

# **HABERGHAM EAVES PARISH COUNCIL**

[www.haberghameavesparishcouncil.co.uk](http://www.haberghameavesparishcouncil.co.uk)

**CLERK: REBECCA AF HAY  
OLLISTAN  
239 RED LEES ROAD  
CLIVIGER  
NR. BURNLEY  
BB10 4RF**

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2<sup>ND</sup>, 2022 IN BURNLEY GOLF CLUB.**

Present: Couns. PG Osbaldeston, K. Haworth, C. Markarian ,P. Drain, P. Marsden, M. Brindle and E Mountford.

### **1. Apologies for absence**

PSCO Clark.

### **2. Minutes of the last meeting**

These were accepted, with the correction of those present to include Coun. P. Marsden.

### **3. Matters arising from minutes**

#### **3.1 Bull and Butcher garden**

Plans showing the landscaping at the new care home have been approved by BBC. The owners of the care home have agreed to mow the grass of the parish council garden. The clerk to check with BBC parks to ensure the garden area is still to be cared for by them.

#### **3.2 Fairways Drive ginnel**

Coun Inkle had chased up the replacement bin at the ginnel. BBC say a new one is not required, but if the parish council wanted to pay for one, then the cost would be £544.95 for the bin, which included installation. Due to the high implications, the parish council decided not to buy a new bin and await a new one when required. Coun. Drain said there is a tree which needs trimming in the ginnel. Vegetation has been dumped in the ginnel,

.

#### **3.3 Vegetation tipping on Moseley Road**

The parish council is working with LCC to apply for funding for work to maintain and upgrade the area off Moseley Road, which will include access and repairs to make the area more accessible to multi users..The application to the Lancashire Environment Fund has been submitted and results should be due at the end of this month. Coun. Markarian declared an interest in the scheme, but asked whether the work to repair the steps at The Kilns had been included in the plan as it would involve potentially disturbing a water pipe. The clerk to check with LCC.

#### **3.4 Vegetation around planters and boundary stones**

The lengthsman has strimmed around and tidied up the area. Following the bad weather, there is to be a check on the plants in the two troughs and at the entrance to The Buttercross. Once decided, Coun. Drain is to keep tidy and re plant seasonal plants if necessary, with the assistance of Coun. Mountford.

### 3.5 Pot holes in Fairways Drive

LCC has patched these up, but since the bad weather, they are in need of more filling. The clerk to contact LCC. Repair work to pot holes in Eaves Avenue appears to have stood the bad weather.

### 3.6 Woodplumpton Road dog bin

The request for a bin has been added to the list for the next financial year.

### 3.7 Community speed/road watch

Couns. PG Osbaldeston and E Mountford had met with Assistant Police Commissioner Andy Pratt and PSCO Sharon Clark to see how the speed monitoring units work. Following this, Coun Drain had joined a virtual meeting to discuss a community watch which is designed to get the community involved in order to identify the areas where there is a need to try and prevent speeding and bad driving. Coun. Drain had also been approached by residents in Fairways to provide a type of rumble strip. It is hoped this can be discussed under the scheme. Coun Osbaldeston said the police are also cracking down on car meets.

### 3.8 Re stocking of trees at former escape road site

The clerk to check with BBC re the Forestry Commission order to re stock the trees which were illegally felled.

## 4. Reports from outside bodies

Police report for January

Glen View Road - Civil dispute, road traffic collision, nuisance.

Buttercross Close - Hoax calls.

Farrington Road – Burglary.

Woodplumpton Road - Injured wildlife, assault.

Billington Road - Burglary, vehicle crime, road traffic collision.

Moseley Road- Criminal damage.

Apex Close - Highway, parking issues.

Farrington Road – Nuisance.

Rosendale Road - Theft, civil dispute.

Crown Point Road - Highway disruption.  
February

Farrington Road –Burglary.

Nuisance - youths throwing eggs at vehicles.

Farrington Close – Burglary.

Crown Point Road - Highway disruption, issues with cattlegrid.  
Road related, car driven off road.  
Suspicious circumstances, car.

Manchester Road -Highway disruption, sheep in road.

Apex Close- Highway disruption, parking issues.

Oakeneaves Avenue -Highway disruption, sheep in road.

## 5. Correspondence

Following a report of overgrown ivy coming at Approach Way, LCC had arranged for it to be cut back.

## 6. Planning

HOU/2021/0747 PROPOSAL: Ground floor pitched roof rear extension and first floor side extension. AT: 33 Wilkie Avenue Burnley Habergham Eaves - no comments

HOU/2021/0743 PROPOSAL: Proposed demolition of existing garage erection of single storey extension to side and rear and new detached garage. AT: 12 Oakeneaves Avenue Burnley Habergham Eaves - no comments.

FUL/2021/0691 - Erection of 122no. dwellings and associated access, parking & landscaping. | Land south of Rossendale Road - Habergham Eaves Parish Council objected to this site being placed in the Local Plan for the very reasons which are now causing concern in the community. It is important to bear in mind that just because a site is in a Local Plan, planning permission is not inevitable and the concerns and objections of the community which will be affected by the development, should be at the forefront of the developers, planners and councillors' minds.

Having now read the planning statement prepared on behalf of Seddon Homes, it is clear that the developer is linking this application with application FUL/2021/0273 submitted by Barratt Homes and which has yet to be decided . The main links are to the main points of objections, access and number of houses.

Although we realise the council looks at the merits of each plan as it is submitted, Habergham Eaves Parish Council has reflected the links in its objections as below.

### **Number of houses is in excess of that allocated in the Local Plan**

The Local Plan, page 59 [Burnley's Local Plan Adopted Version - Final.pdf](#), says that for HS1/4 Land at Rossendale Road (housing) the **indicative number of dwellings is 188**. The estate to the north (Application FUL/2021/0273) is for 101 houses, whilst the estate to the south (Application FUL/2021/0691) is for 122 dwellings, giving a total of **223 dwellings, almost 20% more than that allocated**. We would point out that there is no evidence of need for this extra 20%. Burnley has thousands of empty homes which could be renovated and returned to people to live in and there is no justification to infringe any further on green belt land. The council has a policy for protecting the countryside for a reason and should adhere to it.

### **Traffic will exit through other housing estate to north**

The access suggested by using the road proposed via Application FUL/2021/0273 is of great concern.

The area is already saturated in traffic as vehicles access Rossendale Road from the existing estates and we would ask how a decision can be made on access if it is reliant on the approval of another planning application before it has gone to committee?

We note how all of the traffic from the southern estate will get to Rossendale Road , passing along the straight length of road in the estate to the north, and this will be a busy stretch of road

Suggest that the application for the estate to the north should not be granted without considering this, and the increased loading of traffic entering Rossendale Road from the two estates combined.

Rossendale Road itself is a busy main road with housing on both sides and therefore parking on both sides, leading to poor sight lines, especially coming out of the estates onto it. How is this to be addressed at peak times? Couple this with the increase of traffic which will also flow onto Rossendale Road from the proposed nearby industrial estate, heading for both Manchester and the M65 and the traffic increase will not only lead to congestion, but affect the quality of life for the existing community.

### **Claim the development will improve biodiversity is contradictory**

The planning statement (paragraph 5.4.20) says '**the proposed development will protect and enhance the natural and built environment in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 8 of the NPPF, including ... improving biodiversity**'. This is contradicted by the results of the Assessment of the Biodiversity Net Gain, Table 4.4 of which shows a **32% loss of habitat units**. The suggestion in paragraph 5.3 of the BNG Assessment is that '**the enhancements proposed for biodiversity (i.e. the bat and bird boxes proposed) will mitigate for**

**the losses of habitat associated with the BNG Metric'**. This is not justified and the provision of 'some bird and bat boxes' is not a meaningful substitute for the provision of appropriately designed wildlife habitat.

The Planning Statement (paragraphs 8.18-8.1.10) says the developers intention is that the exact type and amount of contributions required for the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain across the site will be discussed with the Council during the application process, and that this intention should be sufficient to positively weigh significantly in favour of the scheme. There is no evidence that Biodiversity Net Gain is achievable and the suggested provision of some bird and boxes demonstrates a lack of commitment to meaningful wildlife habitat creation. **The proposal needs to demonstrate in advance it will (as it claims) improve biodiversity, rather than suggest this can deal with at a later stage.**

It is apparent that the proposed watercourse will be of limited value. It will (presumably) be culverted underground to the north under the other housing estate and has no direct connection with the either of the attenuation ponds. These ponds will be of limited value for wildlife unless they are securely fenced and designed to support significant areas of marginal vegetation. These are attenuation ponds, included as SuD flood control features to trap flood water. They will periodically dry out during the summer months, making them sub-optimal as wildlife habitat. It is not clear if the attenuation pond will be securely fenced to prevent disturbance, littering, etc.

### **Renewables**

It is disappointing that the developer is choosing not to install any renewable energy systems in homes. Although we realise this complies with the council's current building regulations, it goes against the council's climate change emergency policy adopted in 2020 (two years after the Local Plan), where the council pledges to do all it can to protect the environment. To put the onus on the future home owners to install solar roof panels etc is unrealistic. It is noted, Burnley Council negotiated renewables when the Red Lees Road site was developed, so it shows the council feel the need for developers to adopt this good practice.

### **Recreational areas**

The parish council is disappointed that the developer has not included a stand alone play area and instead is relying on existing play facilities and footpaths in the area. When Oakeneaves Avenue was built, a play area was included in the plan, yet in the end extra houses were built on the site. Seddon Homes say they will discuss this facility after a decision has been made, but the parish council would ask why this very important issue, for the well being of the community, is not included in the application.

### **Developer contributions**

The parish council is disappointed that the loss of green fields is not resulting in a substantial contribution from the developer to compensate for the extra strain on services, especially education, within the existing community.

### **Buttercross**

We can't see the developer has made any provision for the grade II listed Butter Cross, which is a surprise, as they mention it in the Planning Statement – the Archaeological Report says 'This assessment has established that there is a designated heritage asset within the site, the Grade II Listed Base of Former Butter Cross. The asset is at risk of potential direct physical impacts and impacts to its setting. **The cross base is noted in the evidence base prepared for the current Local Plan, which suggests that the site of the cross base should be preserved and protected, or the cross base could, potentially, be moved to a new location**'. Again this needs clearing up before the application is considered as this is of historical importance.

## **7. Finance**

The precept was set at £6,000, which is reduced slightly from last year. This is the second year running the council has dropped the precept to show to recognise the potential financial pressures residents face during these times of uncertain cost of living.

Authorised payments were made to:

January

R. Hay, clerk – £385 – salary and expenses.

LCC pension for clerk - £25.55

J. Barritt - £30 for PAYE.

HMRC - £89.11

February:

R. Hay, clerk – £385 – salary and expenses.  
LCC pension for clerk - £25.55.

March:

R. Hay, clerk – £385 – salary and expenses.  
LCC pension for clerk - £25.55  
Website annual charge and content service charge - £560 .

#### 8. Any other business

Coun. Haworth had raised an unsafe tree on Glen View Road and LCC had inspected and will take out remedial action if necessary.

#### 9. Date of next meeting

June 8<sup>th</sup> 7-15 p.m., at Burnley Golf Club, preceded by the AGM at 7 p.m..