

**Matter 14 – Housing site allocations: Edenfield, Helmshore, Irwell Vale and Ewood Bridge**

**Issue – Are the proposed housing allocations in Edenfield, Helmshore, Irwell Vale and Ewood Bridge justified, effective, developable/deliverable and in line with national policy?**

**Question (f) – What scale and form of additional primary school provision would be needed to support the development? Is an expansion of Edenfield Primary School justified, deliverable and consistent with the Green Belt status of the land? If a new school is required, is there scope to accommodate this within the proposed allocation site, or elsewhere? What impact would on-site provision have on housing capacity? What provision is required for early years/childcare and secondary education facilities? What is Lancashire County Council's latest position?**

1. The inclusion of a new school on the site at Edenfield has been included in the earliest version of the local plan and IDP. This has been at a 1 form entry 210 pupils on a site 1.36hectares, this is the minimum form of entry that is cost effective to build. The existing school at Edenfield has some surplus capacity to meet the early yield of the site at this point in time. However, the school does not have the capacity or the land to accommodate the long term yield from the strategic site, therefore the options of expanding the school are considered the best option.
2. Uncertainty of the land being made available to allow expansion requires the option to develop a new school on the site to remain within the local plan and IDP until a point where land is secured. It would not be the responsibility of SPT to specify the location of a new school, this would come through the council's master plan process working with the developer and their agents.
3. It should be noted that no feasibility work or discussions have taken place with any schools affected by new housing the potential option to expand. The situation continues to be monitored through the planning application and the housing land process to enable Lancashire County Council to supply the latest forecasted position.

**Question (i) – Have other constraints including heritage, biodiversity and trees, flood risk, drainage, noise, air quality and contamination been satisfactorily investigated and addressed? Are related mitigation measures/requirements necessary and clearly expressed in Policy HS3?**

4. Requirements for air quality assessment and mitigation measures haven't been included in Policy HS3. Policy ENV6 (Environmental Protection) requires "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...", there is an assumption that the development proposed at Edenfield (H72) would require assessment due to its size. However, to avoid any ambiguity we recommend that the requirement for an air quality assessment should be added to the design principles listed at b) in Policy HS2 to ensure the air quality impact and appropriate mitigation measures are considered for the specific development.

5. Lancaster City Council has developed a Low Emission and Air Quality Planning Advisory Note to be adopted as an SPD in due course. This sets out the process for assessing and mitigating air quality impacts of new development. Consideration should be given to taking a similar approach in Rossendale in support of Policy ENV6, this would provide guidance to developers on when and how air quality issues need to be considered as well as the requirements for mitigation.

<b>Housing / Employment Allocation Ref.</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Question asked in MIQ</b>	<b>SFRA Reference / Site Name</b>	<b>Comments in SFRA</b>	<b>Lancashire County Council comments</b>
H72	Land west of Market Street, Edenfield	i) Have other constraints including heritage, biodiversity and trees, flood risk, drainage, noise, air quality and contamination been satisfactorily	SFRA182 / Land off Exchange Street	No significant surface water risk Level 1 Strategic Recommendation D: Development could be allocated subject to FRA	The proposed development site has an incline of approx. 5 to 20m over an average distance of approx. 200m, falling from east to west, Market St to A56.  The site has numerous narrow strips (less than 5% of total site),

		investigated and addressed? Are related mitigation measures/requirements necessary and clearly expressed in Policy HS3?	SFRA183 / Land between Blackburn Road and A56	No significant surface water risk Level 1 Strategic Recommendation D: Development could be allocated subject to FRA	including open watercourses, that are classed as high and low flood risk from surface water, and development should be avoided within the high flood risk sections. Development within the low flood risk sections of the site, with a carefully considered surface water drainage plan, with adequate drainage mitigation, could reduce any surface water flood risk within these sections as well as any threat to properties adjacent.
			SFRA184 / Land between Chatterton Hey and Nursing Home, Edenfield	No significant surface water risk Level 1 Strategic Recommendation D: Development could be allocated subject to FRA	
H74	Grane Village, Helmshore	i) What is the nature of the surface water flooding risks on the site? Can this be mitigated?	SFRA295 / Grane Village, Land south of Grane Road / east of Holcombe Road, Haslingden	No significant surface water risk Level 1 Strategic Recommendation D: Development could be allocated subject to FRA	The proposed development site has an incline of approx. 15m over an average distance of approx. 200m, falling from north to south, Grane Rd towards Kingsway.
			SFRA254 / Solomon's Site	No significant surface water risk Level 1 Strategic Recommendation D: Development could be allocated subject to FRA	The site has numerous narrow strips (approx. 5% of total site), that are classed as high and low flood risk from surface water, and development should be avoided within the high flood risk sections. Development within the low flood risk sections of the site, with a carefully considered surface water drainage plan, with adequate drainage mitigation,

					could reduce any surface water flood risk within these.
--	--	--	--	--	---