



## **ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

### **STATEMENT IN RELATION TO MATTER 8**

**AUGUST 2019**

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. Gary Hoerty Associates has been instructed by the landowners, Mr. Mark Schofield and Mrs Helen Tickle to submit representations to the Rossendale Local Plan Examination.
2. Our representations relate to Matter 8, as identified by the Inspector.

## **BACKGROUND**

3. Our client, Mr. Mark Schofield and Mrs Helen Tickle, own land, part of which is proposed to be allocated for housing in the plan (site H60). Our clients also own land to the east of Heightside House, north of St. Peter's School. Both sites are shown on the attached plan (Appendix 1). You should note that this representation relates only to the site north of St. Peter's School.

## **OUR CASE IN SUPPORT OF THE INCLUSION OF THE LAND AS AN ALLOCATION**

4. Our representation set out below relates to Matter 8, site assessment section, item f)
5. Part of this site has been included within the urban boundary but the majority excluded. We see no justification for this exclusion. The site was included as a proposed allocation but deleted after the Reg 18 consultation. We see no reason why it cannot be re-instated as a separate allocation. The concerns expressed by the Council's conservation officer relating to the impact on heritage (Heightside House) and landscape are not evidenced and not justified.
6. The land not previously included in the now deleted allocation is designated as countryside in the current Local Plan (Core Strategy). The site is therefore partly within and partly adjacent to the urban boundary and in a sustainable location. Factors supporting its inclusion as an allocation are as follows:-
  - a) It presents no significant constraints against its development (access, drainage, flood risk etc), in this respect being similar to the proposed allocation land.

- b) It would equally support current Core Strategy, emerging Local Plan and national planning objectives, not least in that it would assist in broadening the choice of land for development.
  - c) It would not have an adverse landscape impact. The inclusion of the additional land would enhance the potential for landscape improvement, retention of views and enhancement of green infrastructure.
  - d) It would relate well to existing and proposed development and would not adversely impact on the Higher Clough Fold conservation area or Heightside House.
  - e) It can be accessed.
7. In reference to bullet point 2 above, it should be noted that the allocation of this land for housing would meet the criteria set out in current Core Strategy Policy 1, relating to extensions to the urban boundary, principally in that:-
- a. The extension/amendment to the urban boundary would not adversely affect aspects of the natural environment such as biological, geological, geomorphological, green infrastructure and landscape character assets, including habitats and species of importance for nature conservation or should be capable of full mitigation
  - b. the amendment/extension would not result in the amalgamation of settlements
  - c. the amendment/extension would not result in a significant impact on local views and viewpoints.
8. We are satisfied that any concerns relating to heritage impact and landscape impact can be satisfactorily addressed and any mitigation measures incorporated, in a planning application submission. With regard to heritage impact we would point out the following:
- a) The site does not appear to have formed part of the historic or functional setting of the house, nor was it part of the associated parkland.
  - b) Given the historic and contemporary woodland enclosure to the house, and intervening 20th century built form, there is no significant inter-visibility.
  - c) Development will site comfortably within the context of modern 20th century development, including the primary school to the south.

- d) Part of the site is previously developed.
  - e) No other heritage assets will be affected.
9. We would therefore suggest that the urban boundary set out on the proposals map should be revised to include the remainder of our clients' site and that the site is allocated for housing development.
10. In addition, emerging Local Plan Policy HS1 states that the net housing requirement for the period 2019-2034, will be achieved through providing at least 3180 net additional dwellings over the plan period equating to 212 dwellings per year. It does not preclude a level of development above that required, as a minimum, to meet the identified requirement. The allocation of this land would allow for a greater choice of housing land, reducing pressure for development on less appropriate and less sustainable sites elsewhere.
11. We therefore suggest that the land, which is clearly developable, in a suitable location for housing development, and which would be viable with a reasonable prospect of being available in the short or medium term be included within the urban boundary allocated for housing development.

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 – The site we are putting forward