

Comments on Issues and Options Additional Sites

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
Housing Sites			
<p>Additional Housing Site A – Red Lees Road, Cliviger</p> <p>44 Consultees commented</p>	<p>Cliviger Parish Council (summarised)</p>	<p>There are numerous brownfield sites which means there is ample land for development. Population projections suggest a stagnation or loss of population between 2012 – 2037, and so who is the land being earmarked for? Proposals are spurious, short term opportunism which will be damaging to the physical and economic wellbeing of Cliviger.</p> <p>There are too many houses which would damage the village-like community of Higher Red Lees.</p> <p>Building on the site will have an adverse effect on the historic landscape of Towneley Park.</p> <p>As a greenfield site, building would substantially change the character of an agricultural area, resulting in ribbon development and urban encroachment into the rural area.</p> <p>Rights of way – two routes cross the proposed area to Towneley Park and its environs. These are well used by people escaping the built up area and their loss would have an adverse effect on local wellbeing.</p> <p>Primary schools in Cliviger and Worsthorne are already oversubscribed and do not have the capacity to cope with further children.</p> <p>There are no social facilities which create a community and thus any further building simply creates a 'dormitory' of houses with no heart or purpose.</p> <p>Higher Red Lees and Lower Red Lees should remain separate; this will create 'corridor creep', which is not justified when official statistics on population growth and the type of demand for housing suggested by the council is taken into consideration.</p> <p>The sewerage system is already under strain and further demand will require a new system.</p>	<p>The site is proposed to be allocated for 125 dwellings.</p> <p>Policy SP4: Development Strategy sets out a settlement hierarchy for the towns and villages of the Borough identifying their respective role and function, and the scale of development for housing, employment and retail. Development will be focussed on Burnley and Padiham with development of an appropriate scale supported in the main and small villages. To accommodate the level of development identified in policies SP2: Housing Land Requirement 2012-2032 and SP3: Employment Land Requirement 2012-2032 the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment provides evidence that these requirements cannot be met in full on previously developed sites, or on sites within the Urban Boundary as set out in the 2006 Burnley Local Plan. With this in mind, the Preferred Options Local Plan includes a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites and the new development boundaries for Burnley, Padiham, Worsthorne and Hapton include sites outside of the 2006 Burnley Local Plan urban boundary.</p> <p>The site area has been reduced to lessen the visual impact on the landscape.</p> <p>A scheme of the highest quality which clearly and demonstrably contributes to increasing housing quality and choice across the borough will be expected, including to satisfy the requirements of Policy SP4 2) c) i and ii and SP5, as this site is a greenfield site in the open</p>

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		The unnecessary urban sprawl will affect natural flora and fauna – one of the attractions to draws people to Cliviger as the 'green lung' of Burnley.	<p>countryside at a Key Gateway; and lower density detached housing is preferred not only to provide/increase quality and choice, but the lower density offered would provide greater opportunity for landscaping, planting and minimising impact.</p> <p>The Preferred Options sets out the policies against which planning applications on allocated or non-allocated sites would be judged to ensure an appropriate quality of development. A scheme of the highest quality which clearly and demonstrably contributes to increasing housing quality and choice across the borough will be expected, including to satisfy the requirements of Policy SP4 2) c) i and ii and SP5, as this site is a greenfield site in the open countryside at a Key Gateway;</p> <p>The Council consulted on a baseline IDP at Issues and Options stage in 2014 and has considered the feedback received from this consultation and also the relevant feedback from the wider plan and site consultation. Whilst the Council believes there to be no major infrastructure barriers to the delivery of the Plan as a whole or the individual sites and policies set out, it is appreciated that without knowing the detail of the preferred development requirements e.g. housing and employment land targets, the location and size of the preferred sites and the preferred policy approach, it was difficult for relevant agencies and other consultees to definitively respond on these matters. Having now set out the preferred options, the Council will engage with all relevant consultees before pulling together the IDP for the next stage of plan-making ie Proposed Submission</p>
	Environment Agency (summarised)	Adjacent to Hollins Farm historic landfill site	
	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	Unsustainable location remote from local services although on a bus route.	
	Natural England (summarised)	<p>Site is approx. 1.5km from South Pennine Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest. This is part of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation, which are on European Wildlife Sites that form the Natura 2000 network. Habitats Regulation Assessments will be required.</p> <p>Not enough detailed information on the impacts of development against the conservation objectives of the South Pennine Moors SPA, SAC and SSSI, in particular:</p> <p>Bird disturbance – surveys for breeding birds should be undertaken between March and July, and should be undertaken at least once every two weeks during the breeding season. Birds are used to flying over the sites and could be impacted by development.</p> <p>Recreational pressure – it is important to note that the South Pennine Moors is an upland of international importance, and information needs to be provided to demonstrate how access will be limited to SAC / SPA habitats, i.e. encouraging visitors to less sensitive areas or alternative green space.</p> <p>Water resources – The South Pennine Moors supports specialist flora and fauna. As a result of additional sites, there could be a likely significant effect on this European designated site through water discharges. The site should be screened for LSE via water related pathways.</p> <p>More emphasis should have been given through the appraisal process, in terms of impacts, on nearby SPA, SAC and SSSI.</p>	
	United Utilities Property Services (summarised)	This site is not considered suitable for full residential redevelopment due to the harm to the surrounding landscape and sprawl of the southern part of Pike Hill. Opportunities for a reduced density development with larger areas of open space may be suitable.	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
	Others	<p>Greenfield site beyond the urban boundary. Will lead to urban sprawl. Concern over the merging of Burnley and Cliviger – precedent set for ruination of other green sites</p> <p>Plentiful supply of brownfield sites that have better access to public transport and amenities</p> <p>Question the need for new housing, given its declining population</p> <p>Do not believe that the local amenities could cope with the increase in population</p> <p>St Johns School in Cliviger is already oversubscribed, with no room for expansion</p> <p>Site forms part of an important wildlife corridor, disruption to wildlife. Protected species on site.</p> <p>Increase in traffic</p> <p>Sewerage issue – where will it go? Access to main sewers? Sewers are inadequate and antiquated.</p> <p>Risk of flooding due to increased run off</p> <p>Decline in house prices of existing residents</p> <p>Loss of view</p> <p>Re-occupy empty homes rather than new build</p> <p>Public footpaths cross the site</p> <p>The site cannot be safely accessed</p> <p>Increase in crime due to development of affluent houses – area only covered by a PCSO</p> <p>Lack of local shops and community facilities</p> <p>Sprawl into the greenbelt</p> <p>Negative impact on the town's reputation – a working town surrounded by beautiful countryside.</p> <p>The area is mainly OAPs and they should be protected from major disruption in their lives</p> <p>Negative effect with regards to Carbon Footprint</p> <p>Field is already in productive use – why change this</p> <p>Loss of Cliviger's character</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>Adverse impact on the historic landscape of Towneley Park</p> <p>Adjacent to Hollins Farm historic landfill site</p> <p>Increase in antisocial behaviour</p> <p>Increased pollution – noise, light and refuse)</p> <p>Site capacity is unrealistic. A smaller development that would round off the settlement boundary could be appropriate.</p> <p>Site is remote from employment opportunities</p> <p>Public transport is limited</p> <p>Housing should be on the West of town close to employment opportunities to avoid gridlock</p> <p>Site would not address the need for affordable housing/retirement properties</p> <p>Unlikely to be demand for properties – those currently for sale have not sold</p>	
<p>Housing Site B – Rear of 34 Moseley Road</p> <p>42 Consultees commented</p>	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	Unsustainable location with limited pedestrian access to public transport on Todmorden Road. The site is located in an “access only” zone and restricted by local road geometry, a level crossing on Hufling Lane and a narrow tunnel with no visibility or footpath on Rock Lane. There may be issues creating satisfactory access from Rock Lane.	This site is not proposed for allocation as it was considered to be ‘unsuitable’ and therefore ‘not developable’ through the SHLAA process.
	United Utilities Property Services (summarised)	This site is not considered suitable for development due to highways and amenity constraints. Additionally, due to topography and access implications, the site is not considered viable.	
	Others	<p>Increase in traffic – road is already access only and is restricted by road geometry, a level crossing on Hufling Lane and a narrow tunnel with no visibility or footpath on Rock Lane</p> <p>Increased traffic will impact on road safety</p> <p>The site cannot be safely accessed</p> <p>Limited pedestrian access to public transport</p> <p>Impact on level crossing of more trains to Manchester – it will be closed all the time</p>	
		<p>Crime levels would increase due to easier access</p> <p>Wildlife would be significantly affected. Protected species present on site</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>Development unnecessary when there are other brownfield sites readily available</p> <p>Loss of significant number of trees protected by TPO. Forest of Burnley site</p> <p>Noise pollution from increase in traffic Light pollution</p> <p>Woodland is a popular place for walkers – loss of important recreation resource. Public rights of way through the woodland. Provides valuable greenspace for local residents and a natural divide between different residential areas.</p> <p>Increased surface water run off could lead to increased flooding further down the hill</p> <p>There are significant topography changes - could impact on residential amenity and the viability/deliverability of the site</p> <p>Site is unlikely to deliver a significant range of dwelling types that would not support the requirements for housing choice</p> <p>This is a greenfield site in the rural area/rural fringe which is part of Whin Scar Clough and is on the boundary of the Towneley park/Timber Hill area of search for new Local Nature Reserves where protected species were recorded at this site. Site of unique character on the edge of Towneley will be lost Development would result in a loss of biodiversity whereas the NPPF requires there to be a net gain in nature (biodiversity)</p> <p>Privacy will be affected to our houses which this land overlooks</p> <p>Burnley population is declining so what is the need</p> <p>Access to sewerage – some houses have septic tanks Availability of other utilities?</p> <p>Local schools already heavily subscribed</p> <p>The site is very close to water</p> <p>There will be disturbance during building and once complete the development will affect the valuation of nearby properties</p> <p>Impact on nearby nature conservation sites through disturbance, habitat loss and pollution etc.</p>	
Housing Site C –	Environment	Possible contamination due to previous uses with potential to effect	This site is proposed to be allocated for around

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
AIT Brush Street 5 Consultees commented	Agency (summarised)	Leeds-Liverpool controlled waters. There is possibly an ordinary watercourse on site and Lancashire County Council should be consulted in relation to this, and the culvert, as the Lead Local Flood Authority	95 dwellings. The Preferred Options sets out the policies against which planning applications on allocated or non-allocated sites would be judged to ensure an appropriate quality of development including Policy NE5 Environmental Protection and CC4 and CC5 regarding flood risk and surface water management. Development of this site, whilst respecting the character of the local area, provides the opportunity to lower local densities, and provide greater levels of private amenity space and off street parking.
		This is a brownfield suite and development of the site would be good and appropriate planning. Could be developed along with a number of other sites in the area as long as sufficient amenity space is preserved.	
Housing Site D – Bank Hall Sports Ground 6 Consultees commented	Environment Agency (summarised)	Possible contamination due to previous uses with potential to impact on the River Brun and the Leeds – Liverpool Canal, which are controlled waters	This site is not proposed for allocation as it was considered to be 'unsuitable' and therefore 'not developable' through the SHLAA process. The principal reason was a lack of suitable and safe vehicular access.
	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	The access is located on the A682 Colne Road close to a canal bridge with vertical deflection that restricts visibility both for traffic on Colne Road and vehicles emerging from the site, which gives rise to significant highway concerns which do not support a residential development.	
		Loss of sports facility at the edge of an area of parkland. It is close to the Brun Valley Forest Park which should be given priority for ensuring green fingers to radiate from the town centre	
		Vehicular access onto Colne Road would be very poor, with poor sight lines on to a very busy road	
	The perimeter of the site supports scattered trees and the site is adjacent to semi-natural broadleaved woodland and the canal corridor that is a locally important wildlife corridor		
Housing Site E – Brownside Road and Lennox Street, Worsthorne	Environment Agency (summarised)	Source Protection Zones 2 and 3. Foul drainage will require connection to the main sewer	Part of this site is preferred for allocation for around 18 dwelling on a much reduced are from that set out in the Issues and Options document (53 dwellings). The larger site was not considered to be suitable due its visual impact and coalescing effect
	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	Lennox Street is constrained in width with no scope to improve and offers poor pedestrian access. Access should be served directly onto Brownside Road, without which there are significant highway	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
156 Consultees commented		concerns that do not support a residential development in this location. There is a school opposite which must be carefully considered in any proposals.	<p>Policy SP4: Development Strategy sets out a settlement hierarchy for the towns and villages of the Borough identifying their respective role and function, and the scale of development for housing, employment and retail. Development will be focussed on Burnley and Padiham with development of an appropriate scale supported in the main and small villages. To accommodate the level of development identified in policies SP2: Housing Land Requirement 2012-2032 and SP3: Employment Land Requirement 2012-2032 the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment provides evidence that these requirements cannot be met in full on previously developed sites, or on sites within the Urban Boundary as set out in the 2006 Burnley Local Plan. With this in mind, the Preferred Options Local Plan includes a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites and the new development boundaries for Burnley, Padiham, Worsthorne and Hapton include sites outside of the 2006 Burnley Local Plan urban boundary.</p> <p>The Preferred Options sets out the policies against which planning allocations on allocated or non-allocated sites would be judged to ensure an appropriate quality of development.</p> <p>A scheme of the highest quality is expected in line with Policies SP4 and SP5. Boundary treatments, screening and planting on the site in line with Policy NE3 will help reduce landscape impact. Due to the site being located within the setting of Worsthorne Conservation Area, development must also satisfy the requirements of Policy HE2.</p>
	Natural England (summarised)	<p>Site is approx. 1.5km from South Pennine Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest. This is part of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation, which are on European Wildlife Sites that form the Natura 2000 network. Habitats Regulation Assessments will be required.</p> <p>Not enough detailed information on the impacts of development against the conservation objectives of the South Pennine Moors SPA, SAC and SSSI, in particular: Bird disturbance – surveys for breeding birds should be undertaken between March and July, and should be undertaken at least once every two weeks during the breeding season. Birds are used to flying over the sites and could be impacted by development. Recreational pressure – it is important to note that the South Pennine Moors is an upland of international importance, and information needs to be provided to demonstrate how access will be limited to SAC / SPA habitats, i.e. encouraging visitors to less sensitive areas or alternative green space. Water resources – The South Pennine Moors supports specialist flora and fauna. As a result of additional sites, there could be a likely significant effect on this European designated site through water discharges. The site should be screened for LSE via water related pathways. More emphasis should have been given through the appraisal process, in terms of impacts, on nearby SPA, SAC and SSSI.</p>	
	United Utilities Property Services (summarised)	The site is not wholly suitable for residential development due to conservation and heritage constraints and the resultant urban sprawl. A sensitive redevelopment of part of the site with a lower density may be suitable. This would enable generous amounts of open space and recreation facilities to support some residential development at this site.	
	Worsthorne and Hurstwood Parish Council	Access from Brownside Road onto Lennox Street is poor, and the width of the junction is little more than a backstreet. Until recently the Parish Council believe it was un adopted, and not maintained to adoption standards. An application for development on Lennox	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
	(summarised)	Street was refused by the planning department as being inappropriate, and we cannot see what has changed. The allotment facing the school (now a wood yard) has had many applications refused – what has changed?	
	Others	The extra traffic going through the Brownside Dip will cause severe delays - already one side has to regularly give way at the two choke points where cars are allowed to park in front of the two terrace blocks. Highway safety will be compromised. In winter the village often gets cut off with the snow. Footpaths are also very narrow	
	Development will have a detrimental effect on the character of the village of Worsthorne, causing it to lose its aspirational appeal. Detrimental effect on the Conservation Area		
	Infrastructure, facilities and services in the village will not be able to cope with additional development. New development is not sustainable New development would require a doctors surgery		
	The school is over subscribed. Loss of playing field for redevelopment would be unacceptable		
	There are alternative brownfield sites which should be developed before sites in the Rural Area. These sites could provide the much needed affordable property for single people who can't afford transport or bungalows for our increasingly elderly population. There are also 3000 empty properties		
	The SHMA recommends only 5 – 8dpa in the Rural area. Large allocations in the Rural area would appear to contradict this		
	Development would result in over supply leading to a potential fall in house price values of the properties already in the area. The delivery of too many houses in a relatively short period of time would create instability with all its knock on negative effects.		
	Development would result in the loss of amenity for the residents of Worsthorne the loss of desirability of property in the area created by its unique location		
	Development would result in a large portion of open green space being removed and impinge on the Green Belt land. Significant impact on wildlife and the protected species that have been recorded		

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>Local deer pass through the area Loss of trees and hedgerows Bat survey would be required</p>	
		<p>Far too many houses which would simply mean a spread of the urban boundary and ribbon development into the countryside</p>	
		<p>Loss of Public Rights of Way into an urban setting with knock on effect for public health and recreational activities within the borough</p>	
		<p>Significant impact on cross town congestion from new residents accessing employment opportunities in the west of the Borough or further afield</p>	
		<p>There will be inevitable policing and security issues arising from this, such that the village will require a permanent Police presence, which Lancashire County Council have already advised cannot be funded.</p>	
		<p>Worsthorne is a tourist destination because of the greenspaces and walkways – this development would cancel out the income the village gets from visitors</p>	
		<p>Recent new development in the village has not sold in over 12 months since its completion – proving there is no need for this type of property in this village</p>	
		<p>Lack of amenities for youth. Reference previous issues with male youths in village – speak to PSCO</p>	
		<p>Need for development is questioned given the Borough's declining population</p>	
		<p>Development would result in the loss of an informal open area.</p>	
		<p>The noise and disturbance created from 53 extra homes would be significant</p>	
		<p>Parking in and around Worsthorne is already very difficult</p>	
		<p>There are no public transport links that would support commuting beyond the town – the first bus to leave the village in the morning means an arrival time in Manchester for example of 10.00 Generally poor public transport in Worsthorne. Homes should be built near to jobs Development would lead to a larger carbon footprint due to</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		increasing the miles that families commute to school, work and social events	
		The development of higher value housing would, over time, potentially prevent locals from remaining in the village as prices increase. Properties in Worsthorne are more expensive than other areas so who is the target market for the proposed development	
		Employment opportunities in Burnley will not provide the salaries which would extend to the typical prices of the houses developers would be planning for Worsthorne. If Burnley needs more houses, aside from the 2800 or so which stand empty then in the main lower cost houses for first time buyers and so called affordable housing is the way forward	
		Development would result in the loss of a playing field	
		Worsthorne is an aspirational place to live and building affordable housing would be out of character with the rest of the village	
		Development would be out character and out of scale with the adjacent conservation area. The development would not respond to historic patterns in the adjacent conservation area	
		If development happens home and car insurance will increase	
		The local plan needs to offer an attractive range of opportunities. Sites such as this can deliver a different mix of dwellings to more urban sites. Such sites will increase prospects for delivery over the plan period. The wider benefits of new investment need recognition. Housing development remains sales sensitive – sites must be attractive from a sales perspective. Development viability continues to be a challenge: allocating viable sites remains key in this housing market area..	
		Burnley Council must provide sufficient housing to meet its identified housing needs. This can be achieved on sites within the urban boundary. No need to develop on this site. The site is not needed to provide choice or affordable housing as there are sufficient existing and proposed housing sites	
		Development of this site does not represent sustainable development	
		Substantial levels of development will have a devastating effect on	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		the villages and place unsustainable pressure on local services	
Housing Site F – Brownside Road, Worsthorne 153 consultees commented	Natural England (summarised)	<p>Site is approx. 1.5km from South Pennine Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest. This is part of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation, which are on European Wildlife Sites that form the Natura 2000 network. Habitats Regulation Assessments will be required.</p> <p>Not enough detailed information on the impacts of development against the conservation objectives of the South Pennine Moors SPA, SAC and SSSI, in particular:</p> <p>Bird disturbance – surveys for breeding birds should be undertaken between March and July, and should be undertaken at least once every two weeks during the breeding season. Birds are used to flying over the sites and could be impacted by development.</p> <p>Recreational pressure – it is important to note that the South Pennine Moors is an upland of international importance, and information needs to be provided to demonstrate how access will be limited to SAC / SPA habitats, i.e. encouraging visitors to less sensitive areas or alternative green space.</p> <p>Water resources – The South Pennine Moors supports specialist flora and fauna. As a result of additional sites, there could be a likely significant effect on this European designated site through water discharges. The site should be screened for LSE via water related pathways.</p> <p>More emphasis should have been given through the appraisal process, in terms of impacts, on nearby SPA, SAC and SSSI.</p>	The site is not preferred for allocation as it was considered to be 'unsuitable' and therefore 'not developable' through the SHLAA process.
	United Utilities Property Services (summarised)	A sensitive redevelopment of part of the site with a lower density may be suitable. This would enable generous amounts of open space and recreation facilities to support some residential development at this site.	
	Worsthorne and Hurstwood Parish Council (summarised)	Development would bridge the gap between Worsthorne Village and the estates to the west. It would see the end of Worsthorne as a separate entity (as indicated in the rural masterplanning study, 2011), and increase the congestion feeding out of the village at peak times which would make the upper end of Brownside Road extremely busy.	
	Others	The extra traffic going through the Brownside Dip will cause severe delays - already one side has to regularly give way at the two choke	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>points where cars are allowed to park in front of the two terrace blocks Highway safety will be compromised. In winter the village often gets cut off with the snow Footpaths are also very narrow Dangerous camber on road at corner of Heckenhurst Avenue and Brownside Road</p>	
		<p>Development will have a detrimental effect on the character of the village of Worsthorne, causing it to lose its aspirational appeal The site provides a break between Lindsay Park and Worsthorne village centre and helps maintain the village heritage which is a conservation area with multiple grade 2 listed buildings. Developing this site would have an adverse effect on these sites</p>	
		<p>Infrastructure, facilities and services in the village will not be able to cope with additional development. New development is not sustainable New development would require a doctors surgery</p>	
		<p>The school is over subscribed. Loss of playing field for redevelopment would be unacceptable</p>	
		<p>Development would result in a large portion of open green space being removed and impinge on the Green Belt land. Significant impact on wildlife and the protected species that have been recorded Local deer pass through the area Loss of trees and hedgerows Bat survey would be required The land is important for agriculture Adverse effect on biodiversity and geodiversity</p>	
		<p>There are alternative brownfield sites which should be developed before sites in the Rural Area. These sites could provide the much needed affordable property for single people who can't afford transport or bungalows for our increasingly elderly population. There are also 3000 empty properties</p>	
		<p>There will be inevitable policing and security issues arising from this, such that the village will require a permanent Police presence, which Lancashire County Council have already advised cannot be funded</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Home and car insurance will increase	
		The noise and disturbance created from extra homes would be significant	
		Significant impact on cross town congestion from new residents accessing employment opportunities in the west of the Borough or further afield	
		Need for development is questioned given the Borough's declining population	
		Properties in Worsthorne are more expensive than other areas so who is the target market for the proposed development	
		Recent new development in the village has not sold in over 12 months since its completion – proving there is no need for this type of property in this village	
		Development would result in over supply leading to a potential fall in house price values of the properties already in the area. The delivery of too many houses in a relatively short period of time would create instability with all its knock on negative effects.	
		The SHMA recommends only 5 – 8dpa in the Rural area. Large allocations in the Rural area would appear to contradict this	
		Development would result in the loss of amenity for the residents of Worsthorne the loss of desirability of property in the area created by its unique location	
		Parking in and around Worsthorne is already very difficult	
		Employment opportunities in Burnley will not provide the salaries which would extend to the typical prices of the houses developers would be planning for Worsthorne. If Burnley needs more houses, aside from the 2800 or so which stand empty then in the main lower cost houses for first time buyers and so called affordable housing is the way forward	
		Worsthorne is a tourist destination because of the greenspaces and walkways – this development would cancel out the income the village gets from visitors	
		Loss of Public Rights of Way into an urban setting with knock on effect for public health and recreational activities within the borough	
		Far too many houses which would simply mean a spread of the	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		urban boundary and ribbon development into the countryside	
		Worsthorne is an aspirational place to live and building affordable housing would be out of character with the rest of the village Development of a housing estate would be completely out of character	
		Worsthorne is not a village to commute to the motorway as many of Burnley's roads are grid locked now at most times of the day New employment development is on the West of the town so new housing should be built there	
		Infrastructure, facilities and services in the village will not be able to cope with additional development. New development is not sustainable New development would require a doctors surgery	
		Lack of amenities for youth. Reference previous issues with male youths in village – speak to PSCO	
		There will be an adverse effect on local listed buildings and conservation areas	
		Generally poor public transport in Worsthorne There are no public transport links that would support commuting beyond the town – the first bus to leave the village in the morning means an arrival time in Manchester for example of 10.00 Last year the bus service was cut back and nearly stopped. The building of new houses would only add to the strain of this service	
		The development of higher value housing would, over time, potentially prevent locals from remaining in the village as prices increase.	
		The access road for construction vehicles to the building sites would be dangerous. The vibrations of these vehicles could cause damage to resident's properties.	
		Burnley Council must provide sufficient housing to meet its identified housing needs. This can be achieved on sites within the urban boundary. No need to develop on this site. The site is not needed to provide choice or affordable housing as there are sufficient existing and proposed housing sites	
		Development of this site does not represent sustainable development	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Substantial levels of development will have a devastating effect on the villages and place unsustainable pressure on local services	
		The local plan needs to offer an attractive range of opportunities. Sites such as this can deliver a different mix of dwellings to more urban sites. Such sites will increase prospects for delivery over the plan period. The wider benefits of new investment need recognition. Housing development remains sales sensitive – sites must be attractive from a sales perspective. Development viability continues to be a challenge: allocating viable sites remains key in this housing market area.	
		The site is available - in single ownership with a willing land owner	
		The site is suitable – development at this location would represent an appropriate and suitable extension to Lindsay Park Road, rounding off of the settlement. The site is in close proximity to Worsthorne and Burnley, which offer a range of services and facilities for residents. The site is also adjacent to a school	
		No technical constraints would preclude residential development. The site is therefore achievable with a realistic prospect of delivering housing in the next five years	
Housing Site G – Butchers Farm	Environment Agency (summarised)	There is an ordinary watercourse on site and Lancashire County Council should be consulted in relation to this as Lead Local Flood Authority	The site is not preferred. Part of the site is included within Worsthorne Development Boundary. The remainder is considered to be unsuitable and therefore not developable in the SHLAA.
153 consultees commented	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	Access unclear – if it is the current farm access, sightlines may be an issue.	
	United Utilities Property Services (summarised)	The site is not considered suitable for residential development due to location, highways, and connectivity with the existing centre.	
	Worsthorne and Hurstwood Parish Council (summarised)	This would result in intolerable traffic issues in the village centre, with poor access onto Ormerod Street from the development, and Ormerod Street taking much additional traffic, which it is not designed to.	
	Others	The site is predominantly isolated from the settlement of Worsthorne and would create a southern spur to the settlement to	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		the detriment of the character and appearance of the settlement	
		<p>The extra traffic going through the Brownside Dip will cause severe delays - already one side has to regularly give way at the two choke points where cars are allowed to park in front of the two terrace blocks</p> <p>Highway safety will be compromised. In winter the village often gets cut off with the snow</p> <p>Footpaths are also very narrow</p> <p>Dangerous camber on road at corner of Heckenhurst Avenue and Brownside Road</p>	
		<p>Development will have a detrimental effect on the character of the village of Worsthorne, causing it to lose its aspirational appeal</p> <p>The site provides a break between Lindsay Park and Worsthorne village centre and helps maintain the village heritage which is a conservation area with multiple grade 2 listed buildings. Developing this site would have an adverse effect on these sites</p>	
		<p>Infrastructure, facilities and services in the village will not be able to cope with additional development. New development is not sustainable</p> <p>New development would require a doctors surgery</p>	
		<p>The school is over subscribed. Loss of playing field for redevelopment would be unacceptable</p>	
		<p>Development would result in a large portion of open green space being removed and impinge on the Green Belt land.</p> <p>Significant impact on wildlife and the protected species that have been recorded</p> <p>Local deer pass through the area</p> <p>Loss of trees and hedgerows</p> <p>Bat survey would be required</p> <p>The land is important for agriculture</p> <p>Adverse effect on biodiversity and geodiversity</p>	
		<p>There are alternative brownfield sites which should be developed before sites in the Rural Area. These sites could provide the much needed affordable property for single people who can't afford transport or bungalows for our increasingly elderly population.</p> <p>There are also 3000 empty properties</p>	
		<p>There will be inevitable policing and security issues arising from</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		this, such that the village will require a permanent Police presence, which Lancashire County Council have already advised cannot be funded	
		Home and car insurance will increase	
		The noise and disturbance created from extra homes would be significant	
		Significant impact on cross town congestion from new residents accessing employment opportunities in the west of the Borough or further afield	
		Need for development is questioned given the Borough's declining population	
		Properties in Worsthorne are more expensive than other areas so who is the target market for the proposed development	
		Recent new development in the village has not sold in over 12 months since its completion – proving there is no need for this type of property in this village	
		Development would result in over supply leading to a potential fall in house price values of the properties already in the area. The delivery of too many houses in a relatively short period of time would create instability with all its knock on negative effects.	
		The SHMA recommends only 5 – 8dpa in the Rural area. Large allocations in the Rural area would appear to contradict this	
		Development would result in the loss of amenity for the residents of Worsthorne the loss of desirability of property in the area created by its unique location	
		Parking in and around Worsthorne is already very difficult	
		Employment opportunities in Burnley will not provide the salaries which would extend to the typical prices of the houses developers would be planning for Worsthorne. If Burnley needs more houses, aside from the 2800 or so which stand empty then in the main lower cost houses for first time buyers and so called affordable housing is the way forward	
		Worsthorne is a tourist destination because of the greenspaces and walkways – this development would cancel out the income the village gets from visitors	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Loss of Public Rights of Way into an urban setting with knock on effect for public health and recreational activities within the borough	
		Far too many houses which would simply mean a spread of the urban boundary and ribbon development into the countryside	
		Worsthorne is an aspirational place to live and building affordable housing would be out of character with the rest of the village Development of a housing estate would be completely out of character	
		Worsthorne is not a village to commute to the motorway as many of Burnley's roads are grid locked now at most times of the day New employment development is on the West of the town so new housing should be built there	
		Infrastructure, facilities and services in the village will not be able to cope with additional development. New development is not sustainable New development would require a doctors surgery	
		Lack of amenities for youth. Reference previous issues with male youths in village – speak to PSCO	
		There will be an adverse effect on local listed buildings and conservation areas	
		Generally poor public transport in Worsthorne There are no public transport links that would support commuting beyond the town – the first bus to leave the village in the morning means an arrival time in Manchester for example of 10.00 Last year the bus service was cut back and nearly stopped. The building of new houses would only add to the strain of this service	
		The development of higher value housing would, over time, potentially prevent locals from remaining in the village as prices increase.	
		The access road for construction vehicles to the building sites would be dangerous. The vibrations of these vehicles could cause damage to resident's properties.	
		Burnley Council must provide sufficient housing to meet its identified housing needs. This can be achieved on sites within the urban boundary. No need to develop on this site. The site is not needed to provide choice or affordable housing as	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		there are sufficient existing and proposed housing sites	
		Development of this site does not represent sustainable development	
		Substantial levels of development will have a devastating effect on the villages and place unsustainable pressure on local services	
		The local plan needs to offer an attractive range of opportunities. Sites such as this can deliver a different mix of dwellings to more urban sites. Such sites will increase prospects for delivery over the plan period. The wider benefits of new investment need recognition. Housing development remains sales sensitive – sites must be attractive from a sales perspective. Development viability continues to be a challenge: allocating viable sites remains key in this housing market area.	
		The site is available - in single ownership with a willing land owner. The existing activities can be relocated and incorporated into other nearby farms operated by the landowner ensuring no loss of employment	
		The site is suitable – Residential development on this site would cause less harm to character and amenity of the surrounding area than the existing use and be to the betterment of the existing environment. The continuation of new housing into the greenfield element provides a logical rounding off and natural extension to the settlement.	
		No technical constraints would preclude residential development. The site is therefore achievable with a realistic prospect of delivering housing in the next five years	
		Flood Zones 2 and 3 – sequential test and exception test required. An 8m easement from the top of the bank of the River Calder will be required.	
		Wildlife issues would be compromised. Protected species have been recorded on the site	
		This land is possibly the best agricultural land in the borough. What a waste to build on it!	
		The site is a greenfield site in the in the Green Belt	
		This is probably the most sensible site proposed as there is direct	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>access to the M65 and it's in a relatively unpopulated area of Burnley.</p> <p>Access to the M65 is ok however if the new home owners work in Nelson and Colne. If not, then the additional traffic will add to that already struggling past Halfords or B&M stores at busy times of the day.</p> <p>There is a major gas main running across the middle of the site.</p> <p>Development would devalue nearby properties</p> <p>Development would have a negative effect on the landscapes character and vista across the valley floor towards Pendle</p> <p>The site has no access to public transport</p> <p>Development of the site would require a lot of infrastructure – using up resources</p> <p>The site has no nearby schools, shops or other facilities</p> <p>Development is supported as it demonstrates and builds on the significance of the M65 corridor and the Government's investment in it through Lancashire's Growth Deal</p>	
Housing Site H – Land South of Crow Wood	Environment Agency (summarised)	Flood zones 2 & 3 – sequential test and exception test required. An 8m easement from the top of the bank of the River Calder would be required.	This site is not proposed for allocation as it was considered to be contrary to national policy and therefore 'Excluded' through the SHLAA process as it would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	No local amenities and no convenient public transport. The site is isolated by the canal and M65, which would require a reliance on private cars for transport.	
		May request a school nearby due to proposed size of the site.	
		Part of the proposal is on a floodplain (zone 2 & 3), which will impact on local hydrology.	
		Protected species have been recorded on this site	
		This is possibly the boroughs best agricultural land – what a shame to build on it!	
		This is within the green belt	
		This is a sensible site due to its proximity to the M65 and the relatively unpopulated nature of the area.	
	Access to the M65 is ok if people work in Colne or Nelson, however heavy traffic will build up at peak times near Halford or B&M.		

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Development will affect wildlife on the site.	
		There may be a major gas main running across the middle of the site.	
		Proposals will have an impact on house prices and the view from adjacent properties.	
		The noise from building would be a considerable nuisance.	
		There would be a negative impact on landscape character.	
		Wildlife issues would be compromised, affecting Springwood and Oswald Street biological sites, and there will be a negative impact on the River Calder wildlife corridor.	
		The river is a natural boundary which should be the limit of development and the motorway is a created boundary that should be observed in this valley location.	
		There is no access to public transport, and the site is rural in nature.	
		It is likely the aspirational nature of the houses will mean SA3 and SA10 are not fulfilled.	
		It will not reduce the need to travel (SA4)	
		A lot of infrastructure will need to be built, including a bridge to access the site. This will also create CO2 emissions.	
		This is against SA14 due to being greenfield.	
		The first flood event will be a problem for insurance	
		This contradicts SA13	
		There are no nearby shops, schools or other facilities.	
		The site access would likely impact on Gannow roundabout traffic.	
		A possible alternative would be to link to Barden Lane via Lower Manor Lane, which gives a link to Barrowford Road.	
		The site is broadly supported as they demonstrate and build on the significance of the M65 and the governments investment in it.	
		The council already has more sites than is required through the NPPF.	
Housing Site I – Craggs Farm,	Padiham Town Council	Object to the proposals: Site performs an important residential amenity for the surrounding	Whilst the site was considered be 'developable' in the SHLAA for 10 dwellings it is not proposed

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
<p>Padiham</p> <p>53 Consultees commented</p>	(summarised)	<p>houses, and the value to the residents of the gardens is immense and irreplaceable. There is evidence that additional residents would make use of the site for a smallholding, if given the opportunity. The part used for gardens is mainly former grazing land and the grass types would suggest it is generally wet and unimproved. This part also has trees on it – mature sycamore, birch and ash. To bulldoze the mature, well cared for and long standing gardens and to lose this beautiful green space to bricks and tarmac would be vandalism.</p> <p>The felling of trees would have a negative impact on the considerable wildlife present. Birds include sparrows, starlings, blackbirds, robins, magpies, collared doves, wrens, tits and owls. A previous planning application was refused in 2009, and appeal rejected by the planning inspectorate.</p> <p>Traffic access from Blackburn Road and Whalley Road is impractical and dangerous. To attempt to put access onto Vicarage Avenue (short and one way) would be a nightmare and create a dangerous blind corner onto Whalley Road.</p> <p>There should be identified need and lack of brownfield sites, before greenfield development is considered. That is not the case here. Padiham already has had consultation over Baxi and Wyre Street, and there are opportunities at Perseverance Mill, as well as the new development at Station Road. Perseverance Mill would no doubt be welcomed by nearby residents. Padiham has more than played its part as a housing provider for Burnley.</p> <p>There is no need to lose this site for the sake of 20 houses.</p>	<p>for allocation as other sites were preferred to the loss of this attractive open space in an area of high density housing.</p>
	Others	<p>Loss of amenity for existing homes – loss of mature gardens thereby altering the character of the area.</p> <p>This piece of land contributes to the health and well-being of families and the elderly and a great deal of money has been spent on the gardens that exist on this area.</p>	
		<p>Traffic congestion – additional vehicles adding to the already congested road network</p> <p>The site cannot be safely accessed.</p>	
		<p>The development would have a disproportionately adverse impact on the green belt and the character of the area.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land as a continuum of the threat to build on the green belt land on Blackburn Road.</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		This site is of strategic importance in maintaining the green belt The green belt boundary should be altered to include this land	
		Development of a nursing home previously refused and appeal dismissed on amenity and traffic grounds	
		There are numerous alternative Brownfield sites which should be developed before greenfield sites – promoting the gentrification of the town	
		Detrimental impact on the wildlife present on site Individual garden plots maintaining the flora and fauna and encouraging wildlife which would be lost if developed for unrequired housing The site provides an important habitat for numerous species of animals and birds	
		Householders of nearby houses would lose their gardens just to provide gardens for any new houses built there	
		There are a number of houses sites already being built or proposed in Padiham. There is no need for more	
		Parking is already an issue	
		Increased noise and light pollution	
		Development would have an adverse impact on the setting of Craggs Farmhouse	
		Concern over level of development in Padiham and the impact on school places and access to local doctors surgeries and local infrastructure	
		New development would not be in keeping with the large Victorian terraces currently in the area	
		Loss of privacy for existing residents	
		The field is prone to flooding and part of the site is like a swamp. Unlikely to support new development due to ground conditions	
		Burnley Council must provide sufficient housing to meet its identified housing needs. This can be achieved on sites within the urban boundary. No need to develop on this site on the urban fringe. The site is not needed to provide choice or affordable housing as there are sufficient existing and proposed housing sites	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>This is a small site which would be appropriate for larger executive houses</p> <p>It is bounded on three sides by existing housing and a natural line between the farm and Arbory Street limits the area for development.</p> <p>Good access to the site on three roads would not cause severe problems</p> <p>This site is an infill site close to a bus route and Memorial Road. The style and materials used in the buildings should be sensitive to the styles and materials of the existing properties. Respect should be shown to listed buildings. It is also close to shops and within walking distance of St Leonards School.</p> <p>This small site would seem suitable for housing. The site has convenient parkland on the South Side of Blackburn Road and is close to existing industrial estates for employment possibilities</p> <p>Development of this site and other potential employment sites in the area will have a destabilising effect on the local housing market</p>	
<p>Housing Site J – Grove Lane, Padiham</p> <p>9 Consultees commented</p>		<p>The site is an important site for nature – an important habitat for wildlife</p> <p>There are plenty of alternative sites in Padiham and an abundance of traditional terraced houses available to rent and buy</p> <p>Development will lead to a depreciation in values of nearby houses</p> <p>Part of the site is allotments which should be protected.</p> <p>The site has steeply sloping ground and is a natural boundary between residential and poorer mixed industrial uses and forms a good buffer zone.</p> <p>This small site is an excellent place to develop housing in Padiham. It is close to the town centre with access to shops, banks, open space, walks along the river, community centres, pubs and medical centres. It is also close to the mainline bus route. Although this is claimed to be a greenfield site – it lies inside a built up area and may have never been developed because of the steep sloping site.</p> <p>This small site would seem suitable for housing if the industrial site to the south would not lead to unacceptable nuisance and the loss of the greenspace would not be important to the surrounding</p>	<p>Whilst the site was considered be ‘developable’ in the SHLAA it is not proposed for allocation as other sites were preferred.</p>

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		housing The National Trust does not from its perspective object in principle to this site. However, if this site is taken forward for residential development then it will be important to ensure that its development respects its location in terms of the scale, mass, appearance and materials of the new development - in particular having regard to the character and significance of nearby buildings within the Conservation Area. Suitable for 13 properties. Area at present in a bad state and the allotments not used and been left to rot. In the past houses were on part of the site - new houses would improve the area.	
Housing Site K – Heckenhurst Reservoir	Environment Agency (summarised)	Former landfill site – possible contamination issues with potential to impact on Swinden Water, which is a controlled water.	Part of this site together with part of another site put forward separately is proposed to be allocated for around 60 dwellings HS1/15.
183 Consultees commented	Natural England (summarised)	Site is approx. 1.5km from South Pennine Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest. This is part of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation, which are on European Wildlife Sites that form the Natura 2000 network. Habitats Regulation Assessments will be required. Not enough detailed information on the impacts of development against the conservation objectives of the South Pennine Moors SPA, SAC and SSSI, in particular: Bird disturbance – surveys for breeding birds should be undertaken between March and July, and should be undertaken at least once every two weeks during the breeding season. Birds are used to flying over the sites and could be impacted by development. Recreational pressure – it is important to note that the South Pennine Moors is an upland of international importance, and information needs to be provided to demonstrate how access will be limited to SAC / SPA habitats, i.e. encouraging visitors to less sensitive areas or alternative green space. Water resources – The South Pennine Moors supports specialist flora and fauna. As a result of additional sites, there could be a likely significant effect on this European designated site through water discharges. The site should be screened for LSE via water related pathways. More emphasis should have been given through the appraisal	Policy SP4: Development Strategy sets out a settlement hierarchy for the towns and villages of the Borough identifying their respective role and function, and the scale of development for housing, employment and retail. Development will be focussed on Burnley and Padiham with development of an appropriate scale supported in the main and small villages. To accommodate the level of development identified in policies SP2: Housing Land Requirement 2012-2032 and SP3: Employment Land Requirement 2012-2032 the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment provides evidence that these requirements cannot be met in full on previously developed sites, or on sites within the Urban Boundary as set out in the 2006 Burnley Local Plan. With this in mind, the Preferred Options Local Plan includes a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites and the new development boundaries for Burnley, Padiham, Worsthorne and Hapton include sites outside of the 2006 Burnley Local Plan urban boundary.

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		process, in terms of impacts, on nearby SPA, SAC and SSSI.	
	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	Access to the village is restricted to three routes, two of which are single track in places with 60mph derestricted speed limit. The third is via Brownside Road, which has a length over which traffic is restricted to one way working at two locations due to parked cars where residents have no parking facilities. If development does come forward, significant investment would be expected to overcome some of these issues in the interests of highway safety, sustainable access and amenity.	The comments and concerns are noted. The issues raised have been considered in preparing the SHLAA and in selecting sites considered to be 'developable' in the SHLAA to be included in the Preferred Options. This site is preferred.
	United Utilities Property Services (summarised)	The site is available, suitable and viable for residential development due to the connectivity and access with the existing centre. A creative and less intensive density development would provide opportunities for new open space and public realm.	The Preferred Options sets out the policies against which planning allocations on allocated or non-allocated sites would be judged to ensure an appropriate quality of development.
	Worsthorne and Hurstwood Parish Council (summarised)	There is one means of access, along Heckenhurst Avenue which in turn leads off Brownside Road. This is an inadequate point of access. Heckenhurst Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac and there will be significant traffic management and road safety issues if it is expected to carry more traffic. All that traffic will feed into Brownside Road, which is now at capacity. The lower part from Downfield Avenue to Brownside bridge is very narrow with an inadequate pavement. The reservoir was retired in the 1980s, when it was filled and grassed over. There may be issues with contamination, subsidence etc, plus consideration must be given to environmental issues including wildlife.	A scheme of the highest quality is expected in line with Policies SP4 and SP5 and lower density housing is preferred not only to provide quality and choice, but to provide a greater opportunity for landscaping, planting and minimising impacts. The site area has been reduced from that submitted in the Issues & Options Additional Sites Consultation to lessen its impact and make the site better conform to the existing boundaries.
	Others	The extra traffic going through the Brownside Dip will cause severe delays - already one side has to regularly give way at the two choke points where cars are allowed to park in front of the two terrace blocks Highway safety will be compromised. In winter the village often gets cut off with the snow Footpaths are also very narrow Former landfill site. Possible contamination issues with potential to impact on Swinden Water, which is a controlled water. Development will have a detrimental effect on the character of the village of Worsthorne, causing it to lose its aspirational appeal	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>Infrastructure, facilities and services in the village will not be able to cope with additional development. New development is not sustainable</p>	
		<p>New development would require a doctors surgery</p>	
		<p>The school is over subscribed.</p>	
		<p>There are alternative brownfield sites which should be developed before sites in the Rural Area. These sites could provide the much needed affordable property for single people who can't afford transport or bungalows for our increasingly elderly population. There are also 3000 empty properties</p>	
		<p>The SHMA recommends only 5 – 8dpa in the Rural area. Large allocations in the Rural area would appear to contradict this</p>	
		<p>Development would result in over supply leading to a potential fall in house price values of the properties already in the area. The delivery of too many houses in a relatively short period of time would create instability with all its knock on negative effects.</p>	
		<p>Development would result in the loss of amenity for the residents of Worsthorne the loss of desirability of property in the area created by its unique location</p>	
		<p>Development would result in a large portion of open green space being removed and impinge on the Green Belt land. The land is currently used for farming Significant impact on wildlife and the protected species that have been recorded Local deer pass through the area Loss of trees and hedgerows Bat survey would be required</p>	
		<p>Far too many houses which would simply mean a spread of the urban boundary and ribbon development into the countryside</p>	
		<p>Loss of Public Rights of Way into an urban setting with knock on effect for public health and recreational activities within the borough</p>	
		<p>Significant impact on cross town congestion from new residents accessing employment opportunities in the west of the Borough or further afield</p>	
		<p>The type of people that will be living in these houses may not meet the level of behaviour needed in Worsthorne.</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		There will be inevitable policing and security issues arising from this, such that the village will require a permanent Police presence, which Lancashire County Council have already advised cannot be funded.	
		Worsthorne is a tourist destination because of the greenspaces and walkways – this development would cancel out the income the village gets from visitors	
		Recent new development in the village has not sold in over 12 months since its completion – proving there is no need for this type of property in this village	
		Source Protection Zones 2 and 3. Foul drainage will require connection to the main sewer	
		Lack of amenities for youth. Reference previous issues with male youths in village – speak to PSCO	
		Need for development is questioned given the Borough's declining population	
		Development would result in the loss of an informal open area.	
		The noise and disturbance created from 53 extra homes would be significant	
		Parking in and around Worsthorne is already very difficult	
		There are no public transport links that would support commuting beyond the town – the first bus to leave the village in the morning means an arrival time in Manchester for example of 10.00 Generally poor public transport in Worsthorne. Homes should be built near to jobs Development would lead to a larger carbon footprint due to increasing the miles that families commute to school, work and social events	
		The development of higher value housing would, over time, potentially prevent locals from remaining in the village as prices increase. Properties in Worsthorne are more expensive than other areas so who is the target market for the proposed development	
		Employment opportunities in Burnley will not provide the salaries which would extend to the typical prices of the houses developers	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		would be planning for Worsthorne. If Burnley needs more houses, aside from the 2800 or so which stand empty then in the main lower cost houses for first time buyers and so called affordable housing is the way forward	
		Development would result in the loss of a playing field	
		Worsthorne is an aspirational place to live and building affordable housing would be out of character with the rest of the village	
		Development would be out character and out of scale with the adjacent conservation area. The development would not respond to historic patterns in the adjacent conservation area	
		If development happens home and car insurance will increase	
		The local plan needs to offer an attractive range of opportunities. Sites such as this can deliver a different mix of dwellings to more urban sites. Such sites will increase prospects for delivery over the plan period. The wider benefits of new investment need recognition. Housing development remains sales sensitive – sites must be attractive from a sales perspective. Development viability continues to be a challenge: allocating viable sites remains key in this housing market area.	
		Burnley Council must provide sufficient housing to meet its identified housing needs. This can be achieved on sites within the urban boundary. No need to develop on this site. The site is not needed to provide choice or affordable housing as there are sufficient existing and proposed housing sites	
		Development of this site does not represent sustainable development	
		Substantial levels of development will have a devastating effect on the villages and place unsustainable pressure on local services	
		Harle Syke has been ruined by building extra housing. We will not allow this to happen to Worsthorne	
		Development is supported as it demonstrates and builds on the significance of the M65 corridor and the Government's investment in it through Lancashire's Growth Deal	
		Before building work starts a new major road needs to be constructed from Brunshaw Road, Ridge Road or Heasandford as	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>Brownside Road and Heckenhurst Avenue will get too congested especially when hundreds of people are living in the properties</p> <p>Of the sites proposed in the vicinity of Worsthorne this site has a number of advantages – it would make the greatest contribution to the Council's housing requirement figure, access arrangements are relatively straight forward, it would not lead to a merger with the village of Worsthorne, it would be unlikely to contribute further to traffic issues experienced within the village of Worsthorne, particularly in vicinity of the school</p> <p>This country is overcrowded. Reducing the population is the answer to the problem, not building more houses</p> <p>Pay the highest council tax for the privilege of living in a village. I don't wish for any changes to be made here in Worsthorne</p> <p>The site would be a natural extension to the existing Brownside centre and would not result in urban sprawl due to topography and existing boundary treatments</p> <p>The site can be accessed from a number of points along the eastern boundary. The site is therefore suitable in access terms</p> <p>Development will support existing infrastructure and public transport services without compromising the character and appearance of the independent settlements</p> <p>Opportunity for lower density development and create areas of accessible green infrastructure to maintain the character and appearance of the area whilst assisting with the delivery of a range of housing types at this location</p> <p>Development will not harm the overall rural provision or compromise the setting of Listing Buildings owing to the existing landscape screening surrounding these assets</p>	
<p>Additional Housing Site L – Copy Wood, New Road</p> <p>22 Consultees Commented</p>	<p>Cliviger Parish Council (summarised)</p>	<p>There are numerous brownfield sites which means there is ample land for development. Population projections suggest a stagnation or loss of population between 2012 – 2037, and so who is the land being earmarked for? Proposals are spurious, short term opportunism which will be damaging to the physical and economic wellbeing of Cliviger.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an isolated greenfield site without modern infrastructure with a history of mining activity. • The area is adjacent to an area of archaeological interest at 	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation as it was considered to be contrary to national policy and therefore 'Excluded' through the SHLAA process as it would represent development in the open countryside unrelated to an existing settlement.</p>

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>Everage Clough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is dissected by three cloughs which feed into the Brun and Calder. • The flora, fauna would be lost – Burnley is short of protected sites. • The site lies at a major junction adjacent to the A6476/A671. Access onto the site would cause severe congestion and be extremely dangerous – and would also fall between a four way junction and the access to New Copy Farm and cottages. • This would be an unnecessary loss of agricultural land – although due to its neglect it may have become an area of species rich grassland and should be retained. • This would be a new and unnecessary isolated settlement, outside the urban boundary and without any links to the current Cliviger community – and would become a dormitory settlement. • Urban sprawl will degrade the character of the landscape, and development should focus on the existing urban boundary. 	
	Environment Agency (summarised)	Possible contamination due to previous uses with a potential to contaminate the River Calder, which is a controlled water. There is an ordinary watercourse on site, and Lancashire County Council should be consulted in relation to this and the culvert as lead flood authority.	
	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	No local amenities or public transport opportunities, which would require a reliance on private cars for transport.	
		May request a school nearby due to the number of houses proposed.	
	United Utilities Property Services (summarised)	The site is considered unsuitable and unviable for residential development due to the isolated nature of the site, landscape impacts and topography changes.	
	Others	Better to build on brown sites.	
		Traveller sites would be better suited on edge of town nearer to countryside of Cliviger.	
		Isolated greenfield site without modern infrastructure with history of mining activity, runs counter to sustainable development. Site in open countryside and poorly related to existing urban boundary and	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		built form settlement.	
		Adjacent to area of archaeological and historical interest – Warren at Everage Clough – scheduled ancient monument.	
		Site dissected by 3 cloughs that feed the Brun and Calder. Building would compromise watercourses and ecology/flora/fauna.	
		Adjacent to A646/A671 and a major junction. Severe congestion and dangerous as access would fall between a four way junction.	
		No public transport, bus stop a long way off	
		Schools full within area/no schools nearby/not a safe journey for children to walk to school (excluded from walking bus activities)	
		Not close to amenities, leisure centres etc	
		Unnecessary loss of agricultural land	
		Possible contamination due to previous uses with potential to contaminate River Calder	
		Ordinary watercourse/culvert on site – LCC should be consulted	
		Consider for a traveller site	
		More housing needed with a declining population?	
		Ideal place for housing as excellent transport links to several areas such as Todmorden, Bacup, M65, town centre and Cliviger.	
		No overload of traffic as numerous roads lead from the site to various directions.	
		Sits on urban boundary and does not encroach on rural landscape.	
		Well served with good community facilities such as schools, leisure areas like Towneley park and several bus routes.	
		Situated near Lancashire/Yorkshire trainline.	
		Houses would be in-keeping with other houses already built on New Road/Glen View Road and estate behind it.	
		Site would not over-burdensome primary schools that are at full capacity as many schools are easily accessible from this site.	
		Topography of site does not readily lend itself to sympathetic residential development which would become a prominent feature in the open countryside. Significant screening would be required to protect or enhance landscape.	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		May compromise a designated wildlife corridor.	
		Problematic access without adjustments to the speed limit and associated highway works.	
		Would be a new settlement	
		A646 would need acoustic/visual screening so as to not detrimentally impact residential amenity.	
		Viability constraints due to significant change in levels from road to site.	
		Site can deliver a different mix of dwellings to more urban sites	
		Close proximity to Towneley Park/Timber Hill an issue	
		People without a car would live in isolation	
		'Green belt' land	
		Site supports semi-natural broadleaved woodland, scattered trees/shrubs, a river with a waterfall and marshy grassland.	
Employment Sites			
M – Land south of Network 65	Environment Agency (summarised)	Small area of the site is in Flood Zone 2 and 3. Site is adjacent to a former landfill site.	To help achieve sustainable development a balance must be sought between the environment and social considerations and economic growth. Policy SP4: Development Strategy sets out a settlement hierarchy for the towns and villages of the Borough identifying their respective role and function, and the scale of development for housing, employment and retail. Development will be focussed on Burnley and Padiham with development of an appropriate scale supported in the main and small villages. To accommodate the level of development identified in policy SP3: Employment Land Requirement 2012-2032 the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment provides evidence that these requirements cannot be met in full on previously developed
	Hapton Parish Council (summarised)	The industrial site is adequate for demand. There are unoccupied units, and some will be moving to Burnley Bridge. The green belt around Hapton should be maintained to keep the identity as a village. The gradual encroachment of industry onto the greenbelt should stop now. The A679 already suffers heavy traffic which will grow with the addition of Burnley Bridge – there is only one way exit / entrance to the M65 at J9 and this does not need extra traffic. There is a lot of industry proposed at Hapton, and little elsewhere.	
	Lancashire County Council (summarised)	The site is near to J9 of the M65 which is programmed for capacity improvements. The Local Plan as it progresses should, where possible, take forward sites that demonstrate and support the significance of the M65 corridor and the governments investment in it.	
		Extension would dramatically change the rural aspect of Hapton.	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Use of greenfield sites would be detrimental to the community not to mention the wildlife.	<p>sites, or on sites within the Urban Boundary as set out in the 2006 Burnley Local Plan. With this in mind, the Preferred Options Local Plan includes a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites and the new development boundaries for Burnley, Padiham, Worsthorne and Hapton including sites outside of the 2006 Burnley Local Plan urban boundary.</p> <p>A variety of sites have been identified for employment use across the borough in the preferred option to support economic growth. This site is proposed to be allocated and requires the development, in density, layout and building design to take into account the topography of the site and the surrounding landscape, its landscape setting and the site's ecological importance. Screen planting is expected as part of a wider landscaping scheme at the south western, south eastern and northern boundaries of the site to restrict/reduce the impact of any development on the adjacent residential properties and surrounding landscape.</p> <p>The site has been enlarged since the Issues & Options Additional Sites consultation.</p> <p>The Preferred Options sets out the policies against which planning applications on allocated or non-allocated sites would be judged to ensure an appropriate quality of development.</p>
		More suitable brownfield sites within Burnley which must be considered first.	
		Inappropriate as it is a greenfield site in the rural area used for productive agriculture.	
		Close proximity of Pollard Moor, Thornybank Clough and Houghton Hey Plantation County Biological Heritage Sites and Lowerhouse Lodges Local Nature Reserve. Protected species were recorded at the site in July 2014 and it forms part of the important wildlife links network for these designated wildlife sites.	
		Concerned about locating significant development in greenfield/rural areas, where the public transport infrastructure is unlikely to offer a viable alternative to private car travel.	
		The spatial distribution of the Local Plan should broadly reflect the Burnley-Pendle Growth Corridor described in the Lancashire Strategic Economic Plan, i.e. along the M65 corridor.	
		LEP broadly supports the identified additional sites including land to the south of Network 65 for employment. This site demonstrates and builds on the significance of the M65 Corridor and the Government's investment in it through the Lancashire Growth Deal.	
		There is availability on all the current industrial/business parks in the area.	
		Green belt land – Network 65 designated farmland. Green belt at Hapton should be maintained to help keep identity as a village.	
		Excessive and increased traffic on all roads. A679 already suffers from heavy traffic which will grow with addition of Burnley Bridge.	
		Blot on the landscape – acres of steel sheds used for warehousing with loss of ecology. Warehouse sprawl through Altham/Simonstone to Padiham.	
		No significant increase in jobs – very few operatives needed for warehousing. Will not attract white collar workers.	
		Increased noise and light pollution	
		At least Network 65 is not designated as green belt land which makes it a better proposition.	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Prominent site and existing site should remain the limit	
		Some unit occupiers moving to Burnley Bridge, therefore space will become available in existing units.	
		Lot of industrial development at Hapton but not elsewhere in borough. Hapton with Park has already accommodated a large amount of industrial development. Any further development would dramatically change the rural aspect of the ward.	
		Happiness, health and wellbeing of Hapton's population would be affected by any extension as these areas operate as a green lung.	
		Rural areas provide resources for walkers, cyclists and horse riders and are crucial for promoting Hapton and the borough as a desirable place to live and visit.	
		Area forms part of green infrastructure promoting health and wellbeing, supporting biodiversity, wildlife and influencing property prices.	
		Green areas crucial to contain build-up of the urban and industrial areas of Burnley and to prevent coalescence with Hapton and neighbouring Hyndburn.	
		Hapton's reputation as a desirable place to live would be lessened and property prices affected. People are planning to move/ not consider living in Hapton due to industrial nature.	
		Network 65 extension would decrease the elevated long distance views and physical environment.	
		Conditional support for inclusion of Network 65 provided, and only if, this results in the Blackburn Road and Eaves Barn Farm site being deleted from the preferred options and the two sites remain green belt.	
		One of the more logical sites to consider along with land south of Rossendale Rd. Network 65 better as it is farmland as opposed to green belt land.	
		Fully support allocation and further land available	
		Increase traffic congestion on Accrington Rd between M65 J9 and Rosegrove traffic lights.	
		Close to M65 J9 which is programmed for capacity improvements (signalisation of the southern roundabout). The Local Plan should,	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		where possible, take forward sites that demonstrate and support the significance of the M65 Corridor and the Government's investment in it.	
Gypsy and Traveller Sites			
Site GT/A – Heald Road	Environment Agency	This is a former landfill and adjacent to the Leeds – Liverpool canal, which is controlled water. Records show the nearest foul/combined sewer is over 100m from the site. An environment permit may be required if a connection to the main foul/combined sewer is not possible.	This site is not preferred for a number of reasons. A restrictive covenant exists on the land likely to prevent its development meaning the site is not 'available'. There were also other concerns over the suitability of its vehicular access, viability, the loss of publically accessible open space and trees and the potential unsatisfactory living condition for occupiers due to the proximity of the adjacent cement works.
	Lancashire County Council	The limit of the adopted highway is to the east of the railway. The road bridge over the railway is not maintained by the Highway Authority.	
	Petition	A petition of 1352 signatories: It is felt that these three designated areas of the borough have suffered many years of deprivation. These communities have strived tirelessly to support positive regeneration and housing development in these areas only to find by chance the new proposals which will only be detrimental to our future. Our communities are devastated that yet again we were not fully informed of these decisions. We would like to see the continuation of new housing development to promote a better future for OUR TOWN. Please support this campaign and make a difference.	
	Petition	A petition of 169 signatories: We the residents of Lower Manor Lane & Lower Mead Drive, Burnley, petition Burnley Borough Council to refuse planning permission to the proposed Travellers site adjacent to Heald Rd; Burnley. We the undersigned residents are against such a proposal and feel that to grant permission would be greatly detrimental to this estate, which includes Garswood Close & Healdwood Drive.	
Petition	A petition of 120 signatories: We, the undersigned, strongly oppose the proposal from Burnley Borough Council to develop the site on Heald Road as a Travellers' Site. We do not believe that this proposal is in the best interests of our area.		

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		We ask that Burnley Borough Council rule that this site is unsuitable for a Travellers' Site.	
	(Councillors)	There were twelve representations from councillors, eight of whom were concerned about increase in crime, or the fear of crime, amongst existing residents.	
		A further two councillor representations stated that as no site is capable of housing the required 28 pitches, the consultation process was flawed as the limited number of pitches available on Marlborough Street meant that both Heald Street and Lawrence Avenue (15 pitches each) were both required, due to a lack of further site proposals. With this in mind, it was stated one large site that could house at least 30 pitches, ideally on a brownfield site, was preferred. This would also mean the Gypsy and Traveller community was kept together. Furthermore, one councillor felt that there were acceptable provisions elsewhere in East Lancashire, where Hyndburn has nine sites already.	
		Other issues raised by councillors include the impact the site would have on local amenities and the environment, as well as the impact of the site on the housing market and regeneration in the area. It was put forward that the site would be better for housing, or that the gypsy and traveller site would be better located on the periphery of the town centre. The possibility that previously evicted problem tenants may return to the area was also raised.	
		A councillor also made comments on behalf of the residents of the Queensgate ward, which stated that the site would contradict regeneration efforts in the area, that the former colliery land itself was cleared and planted in the 1980s as part of the government's Derelict Land Grant scheme, and is not a haven for wildlife, highly valued by local residents as recreation space, and that the site is part of the Byerden Linear Park, created in the 1990s to link the deprived Stoneyholme and Daneshouse wards to the countryside along the canal.	
		The site is in a residential area, next to a housing estate, and therefore inappropriate and detrimental to the residents of Barden Lane and the Lower Manor estate. The site overlooks the housing estate, raising privacy issues.	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		The site is not near a doctors, dentist or chemist.	
		The site is too close to nursery, primary, junior and disabled schools.	
		The deeds (LA725823) say the site is not to be used other than as a public open space. The proposal directly contravenes the covenant.	
		Approach via Barden Lane us busy with traffic to and from Barrowford / Padiham bypass, and is a heavily used main access route by commercial vehicles, cement work vehicles, school, college and hospital traffic. There are already numerous small vehicle accidents on roads around the site. The main road is already busy due to narrowing under the railway bridge. Can the canal bridge on Barden Road cope with increased traffic? The proposals will increase the carbon footprint.	
		Heald Road is unsuitable for heavy lorries or caravans, and there will be an increase in traffic. Access onto the site is over a narrow railway bridge and only via a single track road. There is no pavement.	
		There are parking issues in the area, particularly in term time.	
		The area is not one with "good transport links". There is a nearby bus stop, but the service only runs in the day, and hourly, and usually full. This is also subsidised by the supermarket, who may withdraw the service at any time.	
		Statistics show the area is deprived.	
		The elevation of the land on three sides means problems regarding any form of pollution (noise, light, environmental) impacts on the adjacent estate. The site is a threat to the peacefulness of the area. There are concerns about noise, including dogs barking, loud music, and engine noise which will impact on quiet neighbourhood.	
		Fear of crime and antisocial anti-social behaviour and , cold calling including from elderly residents,	
		It may be worth removing the bridge if the site goes ahead.	
		The site could be detrimental to the nearby Barden marina and the boat owners and tourists this attracts. Its location will be an eyesore and create a negative first impression to visitors arriving by train or canal.	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>There will be a decrease in local house value, and concerns about resale value and potential. People will not want to invest in properties that are at risk of, or in, negative equity, and concerns over this are creating a lot of anxiety. Local regeneration (including Stoneyholme, Daneshouse. Prarie Fields and Thomas Whitham sixth form site) will have been a waste of time if the site is located here. It will be detrimental to the improvements made over many years to the Queensgate ward.</p>	
		<p>Residents will want to leave, but who will want to buy properties? Landlords will buy them up and turn the area into an undesirable one, which Burnley has many of already.</p>	
		<p>The site will put developers off building and regenerating the local area, or investing in Burnley.</p>	
		<p>The cost of the site will be astronomical. Developing the site, including roads and site facilities will be expensive. There are also increased costs associated with servicing</p>	
		<p>Proposals will disturb the cultural heritage and landscape, and have a negative impact on surroundings.</p>	
		<p>The site and adjacent 'Ash path' is used by residents, who would be denied access or afraid to use the route if this goes ahead.</p>	
		<p>The site will have an impact on the nearby local park, as residents may be afraid to use it.</p>	
		<p>This currently aspirational area will become deprived.</p>	
		<p>There are concerns about the ability of local health services to cope on top of already stretched caseloads. Local schools are already too full.</p>	
		<p>Welcoming people onto sites risks oversubscription and overspill onto neighbouring land.</p>	
		<p>The proposed site is a greenfield site, a local beauty spot, "an oasis of calm", and one of the last available to residents of all ages in the area, who use it recreationally, for walking, dog walking, play, all of which faces being lost to the detriment of local residents. It is listed as a park and recreation area. The site should be left as an unspoiled wood and grass area for people to enjoy. It will not enhance the landscape and character of the borough.</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>The site will result in a loss of woodland, and habitats including bats, deer, swans, water fowl, ducks, stags, birds, water birds, rabbits, foxes, butterflies, badgers, herons, newts, wild flowers. There is a potential for the loss of trees / deforestation.</p>	
		<p>Site is adjacent to Byerden Holme nature reserve and will have a negative impact on it.</p>	
		<p>Concerns about rubbish being left <i>(based on experience of encampments)</i></p>	
		<p>There is a risk of pollution, including to the canal. There is already likely to be ground pollution from the sites former mining uses, and would be costs related to preparing the land.</p>	
		<p>The land is subject to flooding when it rains for a few consecutive days, and becomes boggy. Drainage is also an issue on the site. Cement laid on the site will add to flood risk.</p>	
		<p>Its location is too close to the nearby to a concrete works, canal and railway, which is a health and safety issue, particularly for children. The access road is dangerous, creates dust and the area is generally noisy. The proximity to the cement works could leave the council open to claims for life threatening disease such as lung damage. There is steep bank to the canal on one side too.</p>	
		<p>Locating the site here will have a negative impact on the nice community in the area. Many people have retired and worked hard to buy in the area.</p>	
		<p>Placing the sites here risks negative impacts on resident's mental health, due to stress, unease and discomfort.</p>	
		<p>This will have a negative impact on Burnley's reputation.</p>	
		<p>Proposals are not in the best interests of Burnley.</p>	
		<p>The site has been left to overgrow, presumably so the council can now say it is unused.</p>	
		<p>Had we known about these plans, we would not have bought in the area.</p>	
		<p>Travellers will not use public transport, green space, cycle routes, and footpaths. They will have vehicles of their own.</p>	
		<p>The site would be better for small scale community housing, or as an environmental enhancement area.</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Shouldn't Burnley's first priority be housing the homeless population?	
		"Better" areas should take on their share of problems.	
		The site will increase competition for jobs, when there are already too many low paid jobs, and not enough generally for local residents.	
		Objection to the notion that central government should impose 'the requirement' on Burnley Borough Council to provide the site against local wishes	
		Objection to the fact proposals are being prioritised, when other projects more beneficial to Burnley are shelved.	
		Marlborough Street and Lawrence Avenue are much nearer to facilities.	
		The size of pitches is more than many council homes have.	
		This may force the cement works to close.	
	Supportive	Heald Road is a better option than Marlborough Street, as it is less residential and has better access, and will have less impact on local residents.	
	The location near to residential areas means the communities will have the chance to integrate.		
	The site will comply with national guidelines on traveller sites.		
	The site is sustainable.		
	The road infrastructure is already in place.		
	The site is council owned, and so there are no costs associated with buying them.		
	The sites are well connected to services and can easily be connected to utilities, saving money.		
	If properly managed this could be a good site.		
	If travellers want or need a permanent place to stay, why not buy or rent a property?		
	Traveller site demands, including a lockable shed, two vehicle parking and a garden, is unfair		
	Site GTA/B –	Petition	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
Marlborough Street		It is felt that these three designated areas of the borough have suffered many years of deprivation. These communities have strived tirelessly to support positive regeneration and housing development in these areas only to find by chance the new proposals which will only be detrimental to our future. Our communities are devastated that yet again we were not fully informed of these decisions. We would like to see the continuation of new housing development to promote a better future for OUR TOWN. Please support this campaign and make a difference.	pursued. It is closely sandwiched between the railway and the rear of a row of properties on Marlborough Street and is becoming established as a small woodland area. A number of alternative sites were including those suggested by consultees but none were considered developable i.e. available, achievable and suitable.
	Petition	<p>A petition of 389 signatories:</p> <p>We, the undersigned, petition Burnley council on the matter of the proposed gypsy site at the back of Marlborough Street (site code GTB).</p> <p>This petition is to register objections to the proposed permanent traveller sites in Burnley on the grounds that they will be detrimental to the infrastructure through increased traffic, destruction of close knit communities and also will act as a deterrent for existing businesses to prosper or new business to set up in the area.</p>	
	Petition	<p>A petition of 35 signatories:</p> <p>We, the undersigned, petition Burnley council on the matter of the proposed gypsy site at the back of Marlborough Street (site code GTB).</p> <p>This petition is to register objections to the proposed permanent traveller sites in Burnley on the grounds that they will be detrimental to the infrastructure through increased traffic, destruction of close knit communities and also will act as a deterrent for existing businesses to prosper or new business to set up in the area.</p>	
	Councillors	<p>There were nine representations from councillors, seven of whom were concerned about increase in crime, or the fear of crime, amongst existing residents.</p> <p>A further two councillor representations stated that as no site is</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		capable of housing the required 28 pitches, the consultation process was flawed as the limited number of pitches available on Marlborough Street meant that both Heald Street and Lawrence Avenue (15 pitches each) were both required, due to a lack of further site proposals. With this in mind, it was stated one large site that could house at least 30 pitches, ideally on a brownfield site, was preferred. This would also mean the Gypsy and Traveller community was kept together. Furthermore, it was felt that there were acceptable provisions elsewhere in East Lancashire, where Hyndburn has nine sites already.	
		The site will create problems where there previously were none.	
		There appears to be no need for this site except to avoid a government fine	
	Environment Agency	There is potentially a culverted ordinary watercourse crossing the site. Lancashire County Council should ve consulted as the Lead Local Flood Authority.	
	Lancashire County Council	Access should be taken from Lincoln Street rather than create a separate access onto Marlborough Street.	
	Other - Objections	The underground river on the site risks being polluted by the proposed development.	
		The site is too close to existing housing provisions on Marlborough Street, and the elevation means it overlooks houses.	
		The proposed site will create noise due to the use of generators, vehicles and dogs, as well as light nuisance due to the required lighting on the site. This will be especially problematic at night. The noise issue is a contradiction of the DCLG guidance "Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites" (2008) para.3.9.	
		The adjoining gardens provide "peace and quiet" to the residents on an otherwise built up Marlborough Street, and these risk being lost. A lot of time and money has been spent on clearing and improving these rear gardens, including an annual rent, and proposals will result in a loss of this.	
		The site is close to and visible from the railway line, and will have a negative impact on the opinions of commuters and visitors to the area.	
		The site will impact negatively on the nearby canalside	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		development.	
		The site will increase the problem of bottlenecking on Marlborough Street, which is already used as a rat run. The proposals will add to traffic, which already includes problematic HGV's.	
		The area already has a problem with parking and access, and the proposals will add to this.	
		The increased traffic will be a danger to children who play on the street.	
		Access to the site includes a 90 degree angle, which is dangerous due to poor visibility.	
		The site will put an increased strain on local services, including health centre waiting times and schools.	
		The proposals will result in declining house prices and devalued property in the local area.	
		People would not have brought homes in the area had they known of plans.	
		Why is this site being planned when other areas of town could be improved, e.g. extending Weavers Triangle and the surrounding area?	
		The proposals threaten achievements made in regenerating the area, which was previously subject to market failure.	
		Due to the size of the site and the work needed to make it viable, this site cannot be cost effective.	
		A fear of an increase in crime and anti-social behaviour	
		Concerns about the clearance of litter on the site and costs associated with this when people move on.	
		Concern that there will be an erosion of community spirit, and inter community tension	
		Concerns about the density of the site, and uncertainty about how big the pitches will actually be.	
		Previous planning permissions or approaches to purchase the site have been rejected due to it being a green site. Why is it now being considered for development?	
		The site is an unsafe environment given its proximity to the railway,	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		a contradiction of the DCLG guidance "Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites" (2008) para. 3.3. The proximity to the railway line will create noise nuisance for people using the site, and is a threat to the health and safety of children on the site, a contradiction of the DCLG guidance "Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites" (2008) para.3.18.	
		The site is inappropriate for ordinary dwellings, a contradiction of the DCLG guidance "Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites" (2008) para. 3.6	
		Land north of the site is identified for mixed use development and has extant planning permissions which mean that this site is unsuitable given the aspirations for the land at Lambert Howarth / Finsley Wharf – site should instead be outside of the city centre	
		The site will have a negative affect attempts to improve the town's image.	
		The proposals are not in the best interests of Burnley.	
		Can gypsies and travellers live together?	
		government policy doesn't require sites to be found	
		If you are going to build on the land, why not build something for teenagers or kids instead?	
		The site should be outside of the town centre. The preferred site location should be rural, on the edge of a town, but within the main urban area of Burnley, a contradiction of the DCLG guidance "Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites" (2008) para.3.10.	
		The proximity of the cinema to the site could see travellers parking on the car park.	
		Heald Road is a better option than Marlborough Street, as it is less residential and has better access, and will have less impact on local residents.	
	Supportive	The site is acceptable if managed properly	
		The location near to residential areas means the communities will have the chance to integrate.	
		The site will comply with national guidelines on traveller sites.	
		The site is sustainable.	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		The road infrastructure is already in place.	
		The site is council owned, and so there are no costs associated with buying them.	
		The sites are well connected to services and can easily be connected to utilities, saving money.	
GT/C – Lawrence Avenue	Petition	<p>A petition of 1352 signatories:</p> <p>It is felt that these three designated areas of the borough have suffered many years of deprivation. These communities have strived tirelessly to support positive regeneration and housing development in these areas only to find by chance the new proposals which will only be detrimental to our future. Our communities are devastated that yet again we were not fully informed of these decisions. We would like to see the continuation of new housing development to promote a better future for OUR TOWN. Please support this campaign and make a difference.</p>	Lawrence Avenue: This site has not been pursued as its size now far exceeds the required amount. It is a prominent site in the locality and it would be difficult to satisfactorily integrate a caravan site into the townscape.
	Petition	<p>A petition of 425 signatories:</p> <p>We, the undersigned, strongly oppose the proposal from Burnley Borough Council to develop the site on Lawrence Avenue as a Travellers' Site. We do not believe that this proposal is in the best interests of our area.</p> <p>We ask that Burnley Borough Council rule that this site is unsuitable for a Traveller's Site.</p>	
	Petition	<p>A petition of 67 signatories:</p> <p>Petition against traveller site on Florence ave</p>	
	Councillors	<p>There were twelve representations from councillors, eight of whom were concerned about increase in crime, or the fear of crime, amongst existing residents.</p> <p>A further two councillor representations stated that as no site is capable of housing the required 28 pitches, the consultation process was flawed as the limited number of pitches available on Marlborough Street meant that both Heald Street and Lawrence Avenue (15 pitches each) were both required, due to a lack of further site proposals. With this in mind, it was stated one large site that could house at least 30 pitches, ideally on a brownfield site,</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>was preferred. This would also mean the Gypsy and Traveller community was kept together. Furthermore, it was felt that there were acceptable provisions elsewhere in East Lancashire, where Hyndburn has nine sites already.</p>	
		<p>Other issues raised by councillors include the impact the site would have on local amenities and the environment, as well as the impact of the site on the housing market and regeneration in the area. It was put forward that the site would be better for housing, or that the gypsy and traveller site would be better located on the periphery of the town centre. The possibility that previously evicted problem tenants may return to the area was also raised.</p>	
		<p>There is no need for a permanent site, other than avoiding a government fine</p>	
	Others	<p>Site occupants are unlikely to use public transport or bicycles, so why is it a requirement for the site to be accessible?</p>	
		<p>The land may be contaminated.</p>	
		<p>The land will become contaminated by traveller uses, which will cost more in the future if the land needs to be redeveloped.</p>	
		<p>The proposals are at odds with the improvements made in the area, and will have a negative impact on regeneration in this previously neglected and declining area. There is concern that developers will pull out, and this will have knock on economic effects, as well as the possibility that vacated undeveloped sites may be used as unauthorised settlements. A report by chartered surveyors in Newport confirmed that the perception of the public around traveller sites is a concern for house builders, and a legitimate one regardless of whether such opinions are facts. Research in South Wales also showed that house builders would have to discount house prices when in the vicinity of a traveller site, or reconsider building there. The site also adjoins 'Housing Site 'C' AIT/Brush Street', which could lead to further conflict with residents.</p>	
		<p>There is already a lot of traffic on the estate. This will result in an increase in traffic around the nursery and schools.</p>	
		<p>The site will on local education and health provisions, due to increased usage. Health teams are already stretched, and will be burdened by additional users.</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>The proposal is poorly situated, being located in the middle of an urban housing estate. It should be located on land where there are no homes. The site would be better utilised for affordable housing which could stimulate growth, or as somewhere for children to play.</p>	
		<p>Children use the site daily to play on.</p>	
		<p>There are several cultural heritage sites within 1km. Planning permission should not even be considered.</p>	
		<p>Other travellers, who had broken onto the land using cranes to move boulders previously, caused a lot of stress and tension in the local community.</p>	
		<p>We were sold the dream of owning our first house in a regeneration area with likeminded people. Knowledge of the site would have put us off buying.</p>	
		<p>The site sits 320m from the gateway of Accrington Road, which is a through route and should create a positive impression for business and residents alike.</p>	
		<p>The site would be out of character with the close knit urban form which exists.</p>	
		<p>Fear of Crime</p>	
		<p>The development proposals will devalue nearby homes, including recently purchased new homes in the vicinity of the proposed site. The area is already considered undesirable within town. Existing empty homes in the area and its general 'run down' appearance has already forced house prices down, and this will increase with the location of the site in this area. Some feel that had they known the site was to be located here, they would not have purchased property nearby.</p>	
		<p>People will not want to buy in the area, and existing residents will look to move out. There is a fear that people will not be able to move away from the area, should they wish to. Additionally, the site will impact on rental incomes for private landlords.</p>	
		<p>There is a concern that the proposals will create tensions in the local area between different communities. The Community Cohesion report (T Clarke, 2001) showed deep seated cultural & ethnic segregation, lack of shared values, respect and understanding.</p>	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Residents fear crime and anti-social behaviour.	
		Concerns that gypsy and traveller communities cannot live together on the same site.	
		Why do travellers need to be near schools when other local children have to travel out of the area?	
		The gypsy and traveller community does not mix.	
		The proposals make a large assumption that the site will be well maintained. This is short-sighted.	
		The council will have no control over the land once sold to travellers	
		The proposal will need lighting, water, showers, toilets and refuse collection. Additionally, the site will need additional facilities for sanitation and drying clothes, which will not enhance the area.	
		Fires on the site pose a risk to both people and wildlife in the area.	
		If the site becomes oversubscribed, it may spill over onto adjacent land. The site sends out the wrong message and could lead to oversubscription and overflowing. If it goes ahead, more sites will be put forward in the future.	
		The site will have a negative impact on Burnley and put off the people it is looking to attract in, such as highly skilled professionals.	
		The size of the proposed pitches is bigger than that of council properties.	
		There have been no surveys on the impact of the site on the housing market or house prices, nor has there been a report on the expected increase in ASB and crime.	
		The proposals are not in the best interests of Burnley, and will be the final nail in the coffin of one of the poorest towns in the country.	
		Travellers get special treatment when setting up on land, which the public do not get.	
		The proposals and uncertainty around them are putting off would be buyers from new housing developments. The proposed sites are inconsistent with the wider strategy for regeneration undertaken by the council and the developer. The objective of transforming the area and fostering a private housing market within it is under threat, and locating Gypsy and Traveller sites close to an area	

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		previously subject to market failure is detrimental to the work being undertaken.	
	Supportive	Lawrence Avenue is a better option than Marlborough Street, as it is less residential and has better access, and will have less impact on local residents.	
		The location near to residential areas means the communities will have the chance to integrate.	
		The site will comply with national guidelines on traveller sites.	
		The site is sustainable.	
		The road infrastructure is already in place.	
		The site is council owned, and so there are no costs associated with buying them.	
		The sites are well connected to services and can easily be connected to utilities, saving money.	
		Although local amenities make it a good site, the history of the area is against it.	
All Sites	Highways Agency	The foremost concern of the agency is the SRN, and the transport implications of any proposals should be fully assessed. Regarding housing and employment sites, brownfield / urban area developments is most welcomed, particularly that which encourages walking, cycling or public transport, and reduces the impact on the SRN. We would be concerned about greenfield development. Gypsy and Traveller sites would be welcomed near to essential services, amenities and good transport links in order to reduce private car use and provide access to employment opportunities and schools. Any site which would impact the SRN should be discussed with the Highways Agency.	Noted
	Lancashire County Council	Worsthorne Primary School is already oversubscribed, and if sites E, F, G, and K (and to a lesser extent A) come forward, an additional school site may be requested.	Noted
		A, B, E, F, G, H, K, L, M and GT/A are located within mineral safeguarding areas as defined by policy M2 of the joint Lancashire minerals and waste site allocation and Development Management	Noted

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		Policies Local Plan. Reference should be made to this and the implications on deliverability or mineral sterilisation should be considered and recognised in the Local Plan as it moves forward.	
	Rossendale Borough Council	No comments to make on the sites put forward.	Comments noted
	Worsthorne and Hurstwood Parish Council	<p>Worsthorne is a village, separated from Burnley with its own identity. It has grown over the last ten years or so.</p> <p>The village school is at or exceeding its capacity, and development would result in more children attending the school, which would mean the school needs to be extended at considerable cost. The adjacent school playing field is a valuable resource for the school and must be preserved. Thus, a new school would be required, but no site is available in the village. The alternative would be for children to travel further, increasing their carbon footprint.</p> <p>Enlargement would also mean an increase in need for medical provision in the village, at significant cost.</p> <p>There is concern at traffic flows and management in and around the village, as well as the impact on parking. More parking would detract from the feel of the village. There is already congestion on surrounding roads, which probably exceed comfortable capacity. Houses which equate to around 2 cars per household will lead to increased congestion. The footpaths are narrow and present a risk for pedestrians, and likely inadequate, and a road upgrade with footpath and cycleway would cost around £10million.</p> <p>Drains, sewers, water supply and electricity are at, or exceeding capacity – the cost of upgrading these would be monumental.</p> <p>Development would impact on the local environment. The surrounding green belt, a rural amenity, is a significant tourist attraction, and there is protected wildlife, all of which would be negatively impacted.</p> <p>The village is close to the South Pennines, a designated European</p>	<p>The Plan must strike a balance between environmental, social and economic considerations.</p> <p>Policy SP4: Development Strategy sets out a settlement hierarchy for the towns and villages of the Borough identifying their respective role and function, and the scale of development for housing, employment and retail. Development will be focussed on Burnley and Padiham with development of an appropriate scale supported in the main and small villages. To accommodate the level of development identified in policies SP2: Housing Land Requirement 2012-2032 and SP3: Employment Land Requirement 2012-2032 the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment provides evidence that these requirements cannot be met in full on previously developed sites, or on sites within the Urban Boundary as set out in the 2006 Burnley Local Plan. With this in mind, the Preferred Options Local Plan includes a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites and the new development boundaries for Burnley, Padiham, Worsthorne and Hapton include sites outside of the 2006 Burnley Local Plan urban boundary.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements to support the specific policies and allocations in the Plan are identified within the individual site allocation policies. Further infrastructure may be required</p>

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
		<p>site and one for the pilot areas for Natural England's UK National Ecosystem assessment, because of its importance as a water catchment area.</p> <p>It is presume development will attract aspirational householders. They will more affluent and most likely travelling further afield to work. Whether at locations such as Network 65, Burnley Bridge or further afield like Manchester, they will face the drive across Worsthorne to the motorway or the business parks. The congestion in Burnley in the rush hour is already severe. Development in Cliviger will make this problem significantly worse. Development near transport hubs makes more sense.</p> <p>Most employment opportunities in Burnley would not provide salaries which would extend to the typical prices of the houses developers would be planning in Worsthorne. If Burnley needs more, than lower cost homes for first time buyers and affordable housing is the way forward. According to a housing provision survey commissioned by Burnley Borough Council they have met the requirement through to 2020.</p> <p>The plan will turn Worsthorne into a sprawling suburb of Burnley. There will be inevitable policing and security issues arising from this, and a permanent police presence will be required, which LCC have advised cannot be funded.</p> <p>The council question whether Burnley has the housing need required by the council, especially considering the number of empty properties, and number of properties for sale, as well as the number of brownfield sites that should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as per planning policy.</p> <p>The council should exclude anything in this area from the proposed local plan.</p>	<p>as the detail of schemes is drawn up and for windfall development proposals, the infrastructure requirements and any contributions required will need to be assessed as schemes are drawn up. Infrastructure can be provided directly by developers; or planning contributions can be used to deliver or contribute to on or off-site new or improved infrastructure through Section 106 contributions and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) should the Council introduce it.</p> <p>The Council consulted on a baseline IDP at Issues and Options stage in 2014 and has considered the feedback received from this consultation and also the relevant feedback from the wider plan and site consultation. Whilst the Council believes there to be no major infrastructure barriers to the delivery of the Plan as a whole or the individual sites and policies set out, it is appreciated that without knowing the detail of the preferred development requirements e.g. housing and employment land targets, the location and size of the preferred sites and the preferred policy approach, it was difficult for relevant agencies and other consultees to definitively respond on these matters. Having now set out the preferred options, the Council will engage with all relevant consultees before pulling together the IDP for the next stage of plan-making ie Proposed Submission.</p> <p>The Council will be preparing a plan wide viability assessment prior to the next stage of plan-making. This will assess the overall viability of the Plan – not just the underlying viability of individual sites and any minimum</p>

Site/Policy/Para	Consultee	Issue Raised	Recommended Response
			<p>infrastructure requirements, but the cumulative effects of the policy approach set out to ensure that the plan as a whole can be delivered. The Council will engage with key infrastructure providers in undertaking this study.</p>