



Mr Graham Lamb  
Pegasus Group  
Queens House  
Queen Street  
Manchester  
M2 5HT

**Development Management  
Room 119 - 121  
The Business Centre  
Futures Park  
Bacup  
OL13 0BB**

Our reference: Edenfield Masterplan

Date: 08/12/2023

Dear Sir

**Re: Site H66 Masterplan and Design Codes Land West of Market Street, Edenfield.**

I refer to the above site and the development proposed.

The revised Masterplan and Design Code have been assessed by Officers and I write to set out the measures needed to address concerns raised at this stage.

### **Phasing & Implementation**

Policy H66 of the Adopted Rosendale Local Plan, requires a programme of implementation and phasing to be agreed through a Masterplan.

Despite previous requests for a programme of implementation and phasing, what has actually been submitted does not amount to this. Unfortunately, it predominantly constitutes a list akin to potential planning obligations and therefore, is completely unsatisfactory for the purpose of what the policy specifically requires.

The explanation to the policy states, *'the infrastructure associated with the overall development and each individual phase will be subject to the production of a phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule to be contained in the Masterplan. Site access will be a key consideration.'*

Where terms like programme and schedule have been deliberately used in the policy, the Council would expect a programme/schedule, by definition, to include a realistic sequence of works and phasing, one logically following on from the other and also an indication of what stage in the development, works would commence on the specific item of infrastructure and at what stage it would be implemented/ be made available.

All the infrastructure to be provided as part of the development related to this allocation should be included in the programme, including any off site mitigation such as the

highway measures or specific projects, for example; the proposed community car park and public open space (on Peel's land) depicted within the Masterplan,

It is important for the residents of Edenfield to be able to understand how long aspects of the development will take to be implemented and the likely disruption to be caused.

By way of an illustration regarding the level of detail that should apply to all the items of infrastructure to be included in your programme/schedule, I refer to your plan of off-site highway improvements on pages 46 and 47 of the latest iteration of the Masterplan (September 2023).

The specific examples I will refer to are the proposed 2 metre wide car parking bay depicted on the east side of Market Street and the new parking spaces that are illustrated within close proximity to the proposed access to the Taylor Wimpey development. I would expect the programme/schedule to include a reasonable indication at what stage of the development, these specific works would commence and then be implemented/ made available. Therefore, residents will be able to understand approximately how long the disruption of not having on street parking in front of their properties will last and how long it will take to deliver the new/alternative provision.

## **Highways**

From the Council's discussions with Lancashire County Council in their role as the Highway Authority, it is understood that you will be submitting further information, in an attempt to overcome concerns. Please can you submit those details as soon as possible. It was noted that you previously suggested that you would be providing the Council with further details of gateway features/traffic calming measures, yet we are not in receipt of them. Please provide these details for the Council's consideration.

## **Public Rights Of Way (PROW)**

The following comments from the County Council's PROW Officer will need addressing.

On the Masterplan, there is a gap in the proposed pedestrian/cycle access through the southern residential parcel, east of Chatterton Heys. Therefore, this route needs illustrating on the Plan.

The design of the primary highway through the site needs to take into account the core design principles of the Government's recent 'Gear Change' - A bold vision for cycling and walking and accompanying Cycle Infrastructure Design – Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20, both published in July 2020.

Any cycle routes provided within the masterplan site need to meet the core design principles set out in LTN 1/20 including:

Design Principle 2: 'Cycles must be treated as vehicles and not as pedestrians. On urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians. Where cycle routes cross pavements, a physically

segregated track should always be provided. At crossings and junctions, cyclists should not share the space used by pedestrians but should be provided with a separate parallel route.'

### Design of proposed north – south cycleway and requirements for cycling provision alongside main access road

In line with the requirements of LTN1/20 then the cycleway route should have segregated cycle and pedestrian use with a minimum 3m wide cycleway and 2m wide footway. If this isn't feasible then a shared use path ideally 4.5m wide and at least 3m wide should be provided, to meet the standards set out in Section 6.5 of LTN1/20.

The proposed north-south cycleway should have a sealed surface to facilitate use all year round and reduce the requirements for ongoing maintenance. However, as the Council has requested that equestrian use should be catered for, the path should be surfaced using flexible surfacing materials that have been used on other similar greenway routes in Rossendale including the nearby section of National Cycle Route 6, immediately north of Lumb Viaduct. This will provide a hard wearing, porous surface, suitable for all users. This is an approved material and can potentially be adopted by Lancashire County Council so should be referred to on Page 73 of the Masterplan in regards to surface materials.

### **Drainage**

The Masterplan is silent on the issue of Foul Drainage and at present there is no indication with this submission of the foul drainage strategy. The Council would expect the revised Masterplan to incorporate this matter and explain how it will be addressed.

The Council is attempting to discuss the apparent differences between UU and LLFA in their consultation responses on the matter of surface water drainage and will revert back to you with further information.

### **Education**

The section relating to education should include a commitment to provide both funding for construction of any necessary development on school sites and the provision of freehold land at nil charge, subject to the usual demonstration of a need being demonstrated for school places, beyond existing capacity levels.

### **Biodiversity Net Gain**

This land in all the ownerships is just one allocation (not 3 (or more) separate allocations, which could have been an alternative for the Local Plan) and the site specific policy refers to a Masterplan to cover the whole allocation. Therefore, I still consider we should have more detail at this stage with proposals that have been fully investigated, especially given that two of the larger landowners (Taylor Wimpey and North Stone) are progressing with their schemes.

You have previously suggested that *“Some of the suggested off-site Green Belt compensation measures cited within this masterplan will also add to overall*

*biodiversity net gain and these will be secured through s106 agreements for each planning application.*” However, I think it needs to be clear that BNG and Green Belt Compensation contributions are not the same thing and should not be ‘double counted’ – they are separate matters which require separate distinct planning contributions.

### **Green Belt Compensation Measures**

Any further text inserted into the Masterplan document should refer to the Council’s adopted *Compensation Measures for Green Belt Release (January 2023)* document to ensure that the Masterplan acknowledges that future development will have to comply with the specified measures within the document.

Enhanced links between the development site and Ewood Bridge should also be included as a bullet point.

I look forward to receiving your revised Masterplan and the Council reserves the right to request further amendments in the future, once any amended plans and documentation have been reviewed.

Yours faithfully

*Mike Atherton*

**Mike Atherton**  
Head of Planning & Building Control