# **Topic Planning Policies**

Topic Planning Policies set out the Council's approach to particular types of development. They will apply to all developments of that type and set the standards that the Council will expect proposals to meet. The policies should be read as a whole and are not set out in any specific order or level of priority.

Planning deals with all types of development, so there are many topics. However the topic planning policies in the Core Strategy include policies that specifically or indirectly cover the following issues:

- General Development Locations
- Development Principles
- The Natural Environment
- Housing
- Economy & Employment
- Tourism
- Retail and Shopping
- Social & Community Facilities
- Transport
- Infrastructure
- Health
- Education
- Climate Change
- Open Spaces, Parks and Playgrounds
- The Built Environment

The topic planning policies will set out:

- What we plan to do about the topic (e.g. the built environment)
- Why we need to do something about it
- How we plan to achieve this
- When (broadly) we anticipate this being completed
- Who will deliver/provide it

The topic planning policies are designed to cover development across Rossendale and are therefore quite broad. Further guidance on topic policies may be developed through later documents (Supplementary Planning Documents).

Topic planning policies cover the different types of development that will occur in Rossendale over the next 15 years and set out the Councils approach to managing new development at the same time as protecting and enhancing our natural and man-made assets.

While the Area Visions and Policies set out the principles for new development and proposals in specific areas within Rossendale and provide a steer for future development, the topic planning policies stipulate where, when and how different types of development will be encouraged and what standards are expected. They also set out how our natural environment and built heritage will be protected from development and enhanced through contributions and improvements.

The diagram below illustrates how the spatial vision identifies a number of strategic objectives, which then set the principles and aims carried through and delivered by the area visions and the topic planning policies which will ultimately achieve the spatial vision for Rossendale.



This approach to the Core Strategy means that issues and opportunities are considered at both the strategic Borough-wide and local community levels, making the document a meaningful and realistic planning document for the future of Rossendale, focused on achieving delivery.

The topic planning policies should not be read in isolation. The principles for all future development and improvements are given local guidance and acknowledgment in Section 4: Area Visions and Policies and will apply to every planning application, proposal and allocation that will come forward in those areas between now and 2026.

It is important to understand that the Topic Planning Policies <u>do not</u> override or take precedence over Area Visions and Policies, but set the principles and standards which all future development and improvements will be encouraged and expected to achieve.

### **RLDF 1: General Development Locations and Principles**

#### **General Development Locations**

It is proposed that most new development should take place in Rawtenstall with the majority of other development taking place in Bacup and Haslingden.

### **Urban Boundary**

Development within Rossendale should take place within the defined urban boundary (Local Plan Saved Policy DS1) and should be of a size and nature appropriate to the size and role of the settlement.

The urban boundary defined in Local Plan Saved Policy DS1 will be reviewed and where necessary amended in the Site Allocations DPD in accordance with the following criteria:

- Recent development dictates a necessary change to the boundary
- Anomalies and inconsistencies indicate that amendments need to be made
- An extension/amendment to the urban boundary would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment including biological, geological, geomorphological, green infrastructure and landscape character assets
- Any amendment/extension would not result in the amalgamation of settlements
- The amendment/extension would not result in a significant impact on local views and viewpoints

### Green Belt & Countryside

Proposals outside the urban boundary will be determined in accordance with the relevant national, regional and local planning guidance.

Should a review of the existing Green Belt boundaries (Local Plan Saved Policy DS3) be appropriate, this will be done through the Site Allocations DPD according to the criteria set out in national and regional guidance.

### **Development Principles**

All developments and proposals should:

- Make best use of under-used, vacant and derelict land and buildings
- Complement and enhance the surrounding area(s) of the development without detriment to the local character and heritage assets including through the use of local stone and materials
- Seek to minimise negative impacts upon existing infrastructure capacities and demonstrate effective use of low carbon technologies
- Maximise access by public transport, walking and cycling in a manner that promotes safe and inclusive communities
- Give clear consideration to access for larger vehicles
- Maximise visual quality, including when viewed from surrounding countryside
- Wherever possible, improve links to and the quality of the local network of open spaces and areen infrastructure

Do you agree with the above policy directing the largest amounts of development to Rawtenstall, followed by Bacup and Haslingden? Do you agree with the development principles that have been set out? Are there any additions/deletions you would make

to the development principles? Do you agree with the proposed criteria for reviewing the urban boundary and Green Belt boundaries in the future? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

The urban area of Rossendale primarily consists of a string of individual settlements along the valleys that merge into each other. Rawtenstall is the largest settlement with the best transport links and is the main retail and service centre for the Borough. Because of this function it is proposed that the majority of development should be located here. Bacup is the main centre for the east of the Borough and is a focus for regeneration, with a particular focus on maximising the potential of its historic buildings and promoting development that will meet the needs of the local population. Haslingden has excellent external links via the A56 and contains a number of key employment locations. The town centre is in need of enhancement that reflects its historic context.

Development in other settlements is expected to be primarily focussed in Whitworth with Stacksteads, Waterfoot, Helmshore and Edenfield playing important supporting roles. Improvements to existing employment, retail and service provision will be supported as identified in other policies in this document. In smaller settlements such as Goodshaw, Loveclough, Irwell Vale, Water and Weir development should primarily support local needs.

There is a considerable amount of vacant, under-used and previously developed land and buildings. This can be found in virtually all settlements with a significant proportion being in Rawtenstall, Bacup and Haslingden. Re-use of this resource will help improve the quality of the local environment as well as help to reduce the pressure to build on greenfield, peripheral locations.

The focus on urban areas is not intended to prohibit necessary development in rural areas such as that which is essential for tourism purposes. The intention is to ensure that the qualities that make the countryside of the area distinctive be retained. Part of the Borough, particularly in the south west and around Whitworth is already designated as Green Belt where developments that affect "openness" will be strictly controlled. It is not intended that any alterations will be made to existing boundaries. Alterations to existing buildings in the countryside, such as barns, will be addressed in the "Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside" SPD.

The damp climate of Rossendale combined with the topography results in locally significant problems with surface water run-off. Developments should examine options for sustainable drainage systems including mechanisms such as "grey water harvesting" before it reaches the drainage system. Significantly greater energy efficiency in refurbished as well as new buildings would help to reduce the impact of new development on the utilities network as well as reducing the existing high per capita production of CO<sup>2</sup>.

Both individual planning applications and the analysis of sites in a future Site Allocations Development Plan Document will be considered against the criteria included in this policy. The intention is to improve the sustainability of new development, individually and as a whole, and to promote consideration of local context. Use of stone, historic buildings and places, and the relationship with open space, natural habitats, waterways and the Rights of Way network ("green infrastructure") are all particularly important in the local context. The steep valley sides and views from moorland ridges mean that medium/longer distance views from above can be significant.

The high level of car usage together with concentrations of low car ownership means that new development should be made as accessible as possible by alternative means. Location within 400 metres of bus stops on primary bus corridors will be particularly favoured. The narrow Victorian road network means that large areas are difficult to access by large vehicles, including bin lorries. New development should create attractive, safe streets and also take into account the ability to service the area. The latter will be particularly important for refurbishment of older employment premises.

The use of local materials, labour and suppliers for building will be pursued. This would both reduce the buildings carbon footprint and to encourage development that reflects the local context.

| Strategic               | SO1-7  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Objectives Met          |  |
| Alternative             |  |
| <b>Options Explored</b> |  |
| Indicators              | 1. Amount of development within the urban boundary.            |
|                         | 2. Concordance of development to settlement hierarchy.         |
|                         | 3. Amount of new development on Green Belt or countryside      |
|                         | land.  |
| Targets                 | 1. At least 95% to be within urban boundary.                   |
|                         | 2. Majority of development to take place in Rawtenstall (30%), |
|                         | Haslingden (15%) and Bacup (15%).                              |
|                         | 3. 5%.   |
| Delivery                | Developers, Rossendale BC, Partners.                           |
| Agency(s)               |  |
| Implementation          | Proactive management of planning applications and land         |
|                         | allocation within the LDF.                                     |
| Monitoring &            | 1) Monitoring of planning applications through Annual          |
| Review                  | Monitoring Report (AMR)  |
|                         | - · · · ·  |

# Housing

| RLDF 2: Meeting Rossendale's Housing Requirement   |
|--|
| It is proposed that the gross housing requirement for the period 2003-2026, will be achieved through:  |
| <ol> <li>Providing at least 4000 net additional dwellings over the plan period<br/>2003-2021 equating to 222 dwellings per year.</li> <li>Allocating land to meet the outstanding residual requirement for the<br/>period 2003-2021 and identifying land for the period 2022-2026;</li> <li>Delivering at least 65% of all new dwellings on previously developed<br/>land;</li> <li>Supporting the reuse and conversion of appropriate buildings for<br/>housing;</li> <li>Encouraging higher density developments in sustainable locations, such<br/>as within and adjacent to Rawtenstall, Bacup, Haslingden and<br/>Whitworth and where well served by public transport;</li> <li>Safeguarding the character of established residential areas from over-<br/>intensive and inappropriate new development; and</li> <li>Prioritising the development of previously developed land. However,<br/>where the development relates to a Greenfield site, development will be<br/>permitted where:         <ul> <li>It forms a minor part of a larger development as a whole; or</li> <li>Sa seture of the development as a whole; or</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |
| <ul> <li>ii. It delivers an overriding significant social, economic and<br/>environmental benefit, and it complies with policies for the protection<br/>of green space; or</li> <li>iii. The application is for a barn conversion and it can be demonstrated<br/>that the site has been marketed for economic uses for 18 months, to<br/>the satisfaction of the Council, and is not viable for these purposes.</li> </ul>   |
| The Council, together with housing providers will seek to achieve the completion of net additional dwellings, as required in the most up-to-date and adopted regional policy and associated targets.   |
| Do you agree that the policy above is the most appropriate to manage new housing   |

Do you agree that the policy above is the most appropriate to manage new housing development in Rossendale? Do you agree that the targets are realistic and achievable? Do you agree with encouraging higher density developments in the main towns/urban areas? Do you agree that previously-developed land should be developed as a priority, before Greenfield land?

The Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West Rossendale to provide at least 4000 net additional dwellings over the plan period 2003-2021, equating to 222 dwellings per annum. Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing requires the Core Strategy to look forward 15 years from the point of adoption, therefore we have applied the adopted RSS requirement for the period 2022-2026. This gives a total completion requirement of 5,110 dwellings between 2003 and 2026.

### The Housing Evidence Base

The key evidence in demonstrating how the housing requirement will be met is the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Rossendale's first SHLAA was completed in March 2009 and indicates the housing land supply at April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008.

The assessment concludes that Rossendale's entire 15-year housing requirement can be met on previously-developed land with a surplus of over 5000 potential dwellings on available brownfield and Greenfield land.

However the recession, which commenced in 2008, will have a significant impact upon the rate of housing completions. Annual returns for 2008/2009, undertaken in June 2009 indicated that total net completions for 2008/2009 were 54, compared to a target of 222. Housing completions will continue to be monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report and updates to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

#### **Housing Trajectory**

The trajectory below illustrates past, present and future housing delivery for Rossendale. The Joint Lancashire Structure Plan<sup>1</sup> (2001-2016) annual targets of 220 dwellings per year (2001-2006) and 80 dwellings per year (2006-2016) have been used between 2003/04 and 2007/08 and the Adopted Regional Spatial Strategy annual target of 222 dwellings per year between 2008/09 and 2020/21. The cumulative over/under supply has been calculated through the subtraction of actual/projected completions from the annual RSS requirement. Any surplus/deficit from previous years as well as the current economic climate and predicted recovery rates have been taken in account through the projected net completions



### **Previously Developed Land Trajectory**

The trajectory below shows the completions taking place on both previously developed land (PDL) and Greenfield sites against the relevant development plan target. It demonstrates that the target set in the RSS is achievable and realistic.

It should be noted that the large decrease in PDL completions between 2006 and 2009 is due the implementation of three large Greenfield sites with historic extant permissions totalling 533 dwellings as well as the onset of the recession, making brownfield sites more difficult to deliver.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Superseded by the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (RSS13) September 2008

Due to the amount of deliverable previously developed sites identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 2009) it is anticipated that a minimum of 65% of all new housing will be delivered on previously developed land and this figure may be increased to reflect the amount of available land in Rossendale.



| SO2.   |
|--|
|  |
| Several options have been explored throughout the life of the  |
| Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the       |
| Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is        |
| available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.          |
| 1. Housing trajectory.   |
| 2. Amount of residential development on previously             |
| developed land.  |
| 1. To meet the regional housing provision requirement.         |
| House builders, Registered Social Landlords, Green Vale        |
| Homes, Rossendale BC.  |
| Allocation of land through LDF, developer investment and grant |
| funding.   |
| 1. Housing completions will be monitored through the Annual    |
| Monitoring Report (AMR).                                       |
| 2. Completions on Previously-Developed Land and                |
| Greenfield land will ne monitored through the Annual           |
| Monitoring Report (AMR).                                       |
| 3. Updates to the Strategic Housing Land Availability          |
| Assessment (SHLAA) will be undertaken periodically             |
| throughout the life of the Core Strategy, taking into account  |
| the findings of Annual Monitoring Reports.                     |
| • •  |
| 4. Subject to the findings of the AMR                          |
|  |

### **RLDF 3: Distribution of Additional Housing**

It is proposed that the scale and distribution of the regional housing requirement be as follows:

- 1. The largest number of additional houses will be built in the Rawtenstall area, equating to approximately 31% of the overall requirement.
- 2. Smaller but significant numbers of additional houses will be built in the towns of Bacup, Haslingden and Whitworth equating to approximately 33% of the overall housing requirement.
- 3. Following these settlements/areas, housing development in the areas of Helmshore, Edenfield, Goodshaw, Loveclough, Waterfoot, Stacksteads, Britannia, Facit and Shawforth will be permitted having regard to their relative size and function, the need for urban regeneration, housing market renewal, the capacity of infrastructure, opportunities for new housing, the capacity for growth and past house building trends. The combined total of housing development in these areas equates to approximately 33% of the overall requirement.
- 4. Limited numbers of additional houses will be built in settlements such as Water and Weir to meet the needs of the settlement and help to create sustainable communities, reflecting their relative size and function and their limited capacity to accommodate growth. In these areas new housing development will make up approximately 2% of the total housing requirement.
- 5. In villages and smaller settlements, housing development will be of a very limited scale and only permitted where they meet identified local needs.

The pressures for housing development remain strong in Rossendale, particularly in the more accessible west of the Borough in areas such a Helmshore, Rawtenstall, Crawshawbooth, Goodshaw and Edenfield. This demand must be carefully managed to ensure that the qualities of and characteristics that attract people to Rossendale in the first place are not damaged and that demand can be accommodated without placing excessive pressures on existing infrastructure and services. In tandem with high demand in the west, much of the east struggles with housing market decline and therefore needs significant investment and promotion to overcome these difficulties.

Figures for approximate overall housing development have been calculated from the10226 developable sites identified and assessed in the Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2009 for deliverability within 5 and 10 years. The available sites were broken down by Super Output Areas (SOAs) coinciding with the hierarchy of residential development set out in the policy to give the amount of deliverable sites in that area.

| Strategic             | SO2.  |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b> |   |
| Alternative           | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the   |
| Options Explored      | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the        |
|                       | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is         |
|                       | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.           |
| Indicators            | 1. Proportion of residential developments within the identified |
|                       | areas as detailed in policy RLDF 3.                             |
|                       | 2. Proportion of new dwellings which comply with relevant       |
|                       | Code for Sustainable Homes/Life Time Homes/ BREEAM              |

|                | standards.  |
|----------------|---|
| Targets        | <ol> <li>Residential developments to take place in accordance with<br/>RLDF 3.</li> </ol> |
| Delivery       | House builders, Registered Social Landlords, Green Vale                                   |
| Agency(s)      | Homes, Rossendale BC.   |
| Implementation | Allocation of land through LDF, developer investment and grant                            |
|                | funding.  |
| Monitoring &   | 1. Housing approvals completions will be monitored through                                |
| Review         | the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).   |

### **RLDF 4: Affordable and Supported Housing**

### Affordable Housing

It is proposed that the delivery of affordable housing be achieved by:

- 1. Allocating land specifically for affordable housing development through the Allocations DPD;
- 2. Setting an overall affordable housing target of 30% for all new private sector residential development. Requiring all private sector development to contribute as follows:
  - a. On sites between 5 and 14 units, a commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision may be acceptable unless there is an overriding local need for on-site provision;
  - b. On sites of 15 or more dwellings the presumption will be for on-site provision unless no local need exists, in which case a commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision will be required;
  - c. Any relaxation of the above requirement will only be considered if the applicant pays for the Council to approach an independent specialist to undertake a site-specific economic viability assessment, and the argument is fully justified.
- 3. Supporting "rural exceptions" in small rural settlements for 100% affordable housing schemes to meet an identified local need where the development is small in scale and where that need cannot be met in any other larger settlement.

### **Supported Housing**

It is proposed that the delivery of supported housing be achieved by:

- 4. The provision of smaller units, including apartments and bungalows to meet the needs an ageing population and smaller households.
- 5. Planning for extra care and supported housing appropriate to local needs.
- 6. Higher value market housing to support economic development in the Housing Market Renewal Area.

In requiring provision, the Council will have regard to the level of need and split between social-rented and intermediate affordable housing including type & form; as identified in the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment; Housing Needs Assessment or similar.

PPS3 clearly states that providing affordable housing is a key role of the planning system. Evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2008 demonstrates that there is an annual requirement for 327 net additional affordable

houses in Rossendale, and recommends a 30 percent contribution target be set to deliver this need, of which 35 percent should be intermediate housing.

In addition, the Affordable Housing Economic Viability Assessment (2009) prepared for Rossendale BC concludes that of 72 sites assessed across the Borough, 78 percent would be viable with a 30 percent affordable housing requirement under 'normal' market conditions. Although it recognised that there would be increased difficulty to achieve this target in rural and less desirable areas.

| Strategic             | SO2.  |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b> |   |
| Alternative           | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the   |
| Options Explored      | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the  |
|                       | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection. |
| Indicators            | 1. Amount of affordable dwelling completions.   |
|                       | 2. Completed new dwellings by number of bedrooms and  |
|                       | dwelling type.  |
| Targets               | 1. As per up to date SHMA requirements.   |
| -                     | 2. As per up to date housing mix requirements in SHMA.  |
| Delivery              | House builders, Registered Social Landlords, Green Vale   |
| Agency(s)             | Homes, Rossendale BC.   |
| Implementation        | Allocation of land through LDF, developer investment and grant  |
|                       | funding. Proactively manage planning applications.  |
| Monitoring &          | 1. Annual Monitoring Report/Regional Monitoring Report  |
| Review                | 2. Annual Monitoring Report   |

# **RLDF 5: Meeting the Needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

Sufficient housing provision must be made to meet the needs of the whole community.

It is proposed that:

- 1. Permanent pitches and transit pitches are provided in line with figures specified in the most up to date Regional Strategy
- 2. The preferred areas of search are Haslingden, Waterfoot, Stacksteads and Bacup.
- 3. Sites will be located in places that have good access to the road network, within easy reach of schools, shops and other facilities, should have adequate space for business and storage activities and be accessible by foot, cycle or public transport.
- 4. All sites should be well landscaped and take into account impact on local residents.

In recent years, Rossendale has seen increased interest in Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and at present, there are no authorised sites.

There is a rich heritage of Gypsies and Travellers however they are the most socially excluded ethnic minority in the country and nearly a quarter of Gypsies and

Travellers who live in caravans have no authorised place to stay and raise their families. This causes difficulties for those families in terms of access to basic facilities and services as well as potentially causing inconvenience for local residents with a consequent risk of community tensions.

Recent legislation and guidance from the Government in Circular 01/2006 has indicated a commitment to taking steps to resolve some of the long-standing accommodation issues for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. The Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West is currently undergoing a partial review which will set out separate figures required for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople for each district.

Once identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy, the required provision in Rossendale will be brought forward in the site allocations development plan document, and monitored through Core Output indicator H4.

It is considered that the criteria outlined in the policy will be relevant to both Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople requirements.

| Strategic<br>Objectives Met     | SO2 and SO3   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Alternative<br>Options Explored | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the<br>Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the<br>Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is<br>available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection. |
| Indicators                      | 1. Meeting any needs identified through regional / sub-regional surveys.  |
| Targets                         | 1. 100% of identified need met.   |
| Delivery<br>Agency(s)           | Rossendale BC, Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Groups, 4NW.  |
| Implementation                  | Carrying out needs-assessments at regional, sub-regional and local levels. Determination of planning applications and allocation of land through LDF.   |
| Monitoring &<br>Review          | Monitor annually through District and Regional AMR's  |

Do you agree that the above policies (RLDF 2-5) are the best way in which the issues relating to providing new housing, the distribution of additional housing, the affordability of housing and the needs of Gypsies and Travellers can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

### **RLDF 6: Training and Skills**

It is proposed that the following approach be taken toward improving and providing new opportunities for training and skills be achieved as follows:

The Council will work closely with public, private and voluntary sector partners to maximise access to training and work opportunities for those wanting to enter the labour market or seeking to upgrade existing skills.

The "Building Schools for the Future" programme for Rossendale and the plans of Accrington and Rossendale College to increase its presence in the Bacup area will be actively supported.

Do you agree that the above policy direction is the best way in which the issues relating to Training and Skills can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Rossendale has a number of wards with concentrations of low educational attainment (worst 20% nationally). This includes the centre of Haslingden, the eastern end of Stacksteads, parts of Bacup and the Hall Carr area of Rawtenstall. High levels of benefit dependency, restrictions in employment to low pay/low skill jobs and broader social and environmental problems lead directly from this.

Providing opportunities for enhanced education and training is essential to improving residents' quality of life and providing a skilled workforce for local employers. The Council will work with employers to encourage employment and training of local staff, including in the construction sector. Local Employment Charters will be used as a mechanism to achieve this including through the planning permission process.

"Building Schools for the Future" is a multi-million five year programme to refurbish the Secondary Schools in the Borough. Funding approval has currently been delayed.

Further and Higher Education opportunities are currently limited with students on vocational courses such as NVQ's currently having to travel outside the Borough. This reduces uptake of such courses, especially in the east of Rossendale. A partnership of Accrington and Rossendale College, Rossendale Borough Council, Lancashire County Developments and other bodies is seeking to develop a major new facility near Bacup that will specifically address training issues for sectors such as construction, catering and health. It is hoped that this will significantly enhance educational uptake and reduce deprivation in the Borough.

| Strategic             | SO3 and SO5   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b> |   |
| Alternative           | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the |
| Options Explored      | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the      |
|                       | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is       |
|                       | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.         |
| Indicators            | 1. Percentage of working age population qualified to at least |
|                       | NVQ level 4 (NI 165).   |
|                       | 2. Percentage of relevant local population with access by     |
|                       | non-car modes to (a) primary school; (b) secondary school;    |

|                        | <ul> <li>(c) further education facilities within 15 minutes for primary schools and 30 minutes for secondary/further education.</li> <li>3. Skills gaps in the current workforce reported by employers (NI 174).</li> </ul>  |
|------------------------|--|
| Targets                | <ol> <li>Overall increase in the number of people achieving NVQ<br/>level 4 or higher.</li> <li>100% of local population with access to a primary school<br/>by non-car modes within 15 minutes</li> <li>100%% of local population with access to a secondary<br/>school by non-car modes within 30 minutes</li> <li>80% % of local population with access to a further<br/>education facility by non-car modes within 30 minutes</li> <li>Overall increase in the skill levels of current workforce<br/>NVQ 1-3.</li> </ol> |
| Delivery               | Rossendale BC, Lancashire County Council, Developers,  |
| Agency(s)              | Accrington and Rossendale College, Local Schools.  |
| Implementation         | Extraction of relevant data for analysis from national audits.<br>Carrying out needs-assessments at local level.<br>Determination of planning applications and allocation of land<br>through LDF.  |
| Monitoring &<br>Review | <ol> <li>NI 165</li> <li>LTP Annual Monitoring Report</li> <li>NI174</li> </ol>  |

### **RLDF 7: Social Infrastructure**

It is proposed that social infrastructure improvements and provisions will be delivered as follows:

The loss of community facilities such as pubs, post offices and community facilities that require a change of use application will be resisted, particularly in local centres and small settlements. The following factors will be considered:

- The availability of alternatives within 15 minutes travelling time by non car modes
- The financial viability of the existing use
- Marketing for existing uses

A positive approach will be taken to the development of new community facilities, especially where this creates options for a variety of uses

Do you agree that the above policy direction is the best way in which the issues relating to Social Infrastructure can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

The last decade has witnessed a significant decline in the number of pubs and post offices in Rossendale. This is primarily the result of changing economics, increased use of the internet and the dominant role of supermarkets. The "Spatial Planning in Lancashire: Annual Monitoring Report 2" (LCC 2009) indicates that the percentage of

the population with access to five basic services within 1km (food shop, GP, primary school, post office and bus stop) has declined from 59.4% in 2003/04 to 46.2% in 2007/08. Within Lancashire only Ribble Valley has a lower level of service access. This is primarily due to closure of Post Offices and consolidation of health facilities in Rawtenstall and Bacup as well as the linear nature of the settlements. Places such as Edenfield, Helmshore, Stacksteads, Water and Weir all perform poorly against these criteria.

The planning system is limited in its ability to prevent closures but can through the planning application process require applicants to demonstrate that all reasonable measures have been taken to re-use the building for its previous use. Working both within the Council and with partner's opportunities for business support and grants will be examined.

Over 700 voluntary and community groups exist in Rossendale providing a wide range of services through facilities such as the Maden Centre in Bacup. Other providers such as the Health Trusts, Lancashire County Council and the Borough Council also have an essential role. The development of similar facilities will be supported through the planning process and work with partners.

| Strategic        | SO1, SO3 and SO5   |
|------------------|--|
| Objectives Met   |  |
| Alternative      | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the    |
| Options Explored | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the         |
|                  | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is          |
|                  | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.            |
| Indicators       | 1. Index of Multiple Deprivation-access to service indicator     |
|                  | 2. Change of use applications from pubs and post offices         |
|                  | 3. Access to 5 basic services                                    |
|                  |  |
| Targets          | 1. Minimal decline <2% across the borough.                       |
|                  | 2. Less than 50% allowed   |
|                  | 3. Decline of no more than 5% over 2007/08 levels                |
|                  |  |
| Delivery         | Rossendale BC, Developers, NHS, Relevant PCTs, voluntary         |
| Agency(s)        | sector   |
| Implementation   | Analysis and monitoring of data from national/sub-regional       |
| •                | audits. Determination of planning applications and allocation of |
|                  | land through LDF.  |
| Monitoring &     | 1. Measure when IMD updated                                      |
| Review           | 2. Annually through AMR  |
|                  | 3. Lancashire Spatial Planning AMR                               |
|                  |  |

### **RLDF 8: Transport**

It is proposed that transport improvements and provision within Rossendale will be achieved as set out below:

The East Lancashire Railway corridor from Rawtenstall to the Borough boundary will be safeguarded for combined use as a commuter and heritage railway operation with land in the vicinity of Ewood Bridge to be investigated as a "Park and Ride" site. Links from Rawtenstall Railway Station to the town centre will be enhanced.

Working in conjunction with key partners the following measures will be pursued to enhance the road based public transport network:

- Development of a new bus station in Rawtenstall town centre
- Introduction of bus priority measures at key congestion locations
- Bus Park and Ride facilities in Rawtenstall

The Council will work with the Highway Authority to reduce congestion at key locations within the Borough, in particular around the Gyratory in Rawtenstall

Car parking standards for new development will be implemented in line with relevant regional policy. Working with partners, Car Parking Management in Rawtenstall, Bacup and Haslingden town centres and other locations will be undertaken as part of an overall policy of maintaining business vitality, integrated transport access and creation of attractive places.

Do you agree that the above policy direction is the best way in which the issues relating to Transport can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

47% of the Borough's workforce commutes to employment outside the Borough. There are significant flows to Burnley and Hyndburn. The 2001 census showed over 8 000 people travel to work in Greater Manchester while in excess of 3 000 travel in the opposite direction. Peak hour congestion on the M66 is an increasing problem which causes problems not only for car drivers but for passengers on the X40/X41/X43 and X44 buses.

The East Lancashire Railway is a key asset for the Borough. It currently operates a successful tourist service between Rawtenstall, Bury and Heywood (near Rochdale). It also has potential to perform an important role as a commuter service enabling a 35 minute journey to and from central Manchester. Appraisal of how best to deliver this is being undertaken with a cross-border partnership of planning and transport authorities led by Greater Manchester Integrated Transport Authority. "Park and Ride" facilities at Ewood Bridge and in the vicinity of Rawtenstall station will be required to encourage people to leave their cars while improved walking routes and bus interchange will be pursued. The earliest date of implementation is expected to be 2014/15.

Bus services perform an essential role in the movement of people. The present Bus Station facilities in Rawtenstall are outdated and unattractive. Lancashire County Council is proposing to develop a replacement facility by 2011/12. The consultation process will help to determine the most suitable location.

Express services to Manchester in particular suffer delays within and outside the Borough due to congestion. Bus priority measures will be developed in association with Lancashire County Council and the Highways Agency. Options for bus based "Park and Ride" in and around Rawtenstall will also be examined.

Traffic congestion in Rossendale is limited to peak hours and is most pronounced around the gyratory in Rawtenstall. The Borough Council will continue to work with Lancashire County Council to examine ways to improve traffic flows.

Car parking issues are particularly pressing in the centres of Rawtenstall, Bacup and Haslingden but also affect smaller settlements such as Crawshawbooth. Parking should be managed to maximise short stay provision and to minimise impacts on neighbours.

| Strategic             | SO1, SO3 and SO7  |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b> |   |
| Alternative           | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the   |
| Options Explored      | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the        |
|                       | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is         |
|                       | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.           |
| Indicators            | 1. Congestion – average journey time per mile during the        |
|                       | morning peak (NI 167).  |
|                       | 2. Number of ELR users-commuter and tourist                     |
|                       | 3. Number of local bus journeys originating in the area (NI177) |
|                       | 4. Planning permissions granted with car parking provision in   |
|                       | excess of regional standards.                                   |
| Targets               | 1. Reduce congestion in key areas of the borough.               |
|                       | 2. To increase tourist and commuter use                         |
|                       | 3. To increase number of local bus journeys                     |
|                       | 4. To manage car parking on new developments                    |
| Partner delivery      | Highways Agency, Rossendale BC, Lancashire CC, ELR,             |
|                       | Network Rail, Bus Operators and voluntary groups, Developers.   |
| Implementation        | Analysis and monitoring of LCC, ELR and planning application    |
|                       | data.   |
|                       | Development of employment sites in accessible locations         |
|                       | through Core Strategy and Development Management                |
| Monitoring and        | 1) NI167 through AMR from LCC 2) Data from ELR for              |
| Review                | inclusion in AMR 3) NI177 in AMR from LCC 4) Regional AMR       |

### **RLDF 9: Accessibility**

It is proposed that the following principles be applied to all new development within Rossendale:

New development within the urban boundary should be concentrated close to main public transport corridors such as Rising Bridge-Whitworth or within 400 metres of a bus stop with regular services. Enhanced links to key services and employment opportunities, including in adjacent Boroughs, such as Kingsway in Rochdale, will be pursued. Supporting innovative schemes for "demand responsive" transport will be pursued for hard to access locations.

The design and improvement of streets as attractive places for all users will be given high priority.

The footpath, cycleway and bridleway network including the Rossendale Way and Irwell Sculpture Trail will be developed and enhanced in an integrated manner as part of Rossendale's "Green Infrastructure". Measures to encourage use by the mobility impaired and those experiencing health issues will be promoted.

Do you agree that the above policy is the best way in which the issues relating to Accessibility can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Some wards in Rossendale, in particular around Bacup and Stacksteads, have low car ownership rates. Locating new development close to good quality public transport links is important for ensuring that individuals have opportunities to access key services such as health, education and leisure. This equally applies to origins (new housing) as well as destinations. Main transport corridors are classed as those with at least a 15 minute frequency peak hour service while regular services should have at least a 30 minute peak hour frequency.

Traditional bus services operate most efficiently on routes with lots of users, such as Haslingden-Rawtenstall-Bacup. Serving outlying housing estates is often unprofitable and a more flexible "demand responsive" is often most appropriate. Working with both Lancashire County Council and the voluntary sectors, innovative approaches will be encouraged.

Streets are important places not just for movement of traffic but also as places where people live, shop and play. A large number of older streets in the Borough are unadopted and in poor condition while other streets are car dominated. New development proposals and regeneration schemes will be assessed against their ability to deliver attractive streets.

Rossendale has the densest public rights of way network in Lancashire but much of it is in poor condition. The network has great potential for active tourism which has already been demonstrated by initiatives such as the Mary Towneley Loop bridleway as well as providing physical and mental health benefits for local residents. It also is an essential component of the Boroughs "Green Infrastructure" resource and plays an important role in linking the towns to the nearby countryside. Working with partners' emphasis will be on developing good quality networks.

| CO1 CO2 COC and CO7  |
|--|
| SO1, SO3, SO6 and SO7  |
|  |
| Several options have been explored throughout the life of the  |
| Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the   |
| Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is  |
| available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.  |
| 1. Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling (NI 175)                                       |
| <ol> <li>Working age people with access to employment by public<br/>transport (and other specified modes) (NI176)</li> </ol> |
| 3. % of Rights of Way network in good condition  |
| 4. Percentage of new developments within 400m of a bus stop  |
| with regular services.   |
| 1. To maintain accessibility at 2009 levels  |
| 2. To maintain employment accessibility at 2009  |
| 3. To improve the % of the network in good condition by 5% by 2014 and 10% by 2020   |
| <ol> <li>Minimum of 90% of new development to be within 400<br/>metres of a bus stop with regular services</li> </ol>        |
| Lancashire County Council annual monitoring, bus companies,  |
| Rossendale BC, Groundwork, Developers  |
|  |
| 1. NI 175/176 data collection  |
| 2. ROWIP/LTP data collection   |
| 3. LCC Strategic Planning AMR  |
|  |

### **RLDF 10: Employment Land Provision**

It is proposed that employment land will be provided as follows:

The Council together with developers and other partners will seek to provide sufficient employment land to meet the Borough's requirement of 20hectares outlined in the Employment Land Review 2009 and in line with the current and adopted regional policy. New provision will be informed by the most up to date employment land study or similar.

This provision will be met through the Allocations Document where the Council will protect the best sites in terms of their location, access and suitability. New proposals should primarily be located within the defined urban boundary and maximise the use of previously developed land and buildings and be accessible by means other than the private car. In particular the Council will seek to protect and make best use of key employment locations in Rawtenstall (New Hall Hey), Bacup (Futures Park), Haslingden (Carrs Industrial Estate) and Rising Bridge. Renovation of older industrial estates will be encouraged to improve their attractiveness.

Office development (B1 and A2 uses) should be primarily located in or adjacent to the town centres of Rawtenstall, Bacup and Haslingden.

The loss of existing employment sites to non employment generating uses will be supported where:

- (a) the access to the site is poor and cannot be improved, and
- (b) the current use has an adverse impact on the neighbouring land uses, and
- (c) re-development for employment uses is economically unviable and the site is unlikely to be used for existing or future employment purposes, and
- (d) the site has been marketed for 18 months using a methodology agreed by the Council
- (e) the redevelopment has no negative impacts on surrounding land uses.

The re-use and retention of suitable buildings, including those in rural areas, for appropriate employment generating uses will be supported where:

- it assists diversification of the existing employment base, or
- it supports the creation or growth of a local business, or
- it retains buildings of architectural merit, or
- it contributes to a wider regeneration initiative, and in all cases
- the proposal minimises negative environmental and transport impacts and makes best use of the existing space.

The Council will in general support the creation and expansion of small businesses within the Borough, and promote flexible start up accommodation in the form of small offices and industrial units within the key settlements of Rawtenstall, Bacup and Haslingden. 'Move on' facilities will also be encouraged to support their growth, such as at New Hall Hey.

Do you agree that the above policy is the best way in which the issues relating to Employment Land Provision can be addressed? Do you agree with the amount of employment land to be provided? Do you agree with the protection of existing

employment sites? Do you agree with the criteria for the loss of employment sites to other types of development? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

An Employment Land Review has been undertaken (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, 2009) which considers a gross requirement of 20.84 ha of land is needed for Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 (Light Industry, General Industry and Warehousing) over the plan period to 2026. This assumes that initially the current economic downturn will have significant impacts but in the long term there will be a return to 'business as usual'. The Council will monitor that this figure is still appropriate throughout the plan period.

The Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (2008) identifies the Central Lancashire City region for advanced manufacturing and engineering, environmental technologies, biomedical uses as well as tourism. Policy W3 states that Lancashire needs to provide 294ha of additional land for employment purposes between 2005 and 2021. This equates to a figure of 21 ha for each of the 14 districts. This is similar to the figure identified in the Employment Land Review, although the plan periods differ, giving rise to about 1.3 ha per year.

Rossendale has seen a contraction of local employment opportunities with the decline of textiles, clothing and footwear over the past 30 years. Manufacturing in particular has declined leaving employment sites under-used or in need of remediation or redevelopment. Manufacturing, however, is still a significant source of local albeit low paid employment, and opportunities should be provided to support local businesses to start up, diversify and expand where appropriate, providing opportunities for employees to improve and expand their skills.

The number of Rossendale residents who commute out of the Borough to work (generally to the north Manchester towns and the city centre, as well as to Burnley and Hyndburn) is relatively high at 47%. The average wage levels of working residents in the Borough are similar to county and regional averages but this disguises that workplace earnings are 20% lower than the regional average, indicating that the majority of jobs in Rossendale are lower paid. The Borough's residents tend to be employed as managers, professionals or in administrative work (61% compared to a national average of 55%). The lack of skills, particularly in some deprived wards to the east of the Borough, is significant and the Council is committed to working with its partners to set up a vocational training centre in the east of the Borough, most likely at Futures Park.

The Employment Land Review has noted that many of, even the more popular, industrial estates are in need of renovation to increase their attractiveness and meet the demands of modern businesses. Furthermore, the need for both start up and follow on accommodation to develop and foster new businesses has been identified. A site is already under construction at Rising Bridge and it is intended that through partner working more of these facilities will be provided throughout the Borough. 20.84 hectares of employment land (total gross required) will be provided within the Borough for the period up to 2026.

| Strategic               | SO3, SO4, SO5, SO6, SO7   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b>   |   |
| Alternative             | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the Core    |
| <b>Options Explored</b> | Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the Background and    |
|                         | Supplementary Evidence document which is available alongside the Core |
|                         | Strategy for inspection.  |

| Indicators     | <ol> <li>Annual amount of additional employment land provided.</li> <li>Employment land provided: (a) within urban boundary; (b) within #m of regular public transport service.</li> </ol> |
|----------------|--|
|                | 3. Number of planning permissions granted for employment sites not in  |
|                | Rawtenstall, Bacup or Haslingden town centres.   |
| Targets        | 1. Concordant with most up-to-date employment land study.  |
| <b>J</b>       | 2. (a) 100% (b) 100%.  |
|                | 3. Minimal – sites should be sought in the 3 main town centres.  |
| Delivery       | Rossendale BC, developers, employers, partners.  |
| Agency(s)      |  |
| Implementation | Determination of planning applications and allocation of land through LDF.   |
|                | Management of developer investment.  |
| Monitoring &   | Annual Monitoring Report   |
| Review         |  |

### **RLDF 11: Retail and other Town Centre Uses**

It is proposed that retail and other town centre uses will be provided, supported and protected as follows:

Retail development, together with other town centre uses, such as leisure, will be focussed within the defined town and local centres.

Major proposals will be directed to Rawtenstall town centre with other larger schemes encouraged to locate in the district centres of Bacup and Haslingden. The Retail hierarchy is set out below:

| Town Centre:         | Rawtenstall   |
|----------------------|---|
| District Centres:    | Bacup, Haslingden   |
| Local Centre:        | Waterfoot, Whitworth  |
| Neighbourhood Centre | All other centres (including Edenfield,<br>Stacksteads, Helmshore, Crawshawbooth) |

This hierarchy supports the Council's vision of achieving a quality, well designed, retail development at the Valley Centre, with ancillary local retail in the other centres.

The Primary Shopping Area (PSA) has been defined for the three higher order settlements (Rawtenstall, Bacup and Haslingden). The PSA is important in determining retail applications, as it defines the centre for retail purposes, whereas the overall town centre boundary is used to assist the development proposals for all town centre uses.

Town centre boundaries, which for the smaller areas equate to the PSA, have been defined for Rawtenstall, Bacup, Haslingden, Waterfoot and Whitworth.

Proposals for new convenience floorspace of greater than 200m<sup>2</sup> will be resisted unless:

- it forms part of a wider town, district or local centre regeneration scheme, and
- it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that it will not have a negative impact on the vitality and viability of other centres.

All developments (convenience and comparison) will be expected to provide Impact Assessments where they are above the following thresholds:

- Rawtenstall 750m<sup>2</sup>
- Bacup and Haslingden 500m<sup>2</sup>
- All other centres and outside defined settlement boundaries 200m<sup>2</sup>

They may exceptionally be required at lower thresholds

Do you agree with the proposed scale of retail and commercial leisure use for Rawtenstall Town Centre, the District and Local Centres as set out in the policy above? If not, what scale of development do you suggest is appropriate for each type of service centre and on what grounds? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

This hierarchy supports the Council's vision of achieving a quality, well designed, mainly higher order retail development at the Valley Centre, with only appropriate retail at New Hall Hey, which cannot be accommodated in the Town Centre, such as bulky goods. The Council intends to partner developers in providing training opportunities and associate local jobs for local people. Additional convenience choice may be expected at Bacup to improve the town's offer. However, the number of supermarkets trading within the catchment area of Rawtenstall suggests that additional provision is unlikely to be supported within Rawtenstall

It has been necessary to amend town centre boundaries to allow the contraction and consolidation of these centres.

The town centre, district centre and local centre boundaries have been re-defined in the context of PPS 6 and the health checks undertaken as part of the Retail and Town Centre Study (NLP, 2009). In particular the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) has been defined for Rawtenstall, Bacup and Haslingden. This is the primary boundary for retail development, and is made up of primary shopping frontages and contiguous secondary frontages. The town centres of Waterfoot and Whitworth have also been redefined. As these centres do not have areas of predominantly leisure, business and other main town centre uses adjacent to the primary shopping area, the town centre does not extend beyond the PSA. No boundaries have been set for the smaller neighbourhood centres.

| Strategic        | SO6   |
|------------------|---|
| -                | 300   |
| Objectives Met   |   |
| Alternative      | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the   |
| Options Explored | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the        |
|                  | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is         |
|                  | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.           |
| Indicators       | 1. Number of planning permissions granted for retail            |
|                  | developments outside defined town and district centres.         |
|                  | 2. Percentage of retail developments with floorspaces above     |
|                  | thresholds specified in RLDF 11 with impact assessments         |
|                  | provided.   |
|                  |   |
| Targets          | 1. No applications for retail developments outside town and     |
|                  | district centres approved.                                      |
|                  | 2. 100% of retail applications above the thresholds set in RLDF |
|                  | 11 will supply impact assessments.                              |
|                  |   |
| Delivery         | Rossendale BC, partners, developers.                            |
| Agency(s)        |   |
| Implementation   | Determination of planning applications and allocation of land   |
|                  | through LDF.  |
| Monitoring &     | Annual Monitoring Report(s)                                     |
| Review           |   |
| -                | 1   |

These boundaries are being consulted upon as part of the wider consultation on the Core Strategy and are shown on the following pages.

### Rawtenstall Town Centre Boundary



Bacup Town Centre Boundary



### Haslingden Town Centre Boundary



Key Local Centre Boundary ł= nlp 0 Contrast Industries, Parameter Paral

Waterfoot Local Centre Boundary

### Whitworth Local Centre Boundary



### **RLDF 12: The Valley Centre**

It is proposed that the regeneration of the Valley Centre will be achieved as follows:

The regeneration of the Valley Centre and adjacent buildings in Rawtenstall is of strategic importance. A high quality design will be expected and should include the following elements:

• A focal point for retailers with supporting other uses appropriate to a town centre, including office, leisure and civic uses

Housing may also be appropriate and all designs should take into account public transport access, parking provision and public space provision.

Do you agree that the redevelopment of the Valley Centre is a key project for Rossendale? Do you agree with the principles for any future development of the Valley Centre? Do you agree that it should be redeveloped for a variety of uses? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Rawtenstall, the only centre identified as a town centre, has a strong convenience goods offer and a good selection of independent shops. The Retail and Town Centre (2009) notes an absence of multiple retailers and suggests that the recently vacated Valley Centre is a prime site, in the heart of the Town Centre, to improve the town's overall retail offer and improve its attractiveness. The building is currently semi-derelict and presents a negative image of the centre of Rawtenstall and the Borough as a whole. The site has a planning permission and the Council is working with the owners to bring this site forward for mixed uses and will examine all feasible routes for achieving this.

| Strategic             | SO6   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b> |   |
| Alternative           | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the Core  |
| Options Explored      | Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the Background and  |
|                       | Supplementary Evidence document which is available alongside the  |
|                       | Core Strategy for inspection.   |
| Indicators            | 1. Amount of public space provided in any redevelopment scheme.   |
|                       | 2. Percentage of (a) retail; (b) office; (c) civic uses in any  |
|                       | redevelopment scheme.   |
|                       | 3. Ratio of car parking spaces provided per unit in any redevelopment   |
|                       | scheme.   |
|                       |   |
| Targets               | <ol> <li>#m<sup>2</sup> – (To be determined once viability of schemes has been<br/>assessed)</li> </ol>             |
|                       | <ol> <li>(a) #% (b) #% (c) #%. – (To be determined once viability of schemes has been assessed)</li> </ol>          |
|                       | <ol> <li>In line with national car parking standards, with an extra # spaces for<br/>general public use.</li> </ol> |
| Delivery              | Rossendale BC, developers, partners.  |
| Agency(s)             |   |
| Implementation        | Determination of planning applications and allocation of land through   |

|              | LDF.<br>Management of developer investment. |
|--------------|---|
| Monitoring & | Annual Monitoring Report(s)                 |
| Review       |   |

#### **RLDF 13: Protecting Key Local Retail and other Services**

It is proposed that smaller retail and other service centres will be supported and protected as follows:

The important role of smaller, independent shops will be supported in all defined shopping centres with schemes to enhance and / or expand such facilities given positive consideration.

The Borough has a supply of 'corner shops' which serve local communities. These need to be protected to avoid longer trips being made to other centres, which has implications for inclusivity, as well as reducing the need to travel. Where the Council considers the loss of the retail facility may have negative impacts for the local community, it will be necessary to provide additional information and market the building for a period of at least 18 months.

The existing markets at Bacup, Haslingden and Rawtenstall will be retained. Consideration will only be given to relocation where:

- this forms part of a wider regeneration initiative and
- it positively re-enforces the role of the market

Independent shops are important in terms of the services and access to goods that they provide, as well as the jobs and investment they create. They also contribute to the distinct sense of place of the Borough's settlements. Some outlets, such as top of the range clothes shops, attract a clientele from outside the Borough. Working with partners the Council will seek to support local retailers through initiatives such as shopfront upgrading.

Many corner shops however operate on the margins of viability primarily because of the lower prices and wider range of goods offered by national retailers. The planning system is limited in its ability to support these facilities but can require that changes of use are fully justified.

The Borough's markets provide an important function but have been affected by the national decline in market use. The Council will continue to support markets including through improvements to the surroundings and related signage.

| Strategic<br>Objectives Met | SO6   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Alternative                 | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the   |
| <b>Options Explored</b>     | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the  |
|                             | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection. |
| Indicators                  | Loss of independent shops becoming vacant or changing to  |
|                             | another use.  |

| Targets        | Nil  |
|----------------|--|
| Delivery       | Rossendale BC, Rossendale Chamber of Trade, Owners and |
| Agency(s)      | Developers   |
| Implementation | Through planning applications                          |
| Monitoring &   | Annual Monitoring Report(s)                            |
| Review         |  |

### RLDF 14: Tourism

Tourism is to be promoted throughout the Borough, building on leisure pursuits and the unique sense of place within the Valley, though giving particular emphasis to the east of the Borough. The active sports industry in particular is a key tourism opportunity for Rossendale and will be supported in the following ways:

- Ensuring through the Allocations Document that key sites are identified for tourism in general and specifically to support the "Adrenaline Gateway"
- Facilitating the extension and upgrading of the Public Rights of Way network including interpretation panels, public art and signage
- Taking a positive approach to development of complementary built facilities in the Bacup and Stacksteads area
- Facilitating the Regional Park for East Lancashire

Proposals for the enhancement of other existing tourism attractions including, though the East Lancashire Railway, Helmshore Mills, Cowm Reservoir, the Irwell Sculpture Trail, Valley of Stone, the Mary Towneley Loop, and the Halo "Panoptican" including public realm improvements, improved accessibility by all means, with better linkages and increased parking will be favourably considered.

Planning proposals for the expansion and enhancement of creative industries such as artist studios and the theatres in Bacup and Waterfoot will be given positive consideration.

The countryside will be protected and enhanced for both its own sake and for its tourism value, in particular within the designated West Pennine Moors area and the moorland of the South Pennines.

# Do you agree that the above policy is the best way in which the issues relating to Tourism can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

The Council is committed to promoting the tourism opportunities available within the Borough and recognises the additional opportunities, which will be available to local residents.

The "Adrenaline Gateway" is a concept that seeks to market and develop extreme and outdoor sports facilities in the Borough. A mountain biking facility at the disused Lee Quarry near Bacup is attracting riders from throughout the north-west. An extension is being proposed using rights of way and old tramways to Cragg Quarry which forms part of the "Valley of Stone" proposal. In addition an indoor facility and "basecamp" is proposed near Bacup. Other major outdoor sports facilities include Rossendale Ski near Rawtenstall (which is in need of major refurbishment in the next

five years) and the Mary Towneley Loop bridleway. Long distance walkways include the Rossendale Way and Irwell Sculpture Trail.

Rossendale has a network of creative art providers including theatres, artists and sculptors which both provide employment and attract visitors.

The Council is working with partners, including the Lancashire County Developments Ltd, Lancashire County Council, Groundwork and others in taking forward tourism schemes and in particular active sports initiatives.

| Strategic<br>Objectives Met     | SO5 and SO7  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Alternative<br>Options Explored | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the<br>Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the<br>Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is<br>available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.  |
| Indicators<br>Targets           | <ol> <li>Additional floorspace for employment use in the tourism<br/>sector.</li> <li>Number of planning permissions granted for new sites in<br/>countryside, which do not enhance its tourism value.</li> <li>Percentage of large hotel developments (≥40 rooms) located<br/>in or adjacent to either Rawtenstall or Bacup town centres.</li> <li>Loss of SSSIs.</li> <li>Loss of Recreation Areas.</li> <li>Loss of Biological Heritage Sites.</li> <li>#m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>Zero.</li> <li>100%.</li> <li>Zero.</li> <li>Zero.</li> <li>Zero.</li> <li>Zero.</li> <li>Zero.</li> <li>Zero.</li> <li>Zero.</li> </ol> |
| Delivery<br>Agency(s)           | Rossendale BC, partners, developers, Natural England,<br>Lancashire CC North West Tourism Board, North West<br>Development Agency, Pennine Lancashire.   |
| Implementation                  | Determination of planning applications and allocation of land<br>through LDF.<br>Management of developer investment.   |
| Monitoring &<br>Review          | Annual Monitoring Report(s)  |

### **RLDF 15: Overnight Visitor Accommodation**

The Council will take a positive approach to new small scale visitor accommodation, particularly where this makes use of existing buildings

Any large scale hotel proposals (40 bedrooms or over) should be located in or adjacent the town centres of Rawtenstall or Bacup.

Proposals that seek to increase the supply of overnight accommodation and are appropriate for their locality will be encouraged, including bed and breakfast establishments, as well as camping and caravan parks.

Do you agree that the above policy is the best way in which the issues relating to Overnight Visitor Accommodation can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Joint work is being undertaken with adjoining East Lancashire authorities under the Pennine Lancashire brand, which has identified Rossendale as having one of the lowest numbers of overnight accommodation stays. As the tourism offer improves it is expected that the number of overnight stays will increase. Opportunities including traditional bed and breakfast establishments, bed and tack along the bridleways and camping and caravan sites will be encouraged.

Most new visitor accommodation is expected to be small scale and could in many cases encourage the re-use of existing buildings. Caravan site proposals should be able to demonstrate good access arrangements and be well screened to minimise visual impact.

| Strategic               | S07, SO5  |
|-------------------------|---|
| Objectives Met          |   |
| Alternative             | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the |
| <b>Options Explored</b> | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the      |
|                         | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is       |
|                         | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.         |
| Indicators              | Number of planning permissions which will increase the        |
|                         | number of overnight stays within the Borough.                 |
| Targets                 | Annual increase in the number of approvals for overnight      |
|                         | visitor accommodation.  |
| Delivery                | Developers, Partners, Rossendale BC, North West Tourism       |
| Agency(s)               | Board, North West Development Agency, Pennine Lancashire .    |
| Implementation          | Determination of planning applications and allocation of land |
|                         | through LDF. Management of developer investment.              |
| Monitoring &            | Annual Monitoring Report(s)                                   |
| Review                  |   |

### **RLDF 16: Preserving and Enhancing Rossendale's Built Environment**

It is proposed that the Boroughs built heritage and historic assets be protected and enhanced as follows:

The Council will protect, conserve, preserve and enhance Rossendale's historic built environment including Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens, archaeological sites and locally identified buildings and structures. There are a number of conservation areas, listed buildings and locally listed buildings in Rossendale which contribute to the local distinctiveness and character of the area and their futures will be safeguarded and secured by:

- 1. Protecting important urban open space and green infrastructure from development which would harm these assets.
- 2. Enhancing the value of Rossendale's historic built environment and by implementing Conservation Area Management Plans and public access measures.
- 3. Ensuring all new development respects the distinctive quality of the built heritage and is of a high standard of design, reinforcing the local distinctiveness of Rossendale.
- 4. Ensuring that all development is located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its historic landscape and setting, and retains or enhances the character and context.
- 5. Maximising the potential for the re-use of buildings of historic or local interest for appropriate uses to ensure their future longevity.

Do you agree that the above policy is the best way in which the issues relating to Preserving and Enhancing Rossendale's Built Environment can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Rossendale has a unique built environment, with many buildings and structures predating the industrial revolution. Many more are constructed from locally quarried stone and are important local assets.

Accordingly, all new development should be based on a thorough understanding of the context, significance and local distinctiveness of the site and its surroundings and should be of a high quality in terms of its urban, landscape and architectural design and use of materials.

There are nine Conservation Areas in Rossendale at various stages of re-appraisal including – Bacup Town Centre, Chatterton/Strongstry, Fallbarn, Goodshawfold, Higher Cloughfold, Irwell Vale, Loveclough Fold, Rawtenstall Town Centre and Whitworth Square. It is anticipated that by 2015 all will have Conservation Area Management Plans. Designation of further Conservation Areas will be considered on their own merits.

| Strategic<br>Objectives Met | SO4, SO6 and SO7  |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Alternative                 | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the   |
| Options Explored            | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the<br>Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is |
|                             | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.   |

| Indicators     | <ol> <li>Number of applications approved contrary to the advice<br/>from RBC conservation section and/or English Heritage.</li> <li>Number of up-to-date conservation area appraisals.</li> <li>Number of listed buildings, scheduled monuments and<br/>conservation areas considered to be "at risk".</li> </ol> |
|----------------|---|
| Targets        | <ol> <li>No applications approved contrary to RBC or English<br/>Heritage advice.</li> <li>Appraisals and Management Plans completed by 2015.</li> <li>Overall reduction in the number of listed buildings,<br/>scheduled monuments and conservation areas considered<br/>to be "at risk".</li> </ol>             |
| Delivery       | Rossendale Borough Council, Developers, Partners, Elevate,  |
| Agency(s)      | Pennine Lancashire, English Heritage  |
| Implementation | <ol> <li>Determination of planning applications.</li> <li>Management of conservation areas.</li> </ol>  |
| Monitoring &   | Annual Monitoring Report(s)   |
| Review         |   |

#### **RLDF 17: Protecting and Utilising Rossendales' Natural Environment**

It is proposed that the Boroughs natural environment be protected and enhanced as follows:

The Council will protect and enhance Rossendale's natural environmental assets including biological and geological diversity, green infrastructure, landscape character and areas of ecological importance, including priority habitats and species by:

- 1. Safeguarding and enhancing green infrastructure, biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 2. Safeguarding and enhancing landscape character.
- 3. Protecting sensitive landscapes including areas of ecological importance and interest, from inappropriate and harmful development.
- 4. Ensuring the protection of watercourses from encroachment.
- 5. Avoiding the unnecessary loss of trees, woodland, hedgerows and other types of foliage and flora, ensuring that where necessary, developments make provision for new and replacement planting.
- 6. Promoting sustainable use (including for recreation, tourism and leisure purposes) of the natural environment where it would not prejudice the future of the landscape or other environmental assets.

Do you agree that the above policy direction is the best way in which the issues relating to Protecting and Utilising Rossendale's Natural Environment can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Should the countryside and open spaces be protected from development of formal recreation facilities and be protected primarily for informal recreation or would you support their greater use for formal facilities such as playing pitches, golf courses, multi-use games areas and other facilities supporting the Adrenaline Gateway?

One of Rossendale's most significant selling points is the dramatic and attractive landscape and natural environment that surrounds the urban area, and it is one of
the reasons why many people decide to live, work and visit here. Rossendale's natural assets are considerable. They make a major contribution to the Borough in terms of their cultural value; their significance for providing a local identity to Rossendale; their value for tourism; and their general contribution to the quality of life.

There is a diverse range of habitats, landscapes and areas which make up the natural environment in Rossendale, namely:

- the open countryside its landscape, character and appearance
- the Green Belt
- statutory and local areas of wildlife and ecological value, including Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Biological Heritage Sites (BHS)
- Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGGS)
- air and water quality
- land of recreational and amenity value;
- Healy Dell local nature reserve; and
- the public rights of way network Rossendale Way, Mary Towneley Loop, Irwell Sculpture Trail, Shoe Trail etc

Maintaining and where possible improving Rossendale's natural environment is a major concern for the LDF and it is of the upmost importance that it is protected from inappropriate and harmful development which could jeopardise its future enjoyment and benefits.

| Strategic        | SO4 and SO7   |
|------------------|---|
| Objectives Met   | 504 and 507   |
|                  |   |
| Alternative      | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the |
| Options Explored | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the      |
|                  | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is       |
|                  | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.         |
| Indicators       | 1. Number of applications submitted outside the urban         |
|                  | boundary in the countryside or Green Belt.                    |
|                  | 2. Number and type of applications approved outside the       |
|                  | urban boundary in the countryside or Green Belt.              |
|                  | 3. Applications approved contrary to advice from Natural      |
|                  | England and/or the findings of environmental reports and      |
|                  | studies.  |
| Terrete          | 1. <10% of major development proposals approved contrary      |
| Targets          |   |
|                  | to advice from Natural England and/or the findings of         |
|                  | environmental reports and studies.                            |
| Delivery         | Rossendale Borough Council, Developers, Local Communities,    |
| Agency(s)        | Pennine Lancashire  |
| Implementation   | The determination of planning applications and allocation of  |
| -                | land through the LDF.   |
| Monitoring &     | Annual Monitoring Report(s)                                   |
| Review           |   |

#### **RLDF 18: Renewable Energy**

It is proposed that renewable energy in Rossendale will be achieved as follows:

Renewable energy will meet at least 25% of the energy needs of the Borough by 2025. Renewable energy generation targets for this period are set out in the table below *(to be completed)*.

Proposals for hydropower, photovoltaics and biomass will be given positive consideration unless their visual, hydrological, air quality, transport or ecological impacts outweigh the benefits. Wind energy developments should be assessed against Policy RLDF 19.

Developers will be expected wherever possible within built development to exceed most up to date national and regional minimum energy efficiency standards including through design and orientation, use of materials, insulation and use of micro-technologies

Do you agree that the above policy is the best way in which the issues relating Renewable Energy can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Energy consumption in the Borough in 2006 was 2 106 GWh with gas consumption accounting for nearly half that figure while renewables contributed just 6GWh. (source:BERR) Renewable energy comes in a number of forms including small and commercial scale wind power; photovoltaics; ground-source heat pumps; biomass and hydropower. Local generation of power, both within a development or a small geographic area has the advantage of increasing efficiency by reducing losses that occur through transmission. Larger schemes that contribute to the National Grid help to reduce CO<sup>2</sup> emissions.

Rossendale currently has the highest level of domestic CO<sup>2</sup> emissions of any authority in Lancashire (source: DEFRA 2006). A significant number of households, particularly those living in terraced stock in the east of the Borough, suffer from fuel poverty primarily due to poor insulation. Proposals that improve the energy efficiency of the existing building stock will be encouraged.

Rossendale Borough Council is participating in a sub-regional study led by Pendle Borough Council examining the potential for renewable power generation in the Southern Pennines. This will consider the viability of different forms of energy generation, identify possible constraints and set out suitable areas for development. The study will also identify targets for different technologies for each District. When the Study is complete these will be inserted in the Table below.

Building Regulations, the Government Code for Sustainable Homes and BREAM assessments all promote ever increasing levels of energy efficiency in new development. The Council will wherever economically viable encourage development that exceeds current minimum standards including in upgrades of existing stock. Micro-generation proposals such as photovoltaics and small scale windmills will be encouraged.

| Type of Number of schemes | Indicative output | % contribution |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------|

| technology       | proposed |  |
|------------------|----------|--|
| Small scale wind |          |  |
| Commercial wind  |          |  |
| Photovoltaic's   |          |  |
| Hydropower       |          |  |
| Biomass          |          |  |
| Other            |          |  |

| Strategic             | SO7   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b> |   |
| Alternative           | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the |
| Options Explored      | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the      |
|                       | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is       |
|                       | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.         |
| Indicators            | 1. Number of residential developments achieving at least Code |
|                       | for Sustainable Homes Level 4.                                |
|                       | 2. Number of developments to achieve a BREEAM rating of       |
|                       | silver or above   |
|                       | 3. Number of renewable energy schemes                         |
| Targets               | 1. 40% of all residential developments to achieve a Code for  |
|                       | Sustainable Homes Level 4.                                    |
|                       | 2. 30% of non-residential developments to achieve at least    |
|                       | silver BREEAM standard  |
|                       | 3. Annual increase in the number of renewable energy          |
|                       | schemes.  |
| Delivery              | Developers, Partners, Rossendale BC.                          |
| Agency(s)             |   |
| Implementation        | Determination of planning applications and allocation of land |
|                       | through LDF. Management of developer investment.              |
| Monitoring &          | 1. Development Control/Building Control records               |
| Review                | 2. Annual Monitoring Report(s)                                |

#### **RLDF 19: Wind Energy**

It is proposed that wind energy proposals and provision be determined in accordance with the following:

Wind Energy developments will be given positive consideration where they have a low landscape impact and the greatest overall potential to accommodate this form of electricity generation as shown in the most up to date studies and assessments.

Proposals will be assessed against the following criteria:

- They do not have a significant visual, noise or "flicker" impact on local residents and sensitive users;
- They do not adversely impact areas of ecological value
- They do not have a significant impact, alone or cumulatively, on the landscape character and value, including urban areas and the wider South Pennine landscape.
- Community benefits, in particular contributions to energy efficiency measures, would outweigh other considerations

Do you agree that the above policy is the best way in which the issues relating Wind Energy can be addressed? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Rossendale is an attractive area for wind energy developers and at Scout Moor already contains the largest onshore wind farm in England. The UK Renewable Energy Strategy (July 2009) sets out how the Government aims to source 15% of energy production from renewable sources by 2020 with anticipated to meet two thirds of this figure. This is a sevenfold increase over the 2008 figure and will inevitably lead to further proposals coming forward in Rossendale. The benefits of wind power generation are supported but must be weighed against the wider effects on the community.

Wind energy developments vary in scale from small individual turbines to multiturbine developments. The scale of associated infrastructure such as access tracks and links to the National Grid are usually related to the size of the overall development. Larger schemes in particular provoke strong feelings particularly on the basis of impacts on views. The relationship between wind turbines, long distance vistas across open moorland and views when looking up from the urbanised valleys are all important. A comprehensive South Pennine study is being undertaken (Julie Martin Associates 2010) to create an objective method for analysing the local and cross-border landscape impacts of wind energy and will form the basis for consideration of applications. Issues to be considered include scale, affects on skylines, landscape condition, wildness and tranquillity and amenity value.

Noise from rotating turbines and light reflecting from the blades, known as "flicker effect" can have an impact on nearby residents as well as affecting other parties such as horse riders. The latter is of particular significance in areas close to the Pennine Bridleway. Ecological impacts include release of carbon if turbines are dug into deep peat and can include affects on migrating birds.

The harmful impacts of wind energy generation can be reduced to differing degrees by careful siting. Further advice is included in PPS22 "Companion Guide" (2004). Other negative effects can be compensated by ensuring that the community benefits from the development of wind farms in its area. The Council will seek to negotiate appropriate local agreements using guidance contained in the document "Delivering community benefits from wind energy development: A Toolkit" (Renewables Advisory Board July 2009). Given the low energy efficiency of much of the older terraced housing stock a particular focus will be on establishing a fund to increase energy performance and reduce carbon emissions.

| Strategic             | SO7   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b> |   |
| Alternative           | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the |
| Options Explored      | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the      |
|                       | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is       |
|                       | available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.         |
| Indicators            | 1. Percentage of commercial wind farm applications            |
|                       | granted planning permission contrary to policy.               |
|                       | 2. MW of installed generating capacity                        |
|                       | 3. Number of community benefit agreements negotiated          |
| Targets               | 1. No commercial wind farm applications approved              |
| -                     | contrary to RBC policy and evidence.                          |
|                       | 2. Annual increase in MW generation within Rossendale.        |

|                | 3. Community benefits agreed for each development over    |
|----------------|---|
|                | 5 turbines.   |
| Delivery       | Rossendale BC, developers, partners, National Grid,       |
| Agency(s)      | Infrastructure Planning Commission                        |
| Implementation | Management of developer investment. Determination of      |
|                | planning applications and allocation of land through LDF. |
| Monitoring &   | 1. Planning application records through AMR               |
| Review         | 2. BWEA records   |
|                | 3. Annual Monitoring Report(s)                            |
|                |   |

#### **RLDF 20: Supporting the Rural Economy and its Communities**

It is proposed that the rural environment and economy is protected and enhanced through the following principles:

Development will be restricted to within existing rural settlement boundaries and within identified major developed sites. Outside of these areas, development should accord with countryside and Green Belt policy.

 It is proposed that the existing Rossendale Hospital site, Haslingden Road is defined as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. Detailed boundaries and development criteria will be included in the Site Allocations DPD. It is anticipated that the existing building footprint will form the basis of any proposal.

Support will be given to the social and economic needs of rural communities by encouraging:

- The retention or expansion of appropriate businesses outside of identified urban centres;
- The re-use or replacement of suitable rural buildings for employment generating uses;
- Provision of live-work units;
- Diversification of the agricultural economy;
- Appropriate tourism related initiatives, including schemes which improve the accessibility of tourist assets both within and outside the Borough, particularly in relation to the Adrenaline Gateway;
- Recreation uses appropriate to a countryside location;
- Small scale renewable energy projects and businesses to serve the industry;
- Arts and crafts based industries;
- Technological developments needed to facilitate employment development in rural areas;
- The improvement of public transport links to identified urban centres and employment areas.

In all cases development should be designed to be sustainable, consistent with requirements of Policy RLDF 1 and should not conflict with the environmental protection and nature conservation policies of the LDF but should seek to enhance the environment; and should provide any necessary mitigating or compensatory measures to address harmful implications.

Do you agree that the above policy is the best way in which the issues relating to the Rural Economy and Communities can be addressed? Do you agree that the Hospital Site should be designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt? Do you agree with the types of development which will be encouraged in the countryside? Please explain any changes that you might wish to see.

Although the vast majority of people in Rossendale live and work in the urban areas, large swathes of the Borough are covered by countryside and Green Belt, within which there are a number of communities providing local services.

The importance of providing for the social and economic needs of rural communities and supporting the rural economy are key considerations for the Council. Many aspects of the Core Strategy influence the sustainability of the rural economy, including the scale, location and type of housing (Policies RLDF 2 and 3) as well as environmental considerations (Policy RLDF 17). A careful balance is required to support proposals that assist the economic sustainability of local communities, whilst addressing any potential environmental consequences.

Whilst the spatial vision for Rossendale states that services, facilities and future development should take place within existing urban areas and centres, it is essential that a framework for the delivery of rural regeneration – including affordable housing, rural services, environmental management and economic activity is provided.

There is a clear link between the economic stability of rural areas, and the likely success in achieving a well-managed countryside. Reflecting this, it will be particularly important to encourage environmentally sensitive schemes which capitalise on the tourism potential of the rural parts of the Borough.

| Strategic   | SO1, SO2 SO3, SO5, SO7, SO8  |
|---|--|
| Objectives Met<br>Alternative<br>Options Explored | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the<br>Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the<br>Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is<br>available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.  |
| Indicators<br>Targets                             | <ol> <li>Number of applications submitted outside the urban<br/>boundary in the countryside or Green Belt.</li> <li>Number and type of applications approved outside the<br/>urban boundary in the countryside or Green Belt.</li> <li>Need and demand for services in rural areas</li> <li>Amount and types of farm diversification</li> <li>Greenfield land development and barn conversions</li> <li>Sufficient services to meet the needs of local population.</li> <li>80% of all rural applications to be on previously-developed</li> </ol> |
|   | land.  |
| Delivery  | Rossendale Borough Council, Developers, Local Communities,   |
| Agency(s)   | Rural Futures, Natural England, Lancashire County Council  |
| Implementation                                    | Determination of planning applications and the allocation of   |
|   | land through the LDF.  |
| Monitoring &                                      | Annual Monitoring Report(s)  |
| Review  |  |

#### **RLDF 21: Planning Contributions**

It is proposed that the Council will continue to seek to secure planning contributions on applicable future planning applications as follows:

Where developments will create additional need for improvements/ provision of infrastructure, services or facilities or exacerbate an existing deficiency, contributions will be sought to ensure that the appropriate contributions/ improvements are made.

Contributions will be sought for (but not limited to) the following areas:

- Children's Centres
- Education
- Libraries
- Minerals and Waste Development
- Transport
- Infrastructure
- Waste Management
- Countryside Access
- Cultural Heritage
- Affordable and Supported Housing
- Crime and Disorder
- Landscape Character and Design
- Natural Heritage
- Youth & Community
- Flood Defences
- Health
- Inland Waterways
- Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- Public Realm and Public Art

This policy sets out the overarching framework in relation to the negotiation of planning obligations and agreements.

In implementing this policy and determining priorities for negotiating a planning obligation or agreement, the policy tests as contained in Circular 05/2005 will be applied, and in doing so the Council will have regard to:

- Key strategic issues- supporting the vision, aims and objectives of the Local Strategic Partnership's Sustainable Community Strategy as articulated in the Council's Corporate Plan and the Core Strategy.
- Key local needs as identified through community and evidence base documents such as local housing needs studies, playing pitch and sports facility studies, education plans and other evidence base documents relating to the needs of specific areas within Rossendale.

It is important that development costs including the cost of implementing planning agreements do not prejudice development that supports the Council's aspiration to see the regeneration and improvement of the Borough. If it is claimed that a development is unable to support the costs of a planning obligation (other than those essential to allow the development to proceed) then this could be the subject of negotiations. In such cases, the development costs and the costs of high quality building materials and urban design considerations are universally applicable, and will not be allowed for in negotiations to reduce planning obligations.

Planning agreements will be drafted by the Council, and where appropriate based on model heads of terms which will be agreed with the developer, who will be responsible for the costs incurred in preparing the agreement. The developer will also be required to pay a fee for the Council's costs in administering and monitoring the agreement.

A Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared to amplify the policy, identify priorities and set out the criteria for calculating planning obligations as well as details on administration and monitoring fees.

In addition, the Council may also implement a standard charge for developments which put increased pressure on existing infrastructure. The Council will consider implementing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Utilising this approach will be assessed when the appropriate national regulations are published. If implemented all the relevant consultation procedures would be followed.

Moreover, it should be noted that planning obligations and possibly the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy will form part of a much wider plan/ programme to secure the provision/ improvement of infrastructure, services and facilities. Provision and funding for new and upgraded facilities etc will also be sought from various funding sources and providers.

A detailed infrastructure assessment of the Borough and an infrastructure delivery plan will be undertaken and maintained throughout the course of the plan period and beyond should the Community Infrastructure Levy be considered appropriate for Rossendale.

| Strategic               | SO1-7   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Objectives Met</b>   |   |
| Alternative             | Several options have been explored throughout the life of the   |
| <b>Options Explored</b> | Core Strategy and are explained in greater detail in the  |
|                         | Background and Supplementary Evidence document which is available alongside the Core Strategy for inspection.                           |
| Indicators              | 1. Percentage of planning applications approved with<br>planning contributions.   |
|                         | <ol> <li>Number of major residential developments which do<br/>not have affordable housing provision.</li> </ol>                        |
| Targets                 | <ol> <li>All major developments provide planning contributions</li> <li>All other developments to contribute as appropriate.</li> </ol> |
| Delivery                | Rossendale BC, Developers, Partners.  |
| Agency(s)               |   |
| Implementation          | Management of developer investment. Determination of  |
|                         | planning applications and allocation of land through LDF.   |
| Monitoring &            | 1. Annual Monitoring Report(s)  |
| Review                  | 2. Planning Contributions database  |

| RLDF 22: Planning Application Considerations  |
|---|
| It is proposed that the following considerations will be applied to all future planning applications submitted to Rossendale Borough Council:   |
| Planning permission will be granted if all relevant considerations are properly addressed. These considerations will include whether the development:   |
| <ol> <li>Has adequately considered the on and off-site impacts of the proposal<br/>in terms of climate change, flood risk, wildlife, natural resource use and<br/>pollution.</li> </ol>                   |
| <ol> <li>Makes efficient use of land, including where appropriate providing for<br/>dual use of facilities.</li> </ol>  |
| <ol> <li>Positively contributes to the townscape, landscape and biodiversity of<br/>the local environment.</li> </ol>   |
| <ol> <li>Is compatible with its surroundings in terms of style, siting, layout, orientation, visual impact, local context and views, scale, massing, height, density, materials and detailing.</li> </ol> |
| <ol> <li>Incorporates public spaces, landscaping, public art and 'designing out<br/>crime' initiatives.</li> </ol>  |
| 6. Protects the amenity of the area, including residential amenity in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.  |
| 7. Ensures public safety.   |
| <ol> <li>Provides for safe and satisfactory access and makes a contribution to<br/>meeting the parking requirement arising from necessary car use.</li> </ol>   |
| <ol> <li>Demonstrates that existing drainage, waste water and sewerage<br/>infrastructure capacity is maintained and where necessary enhanced, to<br/>enable development to proceed.</li> </ol>           |
| 10 Ensures where appropriate, equality of appage and use for all apptians   |

10. Ensures where appropriate, equality of access and use for all sections of the community.

This policy sets out topics relevant to the consideration of all planning applications. It is not a fully comprehensive lost of all the considerations. Rather it builds upon the other policies of the Core Strategy – particularly in relation to design, transport and the environmental policies – to ensure that development takes place in the right locations and is designed to ensure acceptable impacts on others and on the environment. It also enables a range of specific issues identified through the Core Strategy Habitat Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal to be addressed.

The Council intends to produce Supplementary Planning Documents which will interpret this policy for specific developments, including most particularly a Development Guidelines SPD and a Design SPD. Until these SPDs are produced, any relevant existing Supplementary Planning Guidance notes/Documents will be used, including:

- Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties SPD
- Open Space and Play Equipment Contributions SPD
- Re-Use of Buildings in the Countryside SPD

| Strategic<br>Objectives Met | SO4,5,7  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Alternative                 | 1. Produce Development Management Development Plan |

| Options Explored | document   |  |
|------------------|--|--|
|                  | <ol> <li>Include a range of development management policies<br/>within Core Strategy</li> </ol>  |  |
|                  | 3. Rely on national and regional guidance  |  |
| Indicators       | <ol> <li>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the<br/>advice of English Heritage or Rossendale BC's own<br/>conservation section.</li> </ol> |  |
|                  | 2. Amount of derelict land in the Borough.   |  |
|                  | <ol> <li>Percentage of residents in the Borough stating they feel<br/>safe in their local area after dark.</li> </ol>                                      |  |
|                  | <ol> <li>Number of planning applications referred to CABE / Design panels.</li> </ol>  |  |
| Targets          | <ol> <li>No planning applications approved contrary to the advice<br/>of English Heritage or Rossendale BC's own conservation<br/>section.</li> </ol>      |  |
|                  | <ol> <li>Annual decrease in the amount of derelict and vacant land<br/>in Rossendale.</li> </ol>   |  |
|                  | <ol> <li>Increase in residents feeling safe in their local area after<br/>dark.</li> </ol>   |  |
|                  | <ol> <li>Annual increase in the number of applications referred to<br/>CABE/Design panels.</li> </ol>  |  |
| Delivery         | Rossendale BC, English Heritage, CABE, Lancashire CC,  |  |
| Agency(s)        | developers, partners.  |  |
| Implementation   | Determination of planning applications and allocation of land  |  |
|                  | through LDF.   |  |
| Monitoring &     | 1. Annual Monitoring Report(s)   |  |
| Review           | <ol> <li>National Land Use Database monitoring</li> <li>National Indicator/LSP</li> </ol>  |  |

#### The Core Strategy and the EC Habitat Regulations

The Core Strategy must be screened under the Habitat Regulations (as amended by the 2007 Regulations) for its effect on European (or Natura 2000) nature conservation sites. Natura 2000 sites include Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar sites (protected wetlands). Sites within 50km of the Borough boundary have to be considered for any direct or indirect impacts that development in Rossendale may cause.

The Natura 2000 sites that could be affected by the policies in Rossendale's Core Strategy all lie outside the Borough boundary and are set down below in what is known as the 'long list' of sites:

- Rochdale Canal SAC
- South Pennine Moors SAC
- Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennines Moor Phase 1)
- South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA.

**Rochdale Canal SAC** is included because of potential effects from the Draft policies on Access to Services and Tourism and Visitor Access.

**South Pennine Moors** have been included because of possible increasing water demand, from the policies on General Development Locations, Housing Provision and Development policies, Employment Land provision and Planning Application Considerations. Policies which increase tourism may have an effect too.

**Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennines Moor Phase 1)** has been addressed looking at possible water supply demand from the same list of policies above. Wind turbines may affect protected bird species. It is thought unlikely that there will be a link to this SPA from Rossendale.

**South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA** is screened in regarding increases in water demand, and using the South Pennines for recreation. Similarly birds can be affected by wind turbines.

The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening (Stage 1) of the Rossendale Core Strategy Draft is available for viewing on the Council's website <u>www.rossendale.gov.uk</u> or at the One Stop Shop in Rawtenstall. Further work is likely to be necessary as the Core Strategy is further developed.

# The Core Strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment

The Habitats Regulations Assessment only covers EC sites. To ensure that all the economic, environmental and social impacts of the Core Strategy are fully considered a Sustainability Appraisal (SA)/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required. An initial scoping Report for the Core Strategy was undertaken by consultants Entec in 2005 and this informed earlier versions of the Core Strategy. Given the delays and subsequent changes to the evidence base, and the revisions made to this version of the Core Strategy, as well as Government guidance being amended on how to undertake SA and SEA, it has been necessary to amend the SA / SEA. The most up to date document that impacts the Core Strategy is the LDF Sustainability Appraisal Report (Scott Wilson, September 2009) and will form the

foundation of the consultation draft of the Scoping Report for all the Local Development Documents within Rossendale's Local Development Framework including the Core Strategy. This is available for viewing on the Council's website <u>www.rossendale.gov.uk</u> as well as at the One Stop Shop in Rawtenstall.

There are 17 sustainability assessment objectives currently identified. Work is currently ongoing to assess the policies in the Core Strategy against the Sustainability Assessment framework.

# <u>Glossary</u>

| Term/Acronym                 | Explanation  |
|------------------------------|--|
| 4NW                          | The regional planning body for the north west.   |
| AAP                          | Action Area Plan   |
| Affordable<br>Housing        | Includes social rented housing and intermediate<br>affordable housing (e.g. shared ownership) provided to<br>households at a cost low enough for them to afford.<br>Households eligible for affordable housing are those who<br>cannot afford open market housing. |
| AGMA                         | Association of Greater Manchester Authorities  |
| AMR                          | Annual Monitoring Report for the Local Development<br>Framework  |
| AQMA / AQMP                  | Air Quality Management Area / Air Quality Management<br>Plan   |
| ASHE                         | Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings  |
| Brownfield Land<br>and Sites | See "Previously Developed Land"  |
| BSF                          | Building Schools for the Future Program  |
| BVPI                         | Best Value Performance Indicator   |
| Casual Provision             | Safely accessible areas for children's play of an informal unorganised nature.   |
| CIL                          | Community Infrastructure Levy  |
| Comparison<br>Goods          | Comparison retailing is the provision of items not<br>obtained on a frequent basis. These include clothing,<br>footwear, household and recreational goods.   |
| Convenience<br>Goods         | Convenience retailing is the provision of everyday essential items, including food, drinks, newspapers/magazines and confectionary.  |

| Core Strategy                 | The Core Strategy will set out the key elements of the<br>planning framework for Rossendale comprising a spatial<br>vision and strategic objectives, a spatial strategy, core<br>policies as well as a monitoring and implementation<br>framework.  |
|-------------------------------|---|
| CROWS                         | Countryside Rights of Ways  |
| Deprivation                   | The condition of being deprived of what one once had or ought to have.  |
| District Centre               | A group of shops often containing at least one<br>supermarket/superstore and a range of services such as<br>banks and restaurants as well as public facilities such as<br>libraries   |
| DPD                           | Development Plan Document   |
| Dual-Use Facility             | Formal recreation facilities within the educational sector<br>which are as a matter of practice and policy, available for<br>public use when not in use by educational<br>establishments.   |
| Dwelling                      | A self-contained building or part of a building used as a residential accommodation, and usually housing a single household. A dwelling may be a house, bungalow, flat, maisonette or converted farm building.  |
| Economically<br>inactive      | Those people who are not in work, but who do not satisfy<br>all the criteria for unemployment, that is, wanting a job,<br>seeking in the last four weeks and available to start in<br>the next two.   |
| Employment<br>Land            | Land for the development of light industry and business premises (use class B1), general industry (use class B2) and warehouses (use class B8).   |
| Evidence Base                 | The information and data that have informed the development of policies.  |
| Formal<br>Provision           | Open space provided for organised sporting activities, such as pitches, courts and bowling greens.  |
| Front-loading<br>consultation | Detailed consultation undertaken at the policy<br>development stage so as to reduce the need for time<br>and resource consuming consultation at the detailed<br>planning stage (i.e. to establish the principle of certain<br>types of development in specific areas so as to set down<br>with greater certainty what would or would not be |

|                            | appropriate there).  |
|----------------------------|--|
| GONW                       | Government Office North West   |
| Green Belt                 | Area of land, largely rural or semi-rural in character,<br>adjacent to the urban area and protected from<br>development by permanent and severe restrictions on<br>building. The term 'Green Belt' refers to areas<br>specifically designated for protection in development<br>plans, in accordance with Government guidance and is<br>not equivalent to the more general term 'greenfield'. |
| Greenfield Land<br>or Site | Land (or a defined site) that is not currently or has not previously been developed.   |
| Green<br>Infrastructure    | 'Green Infrastructure' is a network of multi-functional greenspace. It is set within, and contributes to a high quality natural and built environment.   |
| Gypsies and<br>Travellers  | Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin.  |
| Hectare (ha)               | Metric unit of area equal to 10000 square metres or 2.47 acres.  |
| НМО                        | Houses in Multiple Occupation  |
| HMR                        | Housing Market Renewal   |
| Housing<br>Associations    | Common term for the independent, not-for-profit<br>organisations registered with and regulated by the<br>Housing Corporation. Housing Associations are able to<br>bid for funding from the Housing Corporation. <i>See also:</i><br>Registered Social Landlords.   |
| IMD                        | Indices of Multiple Deprivation  |
| Industrial<br>Development  | Refers to general industry (use class B2) and warehouses (use class B8).   |
| LAA                        | Local Area Agreement   |
| LAP                        | Local Area of Play   |
| LDD                        | Local Development Document   |

| LDF                      | Local Development Framework  |
|--------------------------|--|
| LDS                      | Local Development Scheme   |
| Lifetime Homes           | A standard that has been developed to help house<br>builders produce flexible, adaptable and accessible<br>homes that can respond to changes in individual<br>circumstances. E.g. caring for young children, temporary<br>injuries, declining mobility with age. |
| LNR                      | Local Nature Reserve   |
| LSP                      | Local Strategic Partnership  |
| LTP(2 or 3)              | Local Transport Plan prepared by County Council setting<br>out transport priorities for the area. LTP2 covers 2006-11<br>while LTP3 extends from 2011-2016 plus a longer term<br>vision  |
| MEDS                     | Major Existing Sites in the Green Belt   |
| NHS                      | National Health Service  |
| ODPM                     | Office of the Deputy Prime Minister  |
| Office<br>Development    | Refers to office and business development (use class B1)   |
| ONS                      | Office of National Statistics  |
| Overcrowded<br>dwellings | Households who do not have enough bedrooms.  |
| РСТ                      | Primary Care Trust   |
| Planning<br>Obligation   | A private agreement, usually negotiated in the context of<br>a planning application, between a local authority and<br>persons with an interest in the land (e.g. owner,<br>developer).   |
| Plan Period              | The time period over which a specific document will remain valid.  |
| Polarisation             | The accentuation of a difference between two things or   |

|   | groups  |
|---|---|
| PPG                                     | Planning Policy Guidance note   |
| PPS                                     | Planning Policy Statement   |
| Previously<br>Developed Land            | Previously-developed land is that which is or was<br>occupied by a permanent structure, including the<br>curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed<br>surface infrastructure.  |
|   | The definition includes defence buildings, but excludes:  |
|   | <ul> <li>Land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or<br/>forestry buildings.</li> </ul>  |
|   | <ul> <li>Land that has been developed for minerals<br/>extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes<br/>where provision for restoration has been made<br/>through development control procedures.</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul> <li>Land in built-up areas such as parks, recreation<br/>grounds and allotments, which, although it may<br/>feature paths, pavilions and other buildings, has<br/>not been previously developed.</li> </ul>  |
|   | • Land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time (to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings). |
| Registered<br>Social Landlords<br>(RSL) | Technical name for a body registered with the Housing<br>Corporation. Most Housing Associations are RSLs. They<br>own or manage both social rented and intermediate<br>affordable housing. <i>See also:</i> Housing Associations.                                 |
| RES                                     | Regional Economic Strategy  |
| RSS                                     | Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West  |
| SA                                      | Sustainability Appraisal  |
| Saved policies                          | Current policies that are up-to-date and relevant and so can be continued into the new system.  |
| SBI                                     | Sites of Biological Importance  |
| SCI                                     | Statement of Community Involvement  |

| SEA                         | Strategic Environmental Assessment   |
|-----------------------------|--|
| SFRA                        | Strategic Flood Risk Assessment  |
|                             |  |
| SHLAA                       | Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment   |
| SHMA                        | Strategic Housing Market Assessment  |
| SOA                         | Super Output Areas   |
| Social Rented<br>Housing    | Rented housing owned and managed by local authorities and registered social landlords.   |
| Spatial                     | Of, relating to, involving, or having the nature of space.   |
| Spatial Options             | The realistic options available for future development.  |
| Spatial Planning            | Spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use<br>planning to bring together and combine land use<br>planning with other policies that can influence the nature<br>of places and how they work.   |
| Spatial Portrait            | A description of the character and state of the borough.   |
| Spatial Vision              | Aspirations for the future development of the borough.   |
| SPD                         | Supplementary Planning Document  |
| SPG                         | Supplementary Planning Guidance  |
| SSSI                        | Sites of Special Scientific Importance   |
| Stakeholders                | Any group or individual with an interest in any part or parts of the LDF and its various LDDs.   |
| Sustainability<br>Appraisal | Sustainability appraisal is a tool used to assess the<br>impact of plan policies from an environmental, economic<br>and social perspective. It is intended to provide a<br>systematic process through which the performance of a<br>plan can be tested against the objectives of sustainable<br>development, while the plan is still being produced. |

| Sustainable<br>Development  | Development which meets the needs of the present<br>generation without harming the ability of future<br>generations to meet their needs; to do this, such<br>development limits damage to the environment, and<br>keeps the consumption of natural resources to levels<br>manageable in the long term. |
|-----------------------------|--|
| ТНІ                         | Townscape Heritage Initiative  |
| Travelling<br>Showpeople    | Members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such).  |
| UDP                         | Unitary Development Plan   |
| Under-occupied<br>dwellings | Households with more than one spare bedroom.   |
| UPS                         | Urban Potential Study  |
| Use Class                   | Similar categories of land are grouped into 'Use<br>Classes'. There are sixteen use classes as determined<br>by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order<br>1987 (as amended by ODPM Circular 03/2005).   |
| Windfall Site               | A site not specifically identified for development in a plan, but which becomes available for development or is granted planning permission during the lifetime of the plan.   |