

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 2009  
title: STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND ASSESSMENT  
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
principal author: COLIN HIRST

## 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide Members with information on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and to agree the process for adoption as part of the evidence base

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment is a key element of the baseline information for the Local Development Framework. It will help in the delivery of affordable housing and protecting and enhancing the quality of the environment.
- Community Objectives – As a tool for informing spatial policy, it will provide a basis from which to identify how a range of issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing provision will be addressed through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities – The SHLAA will provide a tool to inform future policy and will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – The Council has a duty to prepare spatial policy that has been built on a robust and credible evidence base of which the SHLAA is an integral part.

## 2 INFORMATION

2.1 The SHLAA Report, as part of the information to be used by the Council in preparing the Local Development Framework for the area is an important part of the evidence base that the Council has to prepare. Members will recall a methodology report for the SHLAA was prepared and consulted upon in September 2008. That report set out the process that the SHLAA followed and highlighted that the report would closely follow the CLG guidance to ensure that an examination at this stage is not required.

2.2 The SHLAA identifies areas of land that have the potential for housing development but it does not allocate these sites for future development, nor does it guarantee the approval of any future planning applications for residential development on these sites. The SHLAA highlights the amount of potential residential land in land-use terms across the borough and provides a model to assess the possibility of these areas ever coming forward for development. This in turn enables options to be explored for future patterns of development in the borough through the wider plan making process which would be subject to more detailed consultation as part of the statutory plan making process.

- 2.3 The draft survey report for the SHLAA was approved for publication in April for consultation for a 4-week period with key stakeholders and other interested parties. The report was available on the Councils website along with a comments form for making representations, and copies were also made available at Planning reception at level D of the Council Offices. Letters were also sent to some 1400 stakeholders including Parish Councils and also individuals who had expressed an interest in being informed of key stages in the LDF process following previous consultation events. Members will be aware that a number of concerns were raised about the availability of the document and as a consequence in agreement with the Chair of Planning and Development Committee the period for responses was extended to 5<sup>th</sup> June.
- 2.4 A high level of response has been made to the draft survey report, with some 720 responses in all received. Officers have carefully considered the SHLAA responses to identify in particular issues raised that will enable us to update technical information on the sites or where the model we apply needs to be amended. We have had a lot of information ranging from matters of landownership for example or the extent of site areas to queries on access and impact.
- 2.5 The aim is to revise the survey report to reflect only those matters of technical detail. Wider issues related to specific sites will be reviewed and collated to help inform future stages of the plan making process and all the work undertaken as part of the review of responses will be available for people to view as part of the background material to the LDF process. It is important to appreciate however that in themselves where they are not related to specific technical matters those responses do not lead to any changes to the baseline information in line with the model and guidance, provided by government.

### 3 TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

- 3.1 Responses to the SHLAA took two forms, a large majority expressed varied concerns about general matters relating to future development in the borough or criticising sites that, within government guidelines, could not be considered as legitimate technical criticisms, or indeed misunderstandings of the whole process and status of the SHLAA. However it is important that all responses are considered and therefore planning officers have reviewed each of these responses point by point the responses to which will be available as part of the background information to the evidence base.
- 3.2 What remained was a minority of responses that were valid technical criticisms, stemming from detailed local knowledge unavailable through other means. Government guidelines require these to be acknowledged and the final version of the SHLAA to contain relevant amendments. It is the table of these technical amendments that is the subject of this report.
- 3.3 A schedule of the technical amendments identified from the responses and that will be taken forward as amendments to the SHLAA are set out at Appendix 1. As can be seen these reflect those aspects of the work that relate to technical changes not measures of reaction to any particular site appearing in the survey.
- 3.4 If members endorse the amendments the survey report will be published in its final form as part of the evidence base and will be available to inform the next stages of the LDF. It should also be noted that there will be a need undertake a review and update of the SHLAA over the next 12 months to ensure it is up to date. This will be an important consideration when the Housing and Economic Development Plan Document is

prepared as it is that document that will seek to establish proposed allocations. The resources required to carryout a review however will once again be extensive. Given the need to focus on the progress with the Core Strategy a review will be scheduled for later in 2010

#### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – none, the publication of the evidence base is within existing budgets.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – None
- Political – None
- Reputation – None

#### 5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

5.1 Endorse that the SHLAA is amended to reflect the schedule of Technical amendments and that the Director of Development Services publishes the finalised report of survey as part of the evidence base for the local development framework.



DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

#### BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Report – draft for consultation April 2009.
- 2 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment - Book of Sites - April 2009.

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

(05110905)

## STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESMENT

## TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

This schedule sets out those matters of "Technical amendment" that are proposed to be taken forward within the Shlaa.

The Council has considered all responses submitted and refined them to those where it is considered, within the scope of the SHLAA survey there is a need to make some change to the report or methodology. Each response is identified by respondent reference and the Technical Point (TP) reference.

The reference enables the origin of the change to be identified in the collated responses and working papers on file.

For Example:

244 / 99 / 008

Respondent/site/comment reference

In some cases where the comment is more general letters are used to indicate the settlement eg whly = Whalley or area eg. RV = Ribble valley

A list of sites referred to in the schedule is included at the back of this appendix.

Respondent Ref	Technical Point Ref	Proposed Amendment and Reason
274/94/002	TP 102	Incorrect TPO had been included on site proforma. TPO 7/19/3/115-1999 is the correct TPO. Database and proforma has been amended.
686/27/002	T.P 201	The SHLAA has had to follow a strict methodology, set out by the department of Communities and Local Government practice guidance in terms of assessing issues such as access and availability of sites at a high/strategic level. The SHLAA has therefore had to make judgements about sites without the degree of detailed information that would be expected should a planning application ever be submitted for any of the sites.  The site will remain in the survey however a note will be added to the SHLAA database regarding this site that there is a potential issue in reference to a ransom strip.
525/66/001	TP 301	In terms of the site being described as remote from existing development, this refers to the site being remote from the existing main built up area. It is recognised that the site is located close to residential units on the southern section of the proposed site.  A description of what is remote from the village boundary will be added to the methodology report
525/66/004	TP 303	In relation to loss of agricultural employment, where sites have been suggested and assessed which would involve the loss of the farm buildings, this is assessed as a loss of employment. Where sites are proposed on fields which belong to the farm these are seen as ancillary to the agricultural use and therefore not a loss of employment use -

		<p>where fields are proposed, there is the potential that the farm can continue to operate despite the loss of a field. If a planning application was submitted for the site, this issue would be considered as part of the planning application determination process</p> <p>Add an explanatory note to the Methodology report at para 7.4</p>
503/66/001	TP 308	<p>In terms of the site being described as remote from existing development, this refers to the site being remote from the existing main built up area. It is recognised that the site is located close to residential units on the southern section of the proposed site.</p> <p>A description of what is remote from the village boundary will be added to the methodology report</p>
503/66/002	TP 309	<p>In relation to loss of agricultural employment, where sites have been suggested and assessed which would involve the loss of the farm buildings, this is assessed as a loss of employment. Where sites are proposed on fields which belong to the farm these are seen as ancillary to the agricultural use and therefore not a loss of employment use- where fields are proposed, there is the potential that the farm can continue to operate despite the loss of a field. If a planning application was submitted for the site, this issue would be considered as part of the planning application determination process.</p> <p>Add an explanatory note to the Methodology report at para 7.4</p>
503/66/005	TP 311	<p>In terms of the site being described as remote from existing development, this refers to the site being remote from the existing main built up area. It is recognised that the site is located close to residential units on the southern section of the proposed site.</p> <p>A description of what is remote from the village boundary will be added to the methodology report</p>
503/66/006	TP 312	<p>In terms of the site being described as remote from existing development, this refers to the site being remote from the existing main built up area. It is recognised that the site is located close to residential units on the southern section of the proposed site.</p> <p>A description of what is remote from the village boundary will be added to the methodology report</p>

310b/RV/001	TP 316	<p>It is recognised that there are sites within Ribble Valley that may have been previously mined. Although the current SHLAA criteria are fully compliant with dCLG guidance, we welcome the advice to include a further criterion relating to coal mining. It is acknowledge however that there may not be specific records of previous coal mining on sites through desk based research and therefore RVBC does not propose to change the criteria set out in the SHLAA at this time. Instead where there is a recognised possibility of past mine working, any proposed development would need to make an assessment of the stability issues and any mitigation/remediation measures that are necessary in line with the guidance in Planning Policy Guidance 14 (Development on Unstable Ground).</p> <p>A note on the issue should be added to the methodology to clarify the intended approach</p>
261/306/003	TP 321	<p>The site was scored on the basis of the model approach to multiple owners. Evidence has been provided to indicate owners agreement to develop the site.</p> <p>The database and survey form will be amended to reflect the ownership position.</p>
708/66/002	TP 333	<p>In relation to loss of agricultural employment, where sites have been suggested and assessed which would involve the loss of the farm buildings, this is assessed as a loss of employment. Where sites are proposed on fields which belong to the farm these are seen as ancillary to the agricultural use and therefore not a loss of employment use - where fields are proposed, there is the potential that the farm can continue to operate despite the loss of a field. If a planning application was submitted for the site, this issue would be considered as part of the planning application determination process.</p> <p>Add an explanatory note to the Methodology report at para 7.4</p>
708/66/005	TP 336	<p>In relation to loss of agricultural employment, where sites have been suggested and assessed which would involve the loss of the farm buildings, this is assessed as a loss of employment. Where sites are proposed on fields which belong to the farm these are seen as ancillary to the agricultural use and therefore not a loss of employment use - where fields are proposed, there is the potential that the farm can continue to operate despite the loss of a field. If a planning application was submitted for the site, this issue would be considered as part of the planning application determination process.</p> <p>Add an explanatory note to the Methodology report at para 7.4</p>

312/169/001	TP 700	<p>Consultee asserts that the land is not vacant as the SHLAA states but is currently used as grazing land, therefore having economic and employment use. Therefore the S 4 scoring should reflect this.</p> <p>Where sites have been suggested and assessed which would involve the loss of the farm buildings, this is assessed as a loss of employment. Where sites are proposed on fields which belong to the farm these are seen as ancillary to the agricultural use and therefore not a loss of employment use- where fields are proposed, there is the potential that the farm can continue to operate despite the loss of a field. If a planning application was submitted for the site, this issue would be considered as part of the planning application determination process</p> <p>Add an explanatory note to the Methodology report at para 7.4</p>
312/169/002 312/169/003	TP 701 TP 702	<p>Consultee asserts that one of the potential access points to the site is covered by a ransom strip, necessitating an entry elsewhere which could compromise a bridleway and that this is not reflected in the scoring</p> <p>The database should note the bridleway under "other constraints" The database and survey report will be amended to reflect this.</p>
296/169/001	TP 704	<p>Consultee asserts that the land is not vacant as the SHLAA states but is currently used as grazing land, therefore having economic and employment use. Therefore the S 4 scoring should reflect this.</p> <p>Where sites have been suggested and assessed which would involve the loss of the farm buildings, this is assessed as a loss of employment. Where sites are proposed on fields which belong to the farm these are seen as ancillary to the agricultural use and therefore not a loss of employment use- where fields are proposed, there is the potential that the farm can continue to operate despite the loss of a field. If a planning application was submitted for the site, this issue would be considered as part of the planning application determination process.</p> <p>Add an explanatory note to the Methodology report at para 7.4</p>

296/169/002 296/169/003 281/169/001 281/169/002 281/169/003	TP 705 TP 706 TP 708 TP 709 TP 710	<p>Consultee asserts that one of the potential access points to the site is covered by a ransom strip, necessitating an entry elsewhere which could compromise a bridleway and that this is not reflected in the scoring.</p> <p>The database should note the bridleway under "other constraints" The database and survey report will be amended to reflect this.</p>
617/047/006	TP 805	<p>The Consultee asserts that the site is all Greenfield, whereas the SHLAA assesses it as Greenfield with brownfield in the middle. The consultee is correct, site 47 is Greenfield with adjacent site 240 a brownfield site. Amend report accordingly</p>
450/94/002	TP 808	<p>Consultee queries the TPO reference and our records show that he is correct. Amend the report's TPO reference from TPO no 5 1982 to TPO 7/19/31155-1999</p>
551/306/001 551/306/008	TP 819 TP 826	<p>Additional information regarding ownership of the sites and the agreement that the owners have regarding potential development has been provided.</p> <p>Amend the report accordingly to reflect ownership position.</p>
551/306/002	TP 820	<p>Regarding sustainability test S3 consultee asserts that the land incorporates the remnants of former sewage works and calico works and therefore should be rated as Brownfield under test S2 as a score of 5 rather than the current report assessment of 1</p> <p>The additional information provided will revise the score in the survey. The data base and report will be amended to reflect this information.</p>
005/001/001	TP 828	<p>Consultee asserts that the footpath that the SHLAA states runs through the site actually runs alongside the site boundary, but outside it. Site file appears to support his view therefore amend the report to say that footpath runs alongside site boundary not within the site in Any Other Comments.</p>
005/001/002	TP 829	<p>Consultee advises that the site is currently used for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Amend report to reflect current active use.</p>
005/001/003	TP 830	<p>Consultee suggests that there's a legal access through this site to adjacent land, specifically site 24. This may affect both sites.</p> <p>Amend the details in "Other Comments" to acknowledge this.</p>
005/001/004	TP 831	<p>Consultee asserts that this site is also access to site 65.</p> <p>Amend Any "Other Comments" to include this information</p>
475/20/001	TP 832	<p>Response advises that the site boundary needs to be adjusted to bring it into line with actual curtilage</p>



678/136/001	TP 834	<p>Consultee informs that the boundaries of the site since its submission have changed and wishes the report to acknowledge this</p> <p>The survey and database will be amended to reflect this.</p>
304/29/003 304/29/004	TP 1012 TP 1013	<p>Reference to the site being called "Government Buildings..." in the report when this site excludes the government buildings is made.</p> <p>It would be more accurate if the site name was amended consequently the database and survey will be amended.</p>
256/209/005	TP 1037	<p>This response identifies that Chipping does not appear among other G4 settlements mentioned in Figure 6 of Chapter 9. There are sites that should appear in the graph.</p> <p>Correct the chart at Figure 6</p>
511/Whly/001 511/Whly/002	TP 1100 TP 1101	<p>The response identifies a need to amend the hosing supply figures as some sites have been missed out when data has been transferred.</p> <p>This will be corrected.</p>
552/306/001	TP 1300	<p>Consultee informs the council of a legal agreement between site owners to develop. This alters the ownership constraint and needs to be reflected in the report.</p> <p>Amend report in terms of the availability</p>
280/RV/001 280/RV/002 280/RV/003	TP 1400 TP 1401 TP 1402	<p>Consultee informs the authority of various pipelines and other technical data in relation to SHLAA sites</p> <p>Amend report to include the presence of intermediate pressure gas pipelines on sites 31, 32, 53 and 59</p> <p>Amend report to include the presence of medium pressure gas pipelines on sites 7, 54, 58, 158, 159, 161, 163 and 164</p> <p>Add to report the information that there are no mains gas supplies to Hurst Green, Bashall Eaves, Bolton by Bowland, Holden, Newton, Slaidburn and Downham</p>
685/089/001 269/089/001 473/089/001	TP 1600 TP 1617 TP 2300	<p>An agent has become aware that that they have included a parcel of land in error and no longer power to act on behalf of the landowner following a change in ownership. They request that their details be removed</p> <p>This splits the site into two ownerships which will need reflecting in the survey.</p> <p>Remove agents from site 89 pro forma but retain site within SHLAA.</p> <p>Amend the database and report to reflect these circumstances.</p>

400/Clithr/001	TP 1609	<p>There may be a restrictive covenant on the site that would need to be resolved before development could take place This should be referenced in the comments section Add a reference to the database and survey report.</p>
411/124/002	TP 1611	<p>The ownership details as presented in the report are queried as the owner of the freehold submitted the site.</p> <p>The survey report and database will be updated to reflect this.</p>
263/161/002	TP 1615	<p>Information relating to the TPO mentioned in the report needs updating as it no longer exists.</p> <p>The survey and database will be amended.</p>
605/106/003	TP 1616	<p>The site is currently used for grazing and consequently the report needs correcting.</p> <p>The survey and database will be amended to take account of this.</p>
320/169/001 320/169/002	TP 1800 TP 1801	<p>Whilst the response advises that the site is currently used for agricultural purposes this would not result necessarily in a loss of employment given the size of this site. As such it is not proposed to amend the S4 assessment at this stage.</p> <p>Where sites have been suggested and assessed which would involve the loss of the farm buildings, this is assessed as a loss of employment. Where sites are proposed on fields which belong to the farm these are seen as ancillary to the agricultural use and therefore not a loss of employment use- where fields are proposed, there is the potential that the farm can continue to operate despite the loss of a field. If a planning application was submitted for the site, this issue would be considered as part of the planning application determination process.</p> <p>With regard to the point that the site is part of grassland mentioned on a 1998 Habitat Survey this should be highlighted in the comments section of the pro forma.</p> <p>Consultee mentions that residents of 18 to 28 Vicarage Lane own an access strip of land along the Lane adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. This would necessitate potential access being placed further along the Lane Amend report to include this information</p> <p>Amend report to take this aspects into account</p>
469/RV/001	TP 1802	<p>Consultee advises that the site is owned by Wilpshire Landowners Association, a group of the owners of adjacent houses</p> <p>The report and data base should be amend to reflect this and its impact upon availability.</p>

495/240/004	TP 1905	<p>Consultee asserts that all of site 240 is in a Conservation Area rather than half as report states.</p> <p>This is correct and the report and database will be amended accordingly.</p>
495/047/001	TP 1906	<p>Consultee indicates that there is no brownfield land in the middle of the site, as the report states.</p> <p>Amend report accordingly.</p>
495/047/007	TP 1912	<p>Consultee suggests that more than half of the site is within the Conservation Area, rather than the half that the report states. On measuring the area of the site 1.48 ha or 55% of the total area of site 47 is within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Amend report to state that 55% of the site is within the Conservation Area.</p>

**Site index:**

- 001 Land adjacent The Bungalow, Queen Street Low Moor Clitheroe,
- 20 South of Claremont Drive, Clitheroe,
- 27 Primrose Lodge/rear of 59-97 Woone Lane, Clitheroe
- 47 Land to rear 53 Chapel Hill, Longridge
- 66 Land east of Bracken Hey Clitheroe
- 89 Lower Buck Farm, Waddington
- 94 Land adj Mill cottage ( off Victoria Terrace), Mellor Brook
- 106 Land at Back Lane, Grindleton
- 124 Banks Cottage, Longridge Road, Thornley
- 136 Land adjacent Clitheroe Road Whalley
- 161 Field rear of Methodist Chapel, Chapel lane, West Bradford.
- 169 Vacant land to east of Vicarage Lane, Wilpshire
- 209 Land adjacent to 14 Church Raikes, Chipping
- 240 Derelict house & barn & land, 53 Chapel hill, Longridge
- 306 Land at Barrow. Barrow