and development of the area. Following the adoption of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy in November 2011, RBC commenced work on its Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. However, this document was halted in favour of the preparation of a full new Local Plan which has now been issued for consultation from Monday 24 July to Monday 9 October 2017. This edition of the Local Plan comprises the Regulation 18 consultation document which sets out the Council's preferred approach to future housing, employment and leisure uses over the Plan period. Once adopted the Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy (2011).</p> <p>1.2 Within the draft Local Plan, sites have been proposed for development (for housing or employment use), for environmental protection and for recreation uses, as identified on the Draft Policies Map. Changes are also proposed to the existing Green Belt and the Urban Boundary. Also, four additional Conservation Areas, along with an extension to an existing Conservation Area, are being considered. 1.3 Documents included in the Draft Local Plan Consultation are the Draft Local Plan (Written Statement), the accompanying Policies Map (including the 6 area maps) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 1.4 The evidence base which supports the Local Plan comprises the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017). • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017). • Employment Land Review (2017). • Green Belt Review (2016). • Environmental Network Study (2017). • Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (2016). • Town Centre, Retail, Leisure and Tourism Study (2017). • Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) (previously published). • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2016). • Local Plan Viability Study 2015 and Updated Viability Study in relation to Affordable Housing (2017). • Landscape Study (2015) (previously published). • Landscape capacity study for wind energy developments in the South Pennines (2014) (previously published). • Heritage Impact Assessment of Housing Sites (2017). <p>1.5 In addition to the above documents, the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, although not strictly evidence, has informed the development of the draft policies.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>1.6 Hourigan Connolly is instructed to review and comment on the emerging</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>Local Plan in relation to land at Oakenhead, Haslingden Old Road, Rawtenstall. The site is not allocated for a particular use within the Draft Local Plan, though it falls within the Urban Boundary of Rawtenstall.</p> <p>1.7 The site comprises a purpose built former resource centre and is constructed in reconstituted stone with a pitched, tiled roof with a central light well. The site is located in the urban area of Rawtenstall within walking distance of a plethora of local services, including supermarkets, restaurants, Primary Healthcare Centre and schools. Haslingden Old Road is also a bus route. As a result, the site is very sustainably located.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>1.8 The starting point for consideration of the emerging Local Plan document is the well-established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>2. LEGISLATIVE & POLICY CONTEXT</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2.1 In this Chapter we set out the relevant legislative and policy context before going on to examine the Council's Local Plan document.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</p> <p>2.2 Part 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (As amended) deals with Local Development.</p> <p>2.3 The RBC Local Plan is being brought forward following changes to the Development Plan making system in England which are set out in the Localism Act 2011. Part 6 Sections 109 – 144 of the Localism Act deal with Planning.</p> <p>2.4 Following revocation of the North West Regional Strategy (RS) in May 2013, Council's such as RBC will set their own housing and employment targets against objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>2.5 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (SI No. 767) came into force on 6 April 2012 and guide the preparation of Local Plans.</p> <p>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>2.6 In his Written Statement of 23 March 2012 the then Minister for Decentralisation and Cities the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP referred to a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help England secure a swift return to economic growth. He urged local planning authorities to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas.</p> <p>2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the Framework) (see below) was subsequently published on 27 March 2012 and urges local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>2.8 In his Written Statement of 6 September 2012 the Secretary of State for</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>Communities and Local Government the Rt. Hon Eric Pickles MP noted an increase in house building starts between 2009 and 2011 but said that there was far more to do to provide homes to meet Britain's demographic needs and to help generate local economic growth.</p> <p>2.9 There can be no doubt that house building is a driver of the local economy besides providing homes for local people.</p> <p>FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>2.10 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework deal with Plan-making.</p> <p>2.11 The importance of the Local Plan is identified as the key to delivering sustainable development and a cornerstone of the development management process (Paragraph 150 refers).</p> <p>2.12 The requirement for Local Plans to be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is embodied in Paragraph 151 of the Framework and stems from the requirements set out under Section 39(2) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Local Plans must also be consistent with the principles and policies of the Framework.</p> <p>2.13 Paragraph 152 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to seek opportunities to achieve and secure net gains for each of the three dimensions of sustainable development. These three dimensions are defined in Paragraph 7 of the framework as economic, social and environmental. According to Paragraph 7 of the Framework these dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”. <p>2.14 Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the roles mentioned in Paragraph 7 should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependant and should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.</p> <p>2.15 The importance of Local Plans taking into account local circumstances is</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>highlighted in Paragraph 10 of the Framework to ensure that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>2.16 Paragraph 152 of the Framework goes on to deal with adverse impacts on any of the dimensions of sustainable development and sets out three tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly significant adverse impacts on any of the dimensions should be avoided, and where possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. • Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. • Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. <p>2.17 Paragraph 154 of the Framework requires Local Plans to be aspirational but realistic and address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change.</p> <p>2.18 The requirement for local planning authorities to set out strategic priorities for their areas in their Local Plans is established in Paragraph 156 of the Framework. Such policies are required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the homes and jobs needed in the area; • the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development; • the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); • the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and • climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape”. <p>2.19 The importance of using a robust and proportionate evidence base for Plan making is dealt with in Paragraphs 158 to 177 of the Framework. Paragraph 158 is of particular relevance to these submissions: “Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals”.</p> <p>2.20 A number of topics are discussed and for the purpose of this document we will focus on housing (Paragraph 159), business (Paragraphs 160 – 161), infrastructure (Paragraph 162) and environment (Paragraphs 165 – 168).</p> <p>HOUSING</p> <p>2.21 Paragraph 159 outlines the importance of preparing a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.</p> <p>2.22 Of particular importance is the requirement for the SHMA to identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the Plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; • addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and • caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand”. <p>BUSINESS</p> <p>2.23 Paragraph 160 of the Framework outlines the importance of local planning authorities having a clear understanding (from a robust evidence base) of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area.</p> <p>2.24 Paragraph 161 of the Framework establishes the importance of understanding business needs (both quantitative and qualitative) and ensuring that sufficient suitable land (both existing and future) is available to meet needs.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>2.25 An objective of government policy is the delivery of growth. Central to this objective is ensuring that infrastructure has the capacity or can be enhanced to deliver growth. A number of factors are outlined in Paragraph 162 of the Framework which need to be considered at a local level including transport, water, foul drainage, energy, telecommunications, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>2.26 Paragraphs 165 to 168 of the Framework deal with environmental matters and set out the requirement that a sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS</p> <p>2.27 Paragraph 182 of the Framework deals with the examination of Local Plans. The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. Local planning authorities are required to submit Plans for examination which they consider “sound” – namely that they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy 		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence; • Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and • Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework”. <p>NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE – LAUNCHED 6 MARCH 2014</p> <p>2.28 On 28 August 2013 the government launched its draft National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The draft NPPG was subject to consultation for 6 weeks and was launched on 6 March in its final form. The NPPG replaces some 230 planning guidance documents but will result in no amendments to the Framework.</p> <p>2.29 The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment section of the NPPG is worthy of specific mention in relation to this Report, in particular paragraph 030 (reference ID: 3-030-20140306 confirms): “Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light. It should be borne in mind that evidence which dates back several years, such as that drawn from revoked regional strategies, may not adequately reflect current needs.”</p> <p>2.30 The NPPG deals with deliverable sites as follows at paragraph 031 (Reference ID 3-031-20140306): “WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘DELIVERABLE SITE’ IN THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING POLICY? Deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan and sites with planning permission (outline or full that have not been implemented) unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. However, planning permission or allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five-year supply. Local planning authorities will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgments on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. If there are no significant constraints (e.g. infrastructure) to overcome such as infrastructure sites not allocated within a development plan or without planning permission can be considered capable of being delivered within a five-year timeframe. The size of sites will also be an important factor in identifying whether a housing site is deliverable within the first 5 years. Plan makers will need to</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>consider the time it will take to commence development on site and build out rates to ensure a robust five-year housing supply.”</p> <p>2.31 In regards to how often a Local Plan should be reviewed, the NPPG states at paragraph 008 of the section titled ‘Local Plans’ (Reference ID 12-008-20140306) that: “HOW OFTEN SHOULD A LOCAL PLAN BE REVIEWED? To be effective plans need to be kept up-to-date. Policies will age at different rates depending on local circumstances, and the local planning authority should review the relevance of the Local Plan at regular intervals to assess whether some or all of it may need updating. Most Local Plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. Reviews should be proportionate to the issues in hand. Local Plans may be found sound conditional upon a review in whole or in part within five years of the date of adoption.”</p> <p>GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STANDARDISED METHODOLOGY FOR HOUSING NEED (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>2.32 On 14 September 2017 the Government announced a consultation on a Standardised Methodology for Assessing Local Housing Need, the basis of which was included in the White Paper (February 2017) and is aimed at helping local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places.</p> <p>2.33 As the consultation document sets out, the root cause of the dysfunctional housing market in the UK is that for too long we have not built enough homes. The Government is aiming to deliver 1.5 million new homes between 2015-2022 and is attempting to create a system which is clear and transparent for local authorities. The new methodology will apply to all future plans, with the exception of those which have been submitted or will be submitted before 31 March 2018.</p> <p>2.34 The standard methodology is principally aimed at tackling problems of affordability as the proposed formula simply uplifts the household projections figure, based on market signals.</p> <p>2.35 For Rossendale the proposed standard methodology has little impact on the annual housing requirement (which, it is suggested should be 212 rather than the current 265 dwellings per annum). However, it should be noted that the proposed standard methodology is currently on consultation and may therefore be subject to changes in due course. It is also worth noting the heavy speculation that the proposed methodology focuses on growth in the south east to the detriment of other parts of the UK, in particular the north west.</p> <p>3. OAKENHEAD – A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3.1 Land at Oakenhead provides an opportunity for sustainable residential development within the Urban Boundary of Rawtenstall. The site has not been allocated for any particular use in the draft Local Plan document, though it does fall within the urban boundary.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>Figure 1: Extract from Draft Proposals Map (with site location indicated by red arrow)</p> <p>3.2 The suitability and delivery of the site for such a use will shortly be confirmed by a planning application for residential development which is to be submitted imminently. During the course of pre-application discussions RBC has provided positive feedback in relation to the development of the site for residential use.</p> <p>SUBMISSIONS</p> <p>3.3 With reference to draft Policy HS1 of the emerging Local Plan, we note that over the plan period RBC will seek to provide at least 4,000 additional dwellings (equating to 265 dwellings per year), whilst addressing a prior under-provision of 425 dwellings within the first five years. Policy HS1 further seeks to deliver 20 percent of all new dwellings on previously developed land across the Borough.</p> <p>3.4 We consider that the Oakenhead site, which is no longer in active use, will assist RBC in meeting its residential development target in the early part of the plan period, with a planning application and subsequent development being imminent. The site will also contribute to the target of delivering 20 percent of development on brownfield land. As recognised within the explanatory text to Policy HS1, the supply of previously developed sites which do not have significant development constraints and are within the urban area are limited within the Borough. Suitable brownfield sites such as this one should therefore be prioritised for development.</p> <p>3.5 There are two primary schools directly to the north of the site, and residential development to the east, south and west and therefore residential use is entirely appropriate in this location.</p> <p>3.6 As a result, it is considered that the emerging Local Plan should identify the Oakenhead site as being a suitable residential development site and it should be allocated as such within draft Policy HS2: Housing Site Allocations.</p> <p>PROPOSED MODIFICATION</p> <p>3.7 The Council is respectfully requested to add land at Oakenhead to the list of allocation residential sites as identified under draft Policy HS2. It is considered that the 0.7ha site will deliver approximately 23 dwellings and that the allocation should allow for “up to 25 dwellings”.</p> <p>3.8 In view of the fact that this site is deliverable and development is forthcoming, it should be formalised and recognised as a residential allocation within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>4. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>4.1 The starting point for consideration of the Council’s Local Plan is the well - established principle embodied in Paragraph 158 of the Framework that Development Plans must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						4.2 It has been highlighted in this Representation that the Oakenhead site is a sustainable brownfield site which is no longer in use. A planning application for residential use is forthcoming following positive discussions with RBC. The site presents an opportunity to contribute to the required level of housing to be delivered over the plan period. In order to formalise this and ensure a smooth delivery of the site for such purposes, we consider that land at Oakenhead should be allocated for residential development under the provisions of Policy HS2. Please see appendix		
1550	Shelley	Carter		SHLAA16072	Support	I am pleased that the Urban Boundary to the north of Weir Village is to end at The Moorlands and the previously proposed housing site at Lower Old Clough Farm (SHLAA 16072) has been removed from the Draft Plan. As the Officer's comments had noted, this site does little to meet any of the current development criteria.		
1559	Ken	Iveson		SHLAA16196 - Land East of Goodshaw Lane, Crawshawbooth	Object	I object most strongly to the possible boundary change on Goodshaw Lane, Goodshaw. I am appalled that the request of a few people to change a boundary can result in this being something that can be entertained. I am afraid, is this is allowed, then next time plans are reviewed a precedent would have been created for self build and builders to encroach even more into the green area. It is an inescapable fact that in present days more houses brings more cars with the frightening prospect of even more traffic on a narrow, single track already dangerous road that has a poor provision of parking and pavements. Goodshaw Lane is used by numerous children going to and from Crawshawbooth Primary School, walkers, cyclists and horses, their riders using the road to connect with bridal ways. Goodshaw Lane becomes almost blocked and parkign totally impossible when St Mary's the reamining church of england church in the area is used for services, baptisms, weddings and funerals. At most times emergency vehicles and council service vehicles have a difficult task trying to begotitate both Goodshaw avenue and Goodshaw Lane ----- without prospect of more vehicular movement. Site reference SHLAA16196 SUITABILITY ---Comments ---Goodshaw Lane is at high and medium risk of surface water flood risk.		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1575	David	Hempsall	Limey Valley Residents Association	SHLAA16382	Object	<p>Area C</p> <p>HS2.47 SHLAA16382 Land to rear of the former Glory public house, Burnley Road, Loveclough (45 houses):</p> <p>Much the same arguments apply to this area as to Area B (supra). It was subject to a Planning Appeal by the developer of what was formerly The Glory. Rejecting the appeal - APP/B2355/C/16/3158284 – the Planning Inspector upheld the notion of maintaining the rural aspect looking west from the A682 Burnley Road. As with Area B, there is the prospect of a further 45-90 vehicles being added the A682 Burnley Road’s volumes.</p> <p>Access via Commercial Street is already problematical, its being the sole point of ingress and egress from the Penny Lodge Estate and homesteads on the western hillsides. The provision of a new junction on the A682 would simply replicate existing issues.</p> <p>It is the LVRA’s view that for the reasons outlined, this proposal should be withdrawn in whole.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1749	M	Morton		landgate lane, shawforth	Object	<p>As a member of Shawforth Flood Forum I am concerned about a proposal to build houses above landgate lane, shawforth.</p> <p>Unfortunately the environment agency has assessed the area as being at low risk for prolonged flooding but this overlooks the fact that we regularly have times of flash flooding. It is for that reason our group os on the environmental agencies list of contacts to inform when there is the threat of heavy rainfall. The pattern of flash flooding was totally underestimated when the LCC carried out a million pound landscaping project in landgate quarry just over 10 years ago.</p> <p>They had to re-engineer the temporary water catchment area as it totally failed in the first flash flood.</p> <p>Most recently the engineers on the Wind Farm Road made exactly the same errors and work carried on adjustments over the 18 months of the project. The effect of building this road has been to oncrease the speed of the water draining off the moor in heavy rain. As a result the LCC has recently re-drained and resurfaced the area of landgate lane immeadiately below the wind farm road. (At rate payers expense!) The result is the water no longer drains slowly, it shoots into the stream and joins the river spodden 300 metres below. This results in the level of the river riding more quickly. One effect is it rises to block the culvert coming down on the opposite side of the road and causes flooding for the residents on Old Lane, Shawforth.</p> <p>As landgate lane narrows beyond the cattle grid any house building would require the lane to be widened, once again requiring re-organisation of the stream. Added to speed of the water draining from the hard landscaping from houses this could cause further distress from flash floods for the residents in Edge Moor Close flats and those living on the main Road along side the River. I hope the planners will take seriously the risk of flash floods in this area, for as members of this forum. We have seen the distress it causes to residents caught up in the aftermath.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1766			Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd	Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield	Object	<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>1.1 This representation is prepared by Turley on behalf of our client Peel Holdings (Land & Property) Limited (hereafter “Peel” or “our client”). It provides comments to Rossendale Borough Council (RBC) in respect of the Rossendale Draft Local Plan1 (July 2017) (‘DLP’) which is currently the subject of public consultation.</p> <p>1.2 This document relates exclusively to the promotion of land at Burnley Road, Edenfield, as a development opportunity. It should be considered in conjunction with the overarching representation submitted by Turley on behalf of Peel.</p> <p>Draft Rossendale Local Plan</p> <p>1.3 As set out in the overarching representation submitted, Peel has continuously and historically engaged with the plan-making process for Rossendale. This has included the submission of detailed representations to the previous Core Strategy and the draft Lives and Landscapes DPD (since withdrawn), including Development Frameworks that set out the development potential at four sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden (allocated in part) • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall (allocated in part) • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield (allocated) • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield (not allocated) <p>1.4 Peel welcomes the progress which has been made on the emerging Local Plan and supports, in principle, the proposals for development within it. In particular, Peel strongly supports the allocation of land at Kirkhill Avenue in Haslingden, Haslam Farm in Rawtenstall, and Blackburn Road in Edenfield, which include some or all of three of the sites previously put forward (as above).</p> <p>1.5 It is noted, however, that additional work is required to ensure that the emerging Local Plan is capable of meeting the full development needs of the Borough. Additional land will need to be allocated for residential development, above that which has been identified in the DLP.</p> <p>1.6 This opportunity is being taken to make representations in relation to the sites previously identified by Peel as capable of accommodating development in the Borough that have not been put forward in the DLP for allocation and/or Green Belt release. Peel is preparing updated Development Frameworks which will promote and justify its landholdings within Rossendale. Matters addressed below and in the overarching representation which directly affect its landholdings will be discussed in detail in each Development Framework.</p> <p>Additional Site Allocations</p> <p>1.7 In the context of the need for the Rossendale DLP to allocate additional land for development, Peel wish to reiterate the development opportunities at each of the four sites previously identified, as well as proposing a further</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>potential site at Rossendale Golf Club.</p> <p>1.8 These sites can each provide a deliverable housing development site in sustainable locations adjoining existing settlements. Initial reviews of site constraints and opportunities, landscape and highways have indicated that there are no significant barriers to development.</p> <p>Development Frameworks</p> <p>1.9 Further site appraisals are being undertaken to inform updated Development Frameworks which will be provided to the Council in due course.</p> <p>1.10 The updated Development Frameworks will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide analysis of the site constraints and opportunities. • Where relevant provide details of the findings of further technical assessment (such as highways, flood risk, ground conditions). • Consider the key principles for development of the site. • Present a proposed site layout plan illustrating development parcels, access, landscaping, etc. • Comment on the economic benefits of development. • Address comments / observations made within the recently published evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. <p>Proposed Development Opportunities</p> <p>1.11 In advance of the full Development Frameworks, the individual site representations are submitted providing initial reviews of the development opportunities.</p> <p>1.12 The Sites are represented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Kirkhill Avenue and Moorland Rise, Haslingden • Land at Haslam Farm, Rawtenstall • Land at Blackburn Road, Edenfield • Land at Burnley Road, Edenfield (this document) • Land at Rossendale Golf Course, Helmshore <p>1.13 This representation relates to land at Burnley Road, Edenfield, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2: A description of the site and its location • Section 3: Details of the consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA)2 and a review of the planning policy context including the Draft Local Plan • Section 4: A Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review • Section 5: Concluding comments <p>1.14 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted here for residential development.</p> <p>2. Site Opportunity</p> <p>Site Description</p> <p>2.1 The land at Burnley Road site is located c. 0.7 km miles north of Edenfield</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>village centre. It extends to c. 1.07 ha (2.6 acres), is broadly rectangular in shape, comprising an open field currently used for grazing.</p> <p>2.2 The site is located to the east of Burnley Road which forms the western site boundary. It is surrounded by residential development to the north, south and west</p> <p>2.3 Buildings and wooded areas to the east help to provide a sense of enclosure. Beyond these are open fields as the land rises towards a low ridge. The southern boundary comprises modern residential properties and playing fields associated with the adjacent Edenfield Church of England Primary School.</p> <p>Local Facilities</p> <p>2.4 The site is located within easy walking distance of Edenfield village centre (approximately 8 minutes walk) which has a number of services and amenities including a butcher, bakery, chemist, post office and two public houses. The town of Rawtenstall is 3.5 km north east of the site and includes a wide variety of traditional town centre uses including supermarkets, national banks and building societies, dentist, high street chemist and a number of restaurants and bars.</p> <p>2.5 Edenfield Church of England Primary School is located around 50m south of the site on the same side of Blackburn Road. The closest High School to the site is Haslingden High School, located approximately 1.9 km; there are 4 other secondary schools within 5 km of the site.</p> <p>2.6 Bus stops are located on Burnley Road, c. 300 m north of the site and on Market Street c. 225m south of the site. These stops are served by the half hourly 482 and 483 bus services, which connects Edenfield with Bury in the south and Burnley and Bacup in the north.</p> <p>2.7 There is a Metrolink station in Bury (c. 9 km south of the site) which connects to the wider Greater Manchester tram network. The site is also well connected to both the local and national highway, with the A56 0.5 km from the site which connects to the M66 (2 km) and in turn the M62 and M60 (15 km).</p> <p>3. Planning Policy Context</p> <p>Consideration in SHLAA</p> <p>3.1 The Draft Local Plan evidence base includes the 2017 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which aims to identify the land supply for housing within the administrative boundary of Rossendale within the next 15 years (2017 – 2032).</p> <p>3.2 The Site is promoted in the SHLAA (Site Ref 16258). The SHLAA Site Assessment confirmed that it is a viable and achievable site for up to 25 homes in the medium to long term (6-10 years, 10+ years). It is noted that more than 10% of the site is at high risk of surface water flooding, and that heritage and landscape impacts would need to be addressed given the proximity to Elton Bank (grade II listed building) and the location within the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>Settled Valleys landscape character.</p> <p>Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management DPD</p> <p>3.3 The Draft LP Part 2 was withdrawn. The plan did not propose the release of this site from the Green Belt. Representations made by Peel in response to that Plan challenged this proposal.</p> <p>Saved Policies</p> <p>3.4 As the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management DPD” (LP Part 2) was not taken forward by Rossendale BC, in relation to site allocations and designations, the Proposals Map and Saved Policies³ remain relevant as part of the development plan.</p> <p>3.5 The Proposals Map identifies the Site as outside the Urban Boundary (Policy DS1) and in the Green Belt (Policy DS3)</p> <p>3.6 However, Policy 1 of the Core Strategy states that the Urban Boundary defined in Local Plan Saved Policy DS1 and the Green Belt boundary defined in Saved Policy DS3, will be reviewed and where necessary amended in the Site Allocations DPD. The reviews would take into account criteria set out in Policy 1 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where small scale selective rounding off of Green Belt boundaries would promote sustainable development opportunities. • An extension/amendment to the urban boundary would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment. <p>3.7 The Core Strategy Figure 15, identifies Edenfield as an area for Green Belt review.</p> <p>Rossendale Draft Local Plan</p> <p>3.8 As discussed in the overarching representation, the Draft Local Plan (DLP) recognises that some release of Green Belt land will be required to meet the housing requirements and the NPPF requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites (DLP, page 12).</p> <p>3.9 The evidence presented in the DLP indicates that 4,425 dwellings will need to be delivered over the period to 2034. Considering the under provision of 425 dwellings since the adoption of the Core Strategy and the potential land supply from non- Green Belt sources of 2,907 dwellings, there is a significant gap of approximately 1,518 dwellings.</p> <p>3.10 The DLP proposes areas for release from Green Belt, allowing for a delivery of a further 715 dwellings. It is therefore evident that the Green Belt releases proposed by the DLP need to be more than doubled - to accommodate 1,518 dwellings - if the emerging Local Plan is to be found sound.</p> <p>3.11 In relation to this Site specifically, the DLP does not propose to extend the Urban Boundary and the site would remain designated Green Belt. Policy SD2: Urban Boundaries directs all development within such boundaries ‘except where development specifically needs to be located within a countryside location and the development enhances the rural character of the</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>area.'</p> <p>3.12 The DLP notes the NPPF requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites that can meet housing needs. It recognises that some release of Green Belt land will be needed to meet this requirement (page 12) and a Green Belt review⁴ forms part of the evidence base for the DLP.</p> <p>3.13 As above, it is clear that there is a significant gap between the housing land supply identified in the DLP and the demand, which cannot be met by non-Green Belt sites alone.</p> <p>3.14 Peel contends that the inclusion of this Site as a housing allocation and its release from Green Belt would be in keeping with the NPPF and would assist in addressing the shortfall of land within the Borough necessary to meet the evidenced housing land demand. The following section considers this in greater detail.</p> <p>4. Green Belt Appraisal</p> <p>4.1 The Site is currently designated as Green Belt. A Green Belt review⁵ (GBR) forms part of the evidence base for the DLP which has informed the plan's proposed retention of the Site within the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.2 The strategic purpose of this area of Green Belt, is to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall to the north/ north west from Edenfield to the south.</p> <p>4.3 The Site sits to the north of Edenfield village centre, and to the east of development along Blackburn Road and Burnley Road. It corresponds with the central part of GBR Parcel P38.</p> <p>Figure 4.1: P38 (Site location indicated)</p> <p>4.4 The GBR rates the contribution of the land parcel to the five Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>4.5 It is important to note at the outset that there are very clear and accepted exceptional circumstances which justify the release of significant amounts of land from the Green Belt to meet Rossendale's housing and employment needs. All land within the current Green Belt, fulfils at least some aspects of Green Belt purposes. As such, it will not be possible to meet the identified housing needs of Rossendale without some impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.6 It is also important to note when considering what land to release from the Green Belt to be clear that the "golden thread" which runs through plan making and decision taking is the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF confirms this at paragraph 84 when it states that "...when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development...". In considering the release of land from Green Belt it is therefore essential to consider what releases of land will achieve sustainable development while minimising the impacts on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>4.7 The GBR identifies that this parcel plays a moderate role in respect of this purpose. It notes that the parcel is adjacent to Edenfield which forms part of the large built up area of Ramsbottom/Bury. There are few urbanising features within the parcel apart from a detached house with surrounding large yard area and a detached bungalow. The influence of these urbanising features is limited with the parcel displaying a relatively strong sense of openness.</p> <p>4.8 This assessment is contested. The DLP proposes to extend the urban boundary on the west side of Blackburn Road and allocate that land for some 450 homes. In allowing additional limited development to the east side of Burnley Road, adjacent to the newly extended urban boundary, would enable additional housing to be delivered without compromising this Green Belt purpose. A similar release to the suggested is proposed at site HS2.74.</p> <p>Purpose 2 - To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>4.9 The GBR considers that the role of P38 in this respect is weak. It notes that there is limited intervisibility between Edenfield and Rawtenstall which at this point are more than 2km apart with intervening steep valley sides. It notes that the parcel forms part of the settlement gap but it is not of critical importance and plays a limited role in preventing the merger. A loss of openness in the parcel is unlikely to be perceived as reducing the gap between the settlement areas.</p> <p>4.10 Peel supports this assessment and is in agreement that the development of this land does not have an important role in preventing towns from merging.</p> <p>Purpose 3 - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>4.11 The GBR found that the parcel's contribution in this respect was moderate. It found a sense of encroachment within the parcel as a result of the visual influence the adjoining settlement edge to the west and a residential property with large yard area located along the eastern boundary. Open pastoral land and characteristics of the open countryside were noted, but with a somewhat weakened rural character. Importance of the contribution to safeguarding large area of open countryside to the east was noted.</p> <p>4.12 Peel does not agree with this assessment. Large areas of open countryside are present to the east of the site and beyond Rossendale's Borough boundary. The development of this site would sit within the redefined urban boundary of Edenfield, between existing development along Burnley Road and with a direct relationship to existing and anticipated development of the village. Existing field boundaries lined with trees on the eastern perimeter would define the extent of the village and form a buffer with the open countryside to the east.</p> <p>4.13 Whilst it is accepted that it is important to protect the countryside from encroachment, it is considered that the release of the Site would be a logical</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>small scale extension to the village, together with the allocation to the west, and that any limited harm in this respect would be outweighed by the benefit of meeting housing land supply requirements in a sustainable location such as this one.</p> <p>Purpose 4 - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p> <p>4.14 The GBR recognised that P38 did not make any contribution to this purpose. As, in practice it would have little intervisibility with the historic settlements of Ramsbottom. The openness of the land within the parcels was not considered to be important to setting or historic significance.</p> <p>4.15 Peel agrees with this assessment.</p> <p>Purpose 5 - Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p> <p>4.16 The GBR notes that all parcels make an equally significant contribution to this purpose.</p> <p>4.17 The DLP proposes to optimise the re-use of brownfield sites to meet development needs and in doing so support ongoing urban regeneration.</p> <p>4.18 As noted above, and in the overarching representation, the supply of deliverable brownfield land is insufficient to deliver the number and type of new homes and employment land required. As such, the extent of urban regeneration which can be achieved is not enough to meet Rossendale's sustainable growth needs and must be accompanied by development on Green Belt land. Exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt release have been proven through the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. The release of land from the Green Belt will not therefore undermine this purpose.</p> <p>Green Belt Appraisal Conclusion</p> <p>4.19 The strategic purpose of the area of Green Belt which the Site forms part is to provide separation between Haslingden and Rawtenstall in the north/north west from Edenfield to the south (with Ramsbottom/ Bury urban area beyond).</p> <p>4.20 The site does not perform a strategic Green Belt function. Its development would not result in encroachment into the wider countryside which surrounds Edenfield and it would relate well to existing development along Burnley Road and to new development under the housing allocation proposed to the west of Blackburn Road to the A56.</p> <p>4.21 It would not result in urban sprawl or lead to the merger of separate settlements and would not reduce the gap between existing settlements. It would not have a significant impact on ongoing urban regeneration. In fact by providing for good quality family housing including elements of aspirational housing the development of this land would support the ongoing economic regeneration of Rossendale.</p> <p>4.22 The proposed boundary will provide a long term defensible Green Belt boundary with the field boundaries to the east and south being strengthened with additional planting.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>4.23 It is considered that this Site is suitable for development and is in a highly sustainable location. Its release from Green Belt will therefore contribute to a sustainable pattern of development which makes the most of proximity to nearby highway infrastructure. There are therefore clear exceptional circumstances to justify its release from the Green Belt.</p> <p>4.24 Peel recommends the Council allocate this land for development to ensure the identification of sufficient land to meet the housing needs of the borough.</p> <p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>5.1 In relation to Peel's land interests in the Borough, this document concerns one of four sites which have been subject of previous Development Frameworks and representations in the context of the Local Plan development. Updates to these frameworks will be provided to RBC in due course, setting out a clear vision and proposals for the development of these sites.</p> <p>5.2 This representation provides an initial review of the development opportunity at Burnley Road, Edenfield, including details of the site and its location, consideration of the site in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA) and planning policy; and a Green Belt appraisal, commenting on the findings of the Green Belt Review which forms part of the evidence base to the DLP.</p> <p>5.3 Peel would welcome discussions with RBC and other stakeholders regarding the emerging Local Plan and the merits of the sites promoted for residential development.</p> <p>5.4 The SHLAA identifies the land at Burnley Road as having potential for development, subject to mitigating site constraints; the DLP proposes it remain within Green Belt. Peel considers that the site can be developed with sensitivity to landscape and heritage features, and together with the large scale allocation to the west (HS:3 Edenfield), there is potential for this site to form part of the extension to the village. The updated Development Framework to follow this representation will further illustrate the opportunity for development of this site and give comfort that it should reasonably be released for development.</p> <p>5.5 Peel requests the designation of land at Burnley Road as a housing allocation and welcomes further discussion on this.</p> <p>Please see appendix for map</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1767	B	Scholes		SHLAA16144	Object	<p>We own the sites SHLAA 16144 and 16143, they form part of the garden of our home, X, Whitewell Bottom X.</p> <p>We would like consideration be given to have the easterly edge of area 16144 be included in to 16143 as to extend the westerly section of 16143 due to the edge of 144 being a flat area of land behind the tree covered westerly area of 143.</p> <p>Enclosed are very rough drawings of the proposed alteration along with illustrations of the topography and the overlap of the two current areas.</p> <p>Map of 16143 from planning document</p> <p>Map of 16144 from planning document</p> <p>Overlap of the two areas.</p> <p>Illustration to show the location of flat land in the two areas.</p> <p>Satellite image with area showing approximate current SHLAA 16144</p> <p>Satellite image of area showing approximate current SHLAA 16143</p> <p>Proposed change to area 16144 to include flat area to the west.</p> <p>Proposed new area for 16143</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1768	Jerry & Abid	Malik & Hussain		Land off Burnley Road, Loveclough	Object	<p>These representations are submitted by Indigo Planning on behalf of Mr Jerry Malik and Mr Abid Hussain in respect of the Draft Local Plan published in July 2017.</p> <p>The representations relate to our clients' site which is located west of Burnley Road (A682) in Love Clough. Please see the accompanying Title Plan which clarifies the extent of their site.</p> <p>Our clients request that the Policies Map and Local Plan is amended to allocate their site for residential development. Part of our clients' site was assessed in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA ref: 16216). The SHLAA's appraisal of part of the site queried its availability and expressed concerns about its suitability due to surface water flooding.</p> <p>These representations provide context on the site and demonstrate its suitability and availability. The representations are supported by details of the site ownership – our clients acquired the site in June 2016. A site appraisal and illustrative masterplan prepared by Brewster Bye Architects is enclosed which demonstrates how residential development could be assimilated into the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>The proposed indicative masterplan demonstrates that at least 55 houses could be provided on the site. A Flood Risk, Ground Condition and Drainage Assessment has also been prepared by Curtins which provides appropriate drainage solutions.</p> <p>Each of these matters is considered in more detail below.</p> <p>Policy Background</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places an emphasis on housing delivery and states at paragraph 47 that local planning authorities should boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>Paragraph 47 requires LPAs to ensure their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed housing need in the housing market area and to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites.</p> <p>To be 'deliverable' sites should be "available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable".</p> <p>Draft Policy HS1 of the emerging Local Plan states that 4,000 additional dwellings (net) need to be delivered within Rossendale between 2019 and 2034. This equates to 265 dwellings a year. The draft policy also identifies that the council needs to address an under-provision of 425 dwellings (as of 31st March 2017) within the first five years of the plan period.</p> <p>The subject site could provide an additional 50 houses (at least) and contribute towards achieving these policy objectives.</p> <p>Site Context</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>The extent of our clients' site is shown on the attached Title Plan and covers an area of approximately 2.7ha.</p> <p>The site is immediately adjacent existing residential areas located on the western side of Burnley Road. It therefore forms a suitable extension to the existing village envelope due to its location. The site would form an appropriate infill between Goodshaw Fold Road and Burnley Road and an appropriate extension to the existing settlements located within the river valley from Rawtenstall to Love Clough. The site is within the 'Settled Valley' landscape character area as defined by the 'Lives and Landscape Character Assessment' (2015) which forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.</p> <p>The site slopes from east to west following the river valley. The site is bounded to the north by an existing public footpath and to the south by residential properties. Burnley Road forms the eastern boundary of the site. Burnley Road is the main route through the village of Love Clough and the speed limit along this stretch is restricted to 40mph. The site is accessible off this road. The nearest bus stop lies within 100m of the site, providing access to Burnley, Skipton and Manchester City Centre.</p> <p>The site is not located within any sensitive ecological or heritage designations. The Environmental Network Study 2017, which forms part of the evidence base to the Local Plan, does not identify any potential environmental constraints to the developing this site.</p> <p>There is a Public Right of Way (PROW) which runs along the northern boundary and across the western portion of the site. As explained further below, the development of housing on the site could provide an opportunity to improve this section of the PROW.</p> <p>Part of our clients' site was assessed in the council's SHLAA 2016 (ref: SHLAA16216). The site assessment identified the site (1.1ha) was suitable for the delivery of 28 dwellings in the long term (11 to 15 years) once ownership constraints and potential flood risk have been addressed. It is important to note that the site identified in the SHLAA was only part (1.1ha) of the overall site promoted for housing in these representations.</p> <p>The council's SHLAA identifies that the site benefits from good access to parks/ play areas. The site is not located in or adjacent to any Biological Heritage Site or Local Geodiversity Site, or within close proximity of a Listed Building or Conservation Areas. The site is also not known to be contaminated or lie within a HSE consultation zone and there are no risks to mineral sterilisation from the redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site lies within an appropriate distance from local convenience shops (within approximately 1mile), and primary schools. The nearest secondary schools and GP surgeries are located within 3 miles and can</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>be accessed by bus.</p> <p>The SHLAA identifies that the site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 due to surface water flooding as opposed to flood risk from a river. However, this risk can be successfully mitigated and further information is provided below and in the attached Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Curtins. The SHLAA also identifies that the site is subject to multiple ownerships and queries its availability which is not the current position. Both matters are addressed below.</p> <p>Site Assessment</p> <p>National policy requires sites allocated for housing to be deliverable and developable. This requires sites to be available now and in a suitable location for development.</p> <p>Site Availability</p> <p>The site is available now and could be developed within 5 years to potentially deliver over 50 houses. Our clients acquired the site in June 2016 and therefore the SHLAA's commentary on the site ownership is incorrect. A title plan is provided in support of this submission and shows the land within our clients' ownership. The area shaded in blue has a dated covenant relating to coal mining activity which has resulted in this small part of the site being left undeveloped to include a landscaped buffer in the accompanying indicative masterplan. The remainder of the site is developable, under the ownership of our clients and deliverable for housing to address the existing shortfall in housing supply.</p> <p>Site Suitability</p> <p>The key considerations to address in relation to suitability are flood risk and the relationship of a housing scheme with the wider landscape.</p> <p>Surface water flooding</p> <p>The enclosed Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Curtins confirms the site is suitable to be allocated for housing. The accompanying report from Curtins provides an indicative surface water and foul water drainage solution which takes into account the identified surface water risk.</p> <p>The Environment Agency Planning Flood Map shows the site area to be located in Flood Zone 1 thus flood risk to the site can be considered low from all primary sources. Secondary flood risks including surface water flooding have also been assessed and the site is considered to be at low risk from all sources providing existing flow routes through the site are acknowledged in the detail design as they currently are shown on the Brewster Bye Architects masterplan and Curtins indicative site drainage layout.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that, as the site is over 1ha, any application will need to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Design, Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>It's clear from draft Policies ENV1 and ENV4, the supporting evidence base for the Local Plan and the planning history for the area that the relationship</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>between a housing proposal on this site and the wider landscape is a key consideration. The attached masterplan prepared by Brewster Bye Architects shows an appropriate design response to developing this site.</p> <p>The site lies on the edge of the existing settlement and forms a logical extension to the existing urban form. The site respects the historic pattern and character of development at Loveclough.</p> <p>The indicative scheme responds to the site's topography, the necessary drainage, the existing PROW and the character of the area. The scheme is relatively low density at 20 dwellings per hectare which is in accordance with draft policy HS5 and reflects the character of the area as illustrated on page 20. The housing mix, as shown on Page 19, also responds to the local character. The scheme will provide 46 semi-detached houses and 9 detached houses.</p> <p>The access and layout responds to the site's topography and the housing steps down in line with the site's gradient. The images of the scheme on pages 20 and 21 demonstrate that this type of housing scheme can be successfully integrated into the wider setting in the river valley.</p> <p>The PROW can be retained and could be improved further. We note the draft Local Plan policy TR2 states; "Although Rossendale has the densest public rights of way network in Lancashire, much of the network is in a poor condition and there is an identified need to develop, extend, upgrade and improve access to the network".</p> <p>Residential development will complement and enhance existing development through design which supports and promotes the character and heritage of Rossendale and the surrounding area. The layout of the site will maintain the ruralurban interface and development will seek to integrate the rural with the urban environment to reduce its prominence. Page 23 illustrates the potential design typologies which could be utilised. These indicative designs are an interpretation of traditional agricultural buildings, would be appropriate in this context and further help to integrate the scheme into the wider setting.</p> <p>The site is sustainably located within close proximity to public transport links and helps support the creation of a safe and inclusive community at Loveclough. The site benefits from good pedestrian accessibility and pedestrian linkages into the village of Loveclough.</p> <p>In accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF the site is a suitable location for development and should be considered favourably.</p> <p>Summary and Conclusions</p> <p>This submission demonstrates that the allocation of this site for housing is appropriate given it is in a highly sustainable location, adjacent the existing settlement boundary and there are no constraints which would render the site undeliverable. The site is deliverable and developable.</p> <p>This cover letter and the accompanying reports address the concerns</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
						<p>previously raised by the council to demonstrate there are no ownership or flooding constraints which would restrict its development potential for residential use. The site is therefore suitable and deliverable and represents a good opportunity for the delivery of additional dwellings in Loveclough. These will make a significant contribution in the short to medium term to Rossendale's five-year housing land supply.</p> <p>In accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF our client's site is entirely suitable for residential development and will complement and enhance the existing community at Loveclough.</p> <p>As such, we request the following amendments to the draft Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Policies Map is amended to include our clients' site within the Urban Boundary and to allocate the site for housing; and • Policy HS2 is amended to allocate our client's site. <p>We trust that these representations will be considered and will inform the future preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see appendix</p>		
1790	David	Trivett		SHLAA16068	Not Applicable	<p>Brownfield. Urban Boundary. Currently Bacup Leisure Centre. Yield calculated 14 units. Excellent existing access off A671.</p> <p>I understood Euro Garages had purchased this site for use as a garage and drive thru retail outlet?</p> <p>This would be a good example of a sustainable development and would certainly benefit Bacup by introducing competition for the one other outlet near the town.</p> <p>It would also be very useful as a brownfield residential development if permission is not granted for the anticipated garage forecourt operation.</p>		
1790	David	Trivett		SHLAA16074	Not Applicable	<p>SHLAA16074 - Land to the rear of Highfield Bacup.</p> <p>Greenfield site. Countryside adjoining the urban area. Currently Grassland and private/storage garden area. Yield calculated 48 units. Access off Maden Road, is poor and will require the felling of mature trees. Access via Meadow Way is better but situated in a different ownership. It is to be noted that Bankside Lane which is a mandatory access point is narrow and steep.</p> <p>The above proposed development is not shown on the Policies Map or listed in Table 1 Housing site Allocations.</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	Site not allo	Further comment
1819	Sylvia	Wrigley		Land west of Rising Bridge Rd	Object	I write to you with reference to the letter sent to us dated 22nd September 2017 re the land west of Rising Bridge Road, between Rising Bridge Road and the A56, as not being proposed for development. We as owners do strongly object to this and request the land be removed from the Green Belt, and allocated for housing. An ideal site for approximately 24 (twenty four old people bungalows) which in turn would release larger houses for family occupations. We trust that you will reconsider this derelict land as proposed. The land being of no other use what so ever. Awaiting your reply so we can then consider a way forward.		

Number of comments Site not allocated

69

Statement of Community Involvement

Reference	SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
-----------	-----	------------------------------------

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SCI	Further comment
1223	Alwyn	Davies	-		Not Applicable	<p>"Statement of Community Involvement Policy 2014 - - The link to the current Statement of Community Involvement is not available on the Councils Consultation webpages. This version of this document can only be found through searching on the council's website. - - On Page 9 section 2.3 the council sets out its commitment to consult with stakeholders in the development of planning processes which includes, residents, business, developers, agents and landowners. This is in line with the Consultation Principles published by the Cabinet Office in 2016 which states: "Consultations should be targeted. Consider the full range of people, business and voluntary sector affected by the policy and whether representative groups exist. Ensure they are aware of the consultation and can access it. Consider how to tailor the consultation to the needs and preferences of particular groups, such as older people, younger people, or people with disabilities who may not respond to traditional consultation methods. " - - It can be evidenced that Rossendale Councils Consultation process has failed to adequately consult with residents affected by proposed developments set out in the local plan. - As a resident who would be affected by the current draft plan I had no knowledge of the proposal until a concerned neighbour canvassed the area and highlighted the council's consultation process to us in a letter that he had produced. For context the proposal in the local plan would mean that my house would be encapsulated by employment space (Warehouses and Factories) on what is currently Green Belt Land. - - The council confirmed at a meeting held in Haslingden Library on the 19th September 2017 that the council had promoted the consultation by putting one article in the Rossendale Free Press (This is a local paper which must be purchased), a post on Facebook (which excludes a vast majority of the residents of Rossendale) and posted the information on the Councils Websites (which with the greatest of respect unless you need information on your bin collection one would have no reason to access it). It is clear that this falls significantly short of a targeted consultation process and it could be argued that the council has done the opposite and tried to engage with as few residents as possible. As a resident significantly affected by the proposal the council has made no effort to consult with me or to gain my views and has it not been for a concerned resident I would not have been able to express my views or exercise my right to respond to this consultation. - - The council lists the methods its uses to consult as: - -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other electronic media e.g. Twitter. • Leaflets Brochures • Notices of Consultation on lamp-posts • Formal Written Consultation / Community surveys • One to one meetings with individual stakeholders, • Public Meetings, • Area Forums • Planning Aids <p>- - As the draft local plan was finalised at the end of July 2017 and the consultation began on the 27th July one can only presume that the lack of engagement is to rush through, under the radar of the public a plan which will affect the lives of thousands of</p>		No

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SCI	Further comment
						<p>resident in Rossendale. It is clear that this has not been a targeted consultation process. - - It is clear that information is not sufficiently detailed as to enable consultees to understand the proposal and make meaningful representations from it. To comment on the consultation document firstly I have had to read Rossendale Draft Local plan which contains information that is complex, specialist and not explained. To contextualise the draft plan and prepare my response for the consultation I have also had to read guidance of a similar nature which included: - - •Rossendale Green Belt Review 2016 - •The planning inspectorate report to Rossendale Council in 2010 - •The Sustainability Appraisal of the Rossendale Local Plan May 2017 - •Authority Monitoring Report June 2017 - •Statement of Community Involvement 2014. - - The documents all contain information presented numerically, tables and maps. I have seen no evidence that the council has made any attempts to provide this information in easy to read formats or provided a consideration for those like me who are not experts in Local Planning policies and procedures. I have also found no evidence of how the council has considered those who's first language is not English or those who have learning difficulties. It is clear that the council has not provided information in a form that is comprehensible to the general audience of consultees, the residents of Rossendale. I would like to bring your attention to Case Law R South West Care Homes V Devon CC and Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Foundation Trust V Joint Committee of Primary Care Trusts and Anor which detailed that 'Prescription to Fairness' is an aspect of fairness in that a consultation document presents the issues in a way that facilitates an effective response, another aspect of fairness lies in the representation of the information of which the views of consultees should be sought. - - At the meeting we posed this to X the planning manager who advised that that they have not written to residents as they generally throw information in the bin as they did with the consultation to the local plan (Core Strategy in 2011). I asked X how the council has come to this conclusion for example; had an evaluation of the previous consultation evidenced that people threw the information in the bin? If so how many people? I wanted to understand how the council had evidenced that this was an ineffective means of consulting with people. I asked X if I submitted a Freedom of Information request asking for this information would it be available. X confirmed that this decision has been taken following chat within her team which was not a minuted meeting. Separately to commenting on the consultation process this worries me as to how the council generally conducts its business. - - I would also like for consideration to the the timings of the consultation meetings to be given which were held between the hours of 4-7pm in the evening. This significantly reduced the opportunity for those in employment to be able to attend the meeting(s). - - At the meeting the Senior Planning Officer and X Planning Manager advised that the landowners of EMP2.15 has been written to and</p>		

ID	Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Other Reference	Statement	Comment	SCI	Further comment
----	-----------	---------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	---------	-----	-----------------

consulted with and it was very promising that the land would be sold to support the local plan. The landowner was contacted during the meeting who confirmed that they had not been contacted or written to and they had no knowledge of the consultation process. I highlighted to X that it was my understanding that it was illegal to provide false and inaccurate information during a consultation process and the process can now be classed as flawed. X acknowledged that this was a significant failing from her team. - We discussed our concerns with Councillor X who was unable to comment or advise on consultation process and when questioned about what an exceptional circumstance is to build on greenbelt land replied if there a 'Horse' on the land you should be fine – My only comment is respect of this is that it must be a concern to the council that members represent them in this manner. It is clear that the consultation process thus far has fallen short of commitment made by the council in the Statement of Community involvement 2014 and is fundamentally and significantly flawed. It would suggest that the council has breached its own policies and procedure has had not provided a fair, equitable and reasonable opportunity for resident of Rossendale to Contribute to the Draft Local Plan 2017. I have submitted a complaint in relation to this consultation process to central government as I feel that an investigation into the failure to adequately consult is required to determine if we have a dishonourable and incompetent council in

Number of comments SCI

1

Unknown

Reference not known unknown

548	David	Tomlinson	-	Object	the development is not needed and will endanger wild life.	-
-----	-------	-----------	---	--------	--	---

Number of comments not known

1

Total number of comments 3046