

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

please ask for: OLWEN HEAP
direct line: 01200 414408
e-mail: olwen.heap@ribblevalley.gov.uk
my ref: OH/CMS
your ref:
date: 7 August 2012

Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414488
DX: Clitheroe 15157
www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

The next meeting of the **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** is at **6.30pm** on **THURSDAY, 16 AUGUST 2012** at the **TOWN HALL, CHURCH STREET, CLITHEROE.**

I do hope you can be there.

Yours sincerely

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

To: Committee Members (copy for information to all other members of the Council)
Directors
Press
Parish Councils (copy for information)

AGENDA

Part I – items of business to be discussed in public

1. Apologies for absence.
2. To approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 19 July 2012 – copy enclosed.
3. Declarations of Interest (if any).
4. Public Participation (if any).

DECISION ITEMS

- ✓ 5. Planning Applications – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 6. Ribble Valley Core Strategy – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- ✓ 7. Housing Land Availability – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 8. Revenue Outturn 2011/12 – report of Director of Resources – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 9. Revenue Monitoring 2012/13 – report of Director of Resources – copy enclosed.
- 10. Appeals:
 - a) 3/2011/0820/P – Development of land without complying with conditions subject to previous planning permission granted at Butchers Laithe, Knotts Lane, Tosside – appeal dismissed.
- 11. Report of Representatives on Outside Bodies (if any).

Part II - items of business **not** to be discussed in public

None.

INDEX OF APPLICATIONS BEING CONSIDERED MEETING DATE 16 AUGUST 2012					
	<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Page:</u>	<u>Officer:</u>	<u>Recommendation:</u>	<u>Site:</u>
A	APPLICATIONS REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE FOR APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS:				
				NONE	
B	APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR APPROVAL:				
	3/2012/0535/P	1	CB	AC	Unit 23, Time Technology Park Blackburn Road Simonstone
C	APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL:				
	3/2012/0053/P	5	GT	R	41 Dilworth Lane Longridge
	3/2012/0134/P	11	AD	R	5 Hodder Court Hurst Green
D	APPLICATIONS UPON WHICH COMMITTEE DEFER THEIR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO WORK DELEGATED TO DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BEING SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED				
	3/2012/0379/P	18	SW	DEFER	Primrose Mill Woone Lane, Clitheroe
	3/2012/0455/P	24	SW	DEFER	Shireburn Caravan Park Edisford Road, Waddington
E	APPLICATIONS IN 'OTHER' CATEGORIES:				
				NONE	

LEGEND

AC Approved Conditionally
R Refused
M/A Minded to Approve

JM John Macholc
SW Sarah Westwood
CS Colin Sharpe
AD Adrian Dowd

GT Graeme Thorpe
MB Mark Baldry
CB Claire Booth

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 AUGUST 2012
 title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

PLANNING APPLICATIONS UNDER THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990:

APPLICATION NO: 3/2011/0535 (GRID REF: SD 377702, 433377)
 PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICES (CLASS A2) TO A TAXI OFFICE (SUI-GENERIS) AT UNIT 23 TIME TECHNOLOGY PARK, BLACKBURN ROAD, SIMONSTONE, BB12 2TY

PARISH COUNCIL: No objections to the usage of the unit for taxi operations, however, they have objections to the location of the original parking area behind Railway Terrace due to potential adverse impact on residential amenity.

The Parish Council proposed that the taxis be parked in either 'Fenced Car Park (Z)' or 'Yard (AA)' as illustrated in the Time Technology Park Site Plan, both of which are remote from residential properties, and underused.

ENVIRONMENT
 DIRECTORATE
 (COUNTY SURVEYOR):
 ADDITIONAL
 REPRESENTATIONS:

No objections to the proposal.

Two letters and a petition with 27 addresses (39 names) have been received objecting to the proposal for the following reasons;

- The residents of Railway Terrace, Bank Terrace and Tunstead Avenue will be affected by increased traffic movements, noise from car engines, voices, car doors slamming, vehicle fumes, and light pollution from headlights at unsociable hours and which would occur 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year;
- Increase in the volume of traffic on an already over used country lane, a busy main road and the entry/ exit is close to a major road junction;
- A taxi company of the proposed size would be better located close to a town centre rather than what is supposed to be a rural village;
- There are already two taxi companies operating in Simonstone and Padiham who employ local people. Allowing this company to operate could have a detrimental effect on these businesses;
- Devaluation of nearby properties; and,
- The nature of the business could attract persons to loiter within the neighbouring area which could lead to vandalism/ theft.

Due to the proximity of the car park, as initially submitted, to the rear of Railway Terrace, the applicant has proposed to use a different car park within the Time Technology Park. An amended site plan dated the 18 June 2012 has been received which proposes to use Car Park Z which is located at the opposite end of the site from Railway Terrace, at the eastern end of Time Technology Park. All surrounding businesses of the new car park as well as all the residents and businesses originally consulted have been re-consulted in June 2012 and no objections to the amended car park location have been received.

Proposal

The application seeks permission to use an existing unit within the Time Technology Park complex as a taxi office. Twenty parking spaces would be provided on an existing car park. The location of the car park has been moved from the north-west corner of Time Technology Park, located at the rear of Railway Terrace, to the eastern edge of the site, adjacent to the building on Time Technology Park known as Indigo House.

The taxi office would run on a twenty four hour basis, seven days a week, and would employ ten full-time members of staff and ten part time members of staff. The business would be run on a shift basis starting at 7am and 7pm.

Site Location

The taxi office would be located in unit 23 within one of the main blocks that make up Time Technology Park. The location of the car park would be adjacent to a building on Time Technology Park known as Indigo House positioned at the eastern end of the site.

Relevant History

Various applications on the site but nothing directly relates to the running of a taxi office.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 – Development Control

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The main matters for consideration in the determination of this application include highway safety and residential amenity.

Access to the car park and unit will be through the main access gates to Time Technology Park and twenty parking spaces would be available for use by the taxi premises. It is thus considered that the proposal is acceptable with regard to highway considerations and consequently the Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal.

In relation to residential amenity, at the time of the submission of the application, residents in the area raised concerns that the proposed use of the car park situated at the rear of Railway Terrace would cause noise and disturbance. Colleagues in the Environmental Health section,

agreed that the level of noise and disturbance would have had an unacceptable impact on the amenity of those residents. As a result of the number of objections, the applicant has liaised with the owners of Time Technology Park and has provided a plan illustrating twenty parking spaces on an alternative car park, which is located at the opposite end of the Industrial/Business Park adjacent to a building known as Indigo House known as Car Park 'Z'.

The parking spaces will thus be located away from residential properties on Railway Terrace. The nearest dwellings are The Knotts and Norwood View positioned on Blackburn Road adjacent to Seaways Services UK Ltd, a haulage and dairy printing business, which are located approximately 80 metres away from the proposed car parking area. It is considered that the taxi business operating will not cause any noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents, however, as it is proposed to run the taxi business 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, it would be reasonable to allow a temporary planning permission for two years to enable the Council to assess exactly what impact the business has on the amenities of the surrounding area.

It is considered that the proposed taxi office and parking area for up to twenty cars is acceptable in this location, the proposal would have little if any affect on residential amenity, therefore, the proposal is considered to be acceptable providing suitable conditions are attached.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has no significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity, nor would it have an adverse visual impact or be to the detriment of highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

1. The use hereby permitted shall cease and any associated plants, materials, and equipment shall be removed on or before 16 August 2014 and the site restored to its former condition to the full satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority unless a renewal of this planning permission has been granted by the Authority.

REASON: This temporary consent has been granted to enable the Local Planning Authority to assess and review the impact of the development against the requirements of Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

2. The licensed private hire vehicles associated with the proposal shall be parked on the designated parking area as shown on the amended location plan dated 18 June 2012 and this area shall be kept available for that purpose at all times.

REASON: In order to prevent the private hire vehicles being parked on the road, and in the interests of residential amenity, in accordance with policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

3. In the event that the parking area is no longer available for use, the permission for the private hire office shall cease.

REASON: In order to prevent the private hire vehicles from parking elsewhere within Time Technology Park in the interests of residential amenity and in accordance with policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

4. No more than twenty private hire vehicles shall operate from the premises hereby approved.

REASON: To ensure there is sufficient appropriate parking for private hire vehicles operating from the premises which would not adversely affect nearby residential amenity in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

C APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0053/P (GRID REF: SD 361239 437244)
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF THREE NEW TWO-STOREY TERRACE DWELLINGS.
GARDEN SPACE ALLOCATED TO EACH PROPERTY. SEVEN SURFACE PARKING BAYS.
RE-SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION 3/2011/0655/P. 41 DILWORTH LANE, LONGRIDGE,
LANCASHIRE, PR3 3ST.

LONGRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL: The Town Council objects to the proposal, and notes the following:

- The minor amendments to the proposal as submitted previously are acknowledged, however these do not affect the Town Council's opinion on the application that remains as it was when first considered in September 2011.
- The Council is concerned about the scale of the proposed development of the site particularly when considered with the other proposals on the site.
- The development will increase traffic on an already busy road.
- There will be a loss of amenity to the local area if trees are felled to allow vehicular access to the site. Councillors stress the importance of consultation with David Hewitt, Countryside Officer, who was involved with securing preservation orders on the trees to be lost.

LCC ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): No objections to the proposal from a highway safety point of view.

UNITED UTILITIES: No objection to the proposed development.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: Nine letters/e-mails have been received from nearby neighbours, and their points of objection have been summarised as follows:

1. Proposed three-dwelling terrace is both in nature and design out of keeping with the surrounding area,
2. Incongruous development,
3. Concern regarding road safety due to a new entrance onto Dilworth Lane,
4. Insufficient parking and it will lead to people parking on Dilworth Lane blocking the road and impairing sightlines,
5. Insufficient turning area within parking area,

6. No pavement to front of houses meaning pedestrians will have to cross over a busy and dangerous road,
7. Size, scale and massing of scheme is inappropriate,
8. Lack of landscaping proposed,
9. Impact on highway safety on a very busy/dangerous road,
10. Impact on residential amenity through overlooking,
11. Impact on residential amenity through the loss of the boundary trees,
12. Visual impact on character and appearance of the streetscene due to the loss of the trees from the site,
13. Impact on the setting and views of the 'Historic building' no. 41 Dilworth Lane (Old Coach House),
14. Inappropriate use of render, and
15. Loss of light.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the proposed construction of three new two-storey terrace dwellings with allocated garden space within the garden curtilage of no. 41 Dilworth Lane. The scheme also includes the creation of a new entrance onto Dilworth Lane and the provision of seven parking bays for the new development. The application is a re-submission of application 3/2011/0655P that was withdrawn by the applicant. 41 Dilworth Lane itself, also known as The Coach House, is predominantly made up of stonework facades, and has a slate roof. The buildings are over 150 years old as they are clearly seen on the 1845 maps supplied within the D&A/Heritage Statement. The building was originally a farmhouse with attached barn, however in the early 80s permission was granted for the conversion of the northern end of the building (originally a coach house/barn) into residential use, hence the appearance of this portion of the property. The buildings have been maintained in a traditional manner, whereas the garden and interior spaces have undergone more contemporary alterations. More recent proposals for other development within the curtilage of the property (including a conservatory and a triple garage) were previously refused for reasons such as their roadside position, visual impact on the converted barn section of the main dwelling and the loss of trees required during their construction, however such issues have now been overcome and these developments have now been approved.

This scheme seeks permission for a development of three properties within the curtilage of the property sited to the far east, north of the recently approved Rowland Homes development. The development will be more than 70m from 41 Dilworth Lane but less than 20m from no. 5 Dilworth Court. The dwellings will measure 5.029m to the eaves and 8.9m to the highest point of the ridge, and will have a combined footprint of approximately 22.965m (w) x 13.697m (d). The properties will have a stone frontage (facing Dilworth Lane) with rendered side and rear elevations, and the roof will be a grey slate to match the roof of no. 41 Dilworth Lane. The scheme requires the removal of all but two of the trees contained within the recently issued TPO including those along the frontage of Dilworth Lane (T1 within the TPO) and the group of trees to the south eastern corner of the site adjacent to no. 5 Dilworth Court. The plans indicate that these trees will be replaced with similar or better species elsewhere on site if approved.

Site Location

The application relates to the garden curtilage of a large semi-detached dwelling approximately 100m to the south east of the settlement boundary of Longridge, within open countryside as

defined by the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan. The site has open fields to the north of the site, a small collection of dwellings to the east, a densely populated area of housing approximately 90 west of the site and construction work has recently commenced on land to the south of the site for a recently approved housing development of 49 units.

Relevant History

3/2012/0052/P - Proposed construction of a new detached triple garage with office space above. Re-submission of application 3/2011/0654P – Granted Conditionally.

3/2012/0051/P - Construction of single storey conservatory to South face of existing two-storey dwelling. Re-submission of application 3/2011/0656P – Granted Conditionally.

3/2011/0656/P - Construction of two-storey conservatory, with mezzanine, to south face of existing two-storey dwelling – Refused.

3/2011/0655/P - Construction of 3no. two-storey terraced dwellings. Garden space allocated to each property and 6no. surface parking bays – Withdrawn.

3/2011/0654/P - Construction of new, detached, triple garage with office space above – Refused.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 – Settlement Strategy.

Policy ENV3 – Open Countryside.

Policy ENV13 – Landscape

Policy H10 – Residential Extensions.

Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.

Policy T1 - Development Proposals - Transport Implications.

Policy T7 - Parking Provision.

Addressing Housing Needs.

Core Strategy 2008-2028 – A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Regulation 19 Consultation Draft.

DP1 – Spatial Principles North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) to 2021.

DP2 – Promote Sustainable Development - North West of England RSS to 2021.

DP7 – Promote Environmental Quality - North West of England RSS to 2021.

L4 – Regional Housing Provision - North West of England RSS to 2021.

L5 – Affordable Housing - North West of England RSS to 2021.

National Planning Policy Framework.

Technical Guidance to National Planning Policy Framework.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The main issues to consider with this scheme are the principle of the development, the visual impact on the streetscene, the visual impact of the scheme on the character and setting of the adjacent dwellings, whether there is an impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings and whether there are any highway safety concerns.

PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The policy basis against which this scheme should be appraised is set out in the context of national, regional and local development plan policies. At a national level the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into force on 27 March 2012 and states that *at the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development* which means that for decision making purposes that:

- Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless
 - *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or*
 - *specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.*

The NPPF requires LPAs to consider housing applications in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the LPA cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable sites. As at 1 July 2012, Ribble Valley can demonstrate a 6 year supply of housing, including a 10% allowance for slippage but no detailed site adjustments for deliverability.

The issue of a five year supply is a somewhat complex one as we move forward with the preferred development option in the Core Strategy at a time when government advice has highlighted that the Regional Strategy (RS) is soon to be abolished and that it will fall upon LPAs to determine what the housing requirement should be for their own borough. The most relevant policies of the RS are those that relate to housing requirements (Policy L4) and affordable housing (Policy L5). The Council has established that it will continue to determine planning applications against the existing RS figure of 161 dwellings per year (in line with Government guidance) and as Members will recall, this is a minimum requirement not a maximum. Even though the Council is undertaking a review of its housing requirements as part of the plan making process, the requirement going forward is most appropriately addressed within the Core Strategy examination and statutory plan making process. Therefore, whilst mindful of the figure of 200 dwellings per year, agreed by a special meeting of Planning and Development Committee on 2 February 2012 as the annual housing requirement (following work undertaken by Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners) it is the 161 per year requirement that remains the relevant consideration for decision-making purposes on planning applications at this time. As stated, the current figure would appear to demonstrate a 5.2 year supply against that requirement.

I am mindful of the statement in NPPF cited above which advocates a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The site under consideration here lies outside the saved settlement boundary of Longridge however as it is bounded on three sides by housing development, the development of this particular site for housing would effectively complete the 'Dilworth Triangle' area of Longridge. The circumstances that are prevalent now with the need to meet the requirements of NPPF and maintain a deliverable five year supply of housing are such that this site is considered to meet the three dimensions of sustainable development as outlined in NPPF – economic, social and environmental. Considered close enough to the settlement boundary as it is, and being of a scale that is not considered inappropriate to the locality (Longridge being the key service centre in the borough), it is concluded that in land use terms the use of the site for residential development as a principle would be consistent with the national policy framework, extant Regional Strategy and at the scale proposed the principles of

the Emerging Core Strategy together with relevant material considerations that the Council must currently take into account.

In relation to whether affordable housing is required on the site, the document 'Addressing Housing Need in Ribble Valley' must be considered. In considering this site, the Council would adopt the approach outlined in paragraph 3.1 of the document, i.e. *In all other locations in the borough [not Clitheroe or Longridge] on developments of 5 or more dwellings (or sites of 0.1 hectares or more irrespective of the number of dwellings) the council will seek 30% affordable units on the site.* On this basis, there is no requirement for affordable housing on this site.

VISUAL IMPACT OF SCHEME

As part of the principle of the development of this site it is also important to consider any potential visual impact of the scheme. Any development of this site will affect the streetscene however in order to refuse a development the significant visual harm of the proposal must be demonstrated and be sufficient enough to outweigh the requirement for new homes within the borough. When considering the harm, this can be done so in a number two ways. With regards to the design and materials used for the proposed housing, the NPPF provides the following guidance. Paragraph 63 of the NPPF notes that in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs that help raise the standard of design more generally in the area. However in virtually the same breath paragraph 64 then advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. At a local level, Policy H2 of the adopted Districtwide Local Plan advises that the impact of proposals on the countryside will be an important consideration in determining all planning applications, and that development should be appropriately sited and landscaped. In addition, scale, design, and materials used must reflect the character of the area, and the nature of the enterprise. Local Plan Policy ENV3 also advises that in the open countryside development will be required to be in-keeping with the character of the landscape area and should reflect local vernacular style features and building materials.

In this instance, the proposal submitted is for three terraced dwellings with a combined footprint of approximately 22.965m (w) x 13.697m (d) that will measure 5.029m to the eaves and 8.9m to the highest point of the ridge. Having visited this location and looked at the size of nearby properties, I am satisfied that the overall height of the building proposed could be supported at this location however there are issues with the overall massing that I will come to shortly. With regards to the materials to be used, the properties will have a stone frontage (facing Dilworth Lane) with rendered side and rear elevations, and the roof will be a grey slate to match the roof of no. 41 Dilworth Lane. The properties to the east and west of the site are predominantly stone in construction however the recently approved development for Rowland Homes to the rear (south) of this site sees a mixture of brick and render being used for the housing approved. On the basis of the materials proposed, I do not consider them to be inappropriate for this particular area however this is not the main area of concern in respect to this scheme.

The main concern with this proposal is a culmination of three aspects of the scheme, namely the overall massing of the housing, the layout on site and the loss of the trees on both the northern and eastern boundary of the site required in order to build the housing. It is hard to disassociate these aspects, as they are all requisites of the scheme submitted. For instance, were the trees able to be retained as part of the development the overall visual impact on the streetscene would potentially be mitigated by the existing tree lined avenue that adds so much to the character and visual amenity of this particular entrance to Longridge; however due to the

massing of the proposed building and layout of the proposed site, the scheme requires the loss of a number of these important trees that front and add to the visual amenity value of Dilworth Lane, and the loss of trees that provide a significant visual amenity screen for the occupiers of no. 5 Dilworth Court. One roadside tree, noted as T1 within the recently enforced TPO Ref. No. 7/19/3/186, a mature horse chestnut, has previously been granted permission to be removed as part of application 3/2012/0052/P to allow the improvement of the existing, severely restricted visibility splays at the existing access. The proposal submitted requires the removal of the following trees protected under TPO Ref. No. 7/19/3/186, namely T4, T5, T6 and the group G1 in its entirety, and it is for these reasons that if approved the Council consider that the scheme would have a significant and detrimental visual impact upon the setting and character of the street scene as well as upon the residential amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. This concern is supported by paragraph 118 of the NPPF which states that 'When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principle - if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. At a local plan level, Policy ENV13 considers landscape protection and advises that the Borough Council will refuse development proposals that harm important landscape features including hedgerows and individual trees.

One of the objections raised by the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings in regards to the proposed development is the potential 'impact on residential amenity' caused by the development of this site, more specifically the close proximity of the development to no. 5 Dilworth Court. There is a distance of 11m between the gable of the new building and the rear elevation of no. 5 Dilworth Lane which, when you measure distances between the new housing on the development site to the site of this site, is not considered unacceptable, however as highlighted in my earlier paragraph the issue is the loss of the large cluster of trees on the boundary that provide a significant visual amenity screen for the occupiers of no. 5 Dilworth Court that is the most cause for concern, and which forms an element of the basis for the reason for refusal. There are no issues of overlooking due to the orientation of the new building on site and oblique angles between habitable room windows.

With regards to the impact on the character and setting of the existing dwelling, especially given the consideration that the building is a non-designated heritage asset (in-line with guidance provided within NPPF), it is worth noting the following. National guidance contained within paragraph 129 of the NPPF considers that 'Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.' Given the distance between the proposed development and the non-designated heritage asset of over 70m, it is not considered that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the non-designated heritage asset.

ACCESS

With regards to the proposed access to the site, following the submission of an amended plan and further information the LCC County Surveyor raises no objection in principle to this application on highway safety grounds. He notes that a satisfactory visibility splay of 2.4m x 50m at the proposed new access to the parking area can be achieved with the felling of a

number of frontage trees. The number of parking bays has been increased from 6 to 7 thus allowing two spaces per dwelling plus a visitor space, and it is considered that if approved the parking area will need to be paved in suitable materials i.e. not loose gravel or similar and be available for use prior to occupation of the dwellings. The proposed dwellings have been moved back slightly from the edge of carriageway to allow a 1.5m footway and facilitate good visibility to the east. The railings to the front of the proposed dwellings have been removed from the plans and no longer encroach on the available footway width. The Highways Officer appreciates that the loss of the trees as part of the planning scheme is a matter for the Council to consider, however if this element were to be accepted, the Highways Officer would be satisfied with the highway safety element of the scheme.

As such, bearing in mind the above comments and whilst I am mindful of the points of objection from the Parish Council and nearby neighbours, I consider the scheme to comply with the relevant policies, and I recommend the scheme accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. Due to the overall massing of the housing, the layout and position on site and the loss of the trees on both the northern and eastern boundary of the site (required in order to facilitate the proposed development), the Council consider that the scheme would have a significant and detrimental visual impact upon both the setting, character and visual amenity value of the street scene and the residential amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. Approval would therefore be contrary to guidance contained within paragraphs 64 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework, as well as the provisions of Local Plan Policies G1, G5, ENV3 and ENV13.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0134/P (GRID REF: SD 370198)
PROPOSED INSTALLATION OF A FLUE FOR A FREE STANDING LOG BURNING STOVE
AT 5 HODDER COURT, KNOWLES BROW, HURST GREEN

PARISH COUNCIL: No comments received.

HISTORIC AMENITY SOCIETIES: Consulted, no representations received.

RVBC COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER: The property has conservation significance for breeding bat species and further survey work is required between May and end of August consisting of at least one evening emergence survey and one dawn survey in order to establish species, numbers, roost status and location of access and roosting points. A detailed method statement is required before any works are undertaken and shall include details of mitigation measures that are required to reduce the impact of the development on protected species [bats].

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:

A letter has been received from a resident of Hodder Court (apartment 7) expressing no objection.

Two letters of objection have been received from residents of Hodder Court (No's 1 and 3) which make the following points:

- i. The application form states that neighbour and community consultation has been undertaken. However, apartments 1-4 unaware of proposals until site notice displayed (and this is inadequate community consultation);
- ii. Plans unclear as to how the flue will run from apartment 5 and emerge from the roof of apartment 7;
- iii. Listed building – concerned that the flue will be on the outer surface of the north wall. Detrimental, unsightly and out of character;
- iv. Smoke and fumes in the enclosed courtyard. More pollution in No's 1-4. Existing kitchen extractor fans in courtyard will allow smoke and fumes to filter to the inside;
- v. The residents of 1-4 Hodder Court have not received individual consultation. The site notice was rather late in the day;
- vi. Bats in the roof space – respect these habitats;
- vii. Oil tank installed at No 5 recently. Planning permission granted despite objections.

Proposal

Listed building consent is sought for a flue for use with a freestanding log burning stove. From its origin, the flue is proposed to pass through 7 Hodder Court (above 5 Hodder Court) and the roofspace and then to project from the roof ridge at the juncture with the contiguous property 'Old House', to the east. The flue is then proposed to be attached to and rise to the full height of Old House's gable chimney stack (approximately a 2.5m projection). Revised plans (21 June 2012) have been received from the applicant, indicating the flue to have a 0.25m x 0.25m casing plan size and to be render coated steel (finish to emulate Ashlar).

Section 7 of the application form (neighbour and community consultation) advises of the agreement to the scheme of the management company and the owner of the gable/chimney to which the flue is proposed to be affixed.

A bat survey has been submitted which concludes that the property has "moderate" conservation significance and breeding bats are likely to be present within part of the roof and void between April and the end of August.

A Design and Access Statement has been submitted which states:

1. the interior of the building was completely refitted in the early 1980's immediately before listing, therefore the interior works do not affect the historic or architectural interest of the building;
2. the cost of heating is fairly onerous due to the size and constructional type. The proposals improve the viability of a protected building and conserve fuel and power.

Site Location

Hodder Court (Hodder Place) is a Grade II listed three-storey house, once a preparatory school for Stonyhurst College, now divided into flats. It is very prominently sited on an escarpment above the river and within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The access drive to Hodder Court is also a public footpath (FP 75).

The Draft Stonyhurst College Conservation Plan (July 2008; 4.1.17) suggests that Hodder Place was originally a mill owner's house. In the early 19th century the factory was demolished and two new wings were added to the house to form a (Society of Jesus) Noviciate.

The list description (22 November 1983) identifies building evolution as '*late C18th with early C19th additions and later C19th extensions*'. It also identifies the south front as the most important elevation and describes in detail its architecturally lively and varied form (styles, roofscape, heights, materials).

The listed building's courtyard elevations are also prominent but suffer to a degree from unsympathetic modern alteration which it is understood is related to the building only being listed part way through implementation of conversion works (application 3/81/0446). This appears to be confirmed by the list description's reference to '*now divided into flats*'.

No's 5 (ground floor) and 7 Hodder Court is to the middle of the south front range. Its ridge is significantly below that of the contiguous property to the east (Old House) revealing a part ashlar-stoned gable apex. The north elevation of the range forms one side of a courtyard which is also prominent and open to views from the public footpath.

Relevant History

Pre-application advice sought by applicant August 2010. Officers considered a roof top flue scheme to be unduly harmful to the listed building.

3/2007/0323 - Fitting of a new stainless steel flue pipe in conjunction with the use of a wood burning stove (Flat 4). LBC refused 15 June 2007. Appeal dismissed 21 April 2008.

3/2006/0284 – Backplate and flue for oil fired boiler, on wall of kitchen, next to rear door leading to private yard (Flat 5). LBC granted 15 May 2006.

3/2006/0010 – Oil tank in private yard (Flat 5). PP granted 30 March 2006.

3/1988/0112 – Velux roof light (Flat 7). LBC granted 24 March 1988.

3/1983/0659 & 0658 – Alterations to form four permanent residential flats on the southerly side of the complex. PP & LBC granted 31 January 1984.

3/1981/0446 – Three dwellings for permanent residential occupation, five holiday flats and bed and breakfast facilities for guest accommodation. PP granted 15 September 1981.

3/1981/0244 – Conversion of former private school to residential unit. Outline PP granted 2 August 1979.

3/1977/0978 – Proposed part demolition and conversion of private school to residential unit. Outline PP granted 31 October 1977.

Relevant Policies

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

National Planning Policy Framework.

Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide.

Policy ENV20 - Proposals Involving Partial Demolition/Alteration of Listed Buildings.

Policy ENV19 - Listed Buildings (Setting).

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy ENV1 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The main consideration in the determination of this listed building consent application is the duty at Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. However, some regard may also be had to the following legislation, policy and guidance.

The National Planning Policy Framework (27 March 2012):

Paragraph 7 states that sustainable development has three dimensions. The creation of a high quality built environment and providing support to community cultural well-being is part of the *social role*. Protecting and enhancing the built and historic environment, the prudent use of natural resources and mitigation and adaption to climate change are parts of the *environmental role*;

Paragraph 17 'Core Planning Principles' includes "*conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations*";

Paragraph 126 states that local planning authorities should recognise that "*heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource*" which should be conserved in a "*manner appropriate to their significance*". Local planning authorities should also take into account "*the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets ... the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring ... (and) the opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place*";

Paragraph 131 states "*In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness”;

Paragraph 132 states *“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification”*;

Paragraph 134 states *“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use”*;

Paragraph 95 states: *“to support the move to a low carbon future, local planning authorities should: actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings .*

The Historic Environment Planning Policy Guide states:

“New elements may be more acceptable if account is taken of the character of the building, the roofline and significant fabric ... in some circumstances the unbroken line of a roof may be an important contributor to its significance” (paragraph 185);

“small-scale features, inside and out, such as ...chimney breasts and stacks ... will frequently contribute strongly to a building’s significance and removing or obscuring them is likely to affect the asset’s significance” (paragraph 187);

“new services, both internal and external can have a considerable, and often cumulative, effect on the appearance of a building and can affect significance” (paragraph 189);

“it would not normally be acceptable for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting” (paragraph 178);

“the junction between new work and the existing fabric needs particular attention, both for its impact on the significance of the existing asset and the impact on the contribution of its setting” (paragraph 180);

“the extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations” (paragraph 114);

“the contribution that setting makes to the significance does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting ... Nevertheless, proper evaluation of the effect of change within the setting of a heritage asset will usually need to consider the implications, if any, for public appreciation of its significance” (paragraph 117);

“when a building is adapted for new uses, its form as well as its external and internal features may impose constraints. Some degree of compromise in use may assist in retaining significance” (paragraph 181);

The Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan states:

“Proposals for the alteration or repair of listed buildings should be sympathetic to their character and appearance. The most important features of any listed building will be preserved” (Policy ENV20);

“development proposals on sites within the setting of buildings listed as being of special architectural or historic interest, which cause visual harm to the setting of the building, will be resisted” (Policy ENV19);

“In determining planning applications the following criteria will be applied:

- (a) Development should be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature;*
- (h) Materials used should be sympathetic to the character of the area”* (Policy G1);

“ The Borough Council will support the development of renewable energy schemes provided it can be shown that such developments would not cause unacceptable harm to interests of acknowledged importance in the local environment” (Policy ENV24).

The ‘Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance’ (EH, October 2011) states:

“the cumulative impact of incremental small-scale changes may have as great an effect on the setting of a heritage asset as a large-scale development” (4.5).

In my opinion, Hodder Court is significant because of its historic association with Stonyhurst and an early water-powered textile mill and the interest of its exterior architecture and setting. The importance of the building’s façade is confirmed by the addition of the building to the Secretary of State’s list despite extensive alteration to the interior; the focus of the list description on the exterior and principally the south front, and the recent dismissal of an appeal concerning further degradation (fitting of roof flue pipe) to the courtyard already ‘modernised’ by 3/1981/0446. The south front roofscape is an interesting, varied and architecturally lively element of the listed building (including materials).

In my opinion and mindful of the legislation, policy, guidance and local resident opinion above, the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character (including setting) and significance of the listed building because the flue is conspicuous, incongruous and visually intrusive.

Buildings are listed for their innate interest rather than because of any public views. However, noting paragraphs 114 and 117 of the HEPPG I am concerned that the gable to Old House is highly visible from the elevated public right of way/road as well as from the south front and the courtyard.

The prominence of the Old House gable is reflected in the quality (Ashlar) of a remnant section of original stonework (the applicant advises that before the construction of his property Old House was the gable end of the range). The gable stonework also reflects subsequent changes to the building and contains less formal work in a variety of coursings, surface finishes and

hues. In this context, the proposed rendered box would be visibly linear, monolithic and not in harmony.

The proposal has some public benefit (NPPF paragraph 134) in respect to the mitigation of climate change and the prudent use of natural resources. However, in my opinion this does not outweigh the harm to the listed building, its setting and its features of special interest [Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990] and I do not consider the proposal to be sustainable development.

I am mindful of the concerns of local residents in respect to the possibility of smoke and fumes resulting from the development but do not consider this issue to be significant in the determination of the listed building consent application.

I am satisfied that the Borough Council has met its statutory obligations in respect to application consultation.

RECOMMENDATION: That listed building consent be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. The proposal is unduly harmful to the character (including setting and interesting roofscape) and significance of the listed building because the flue would be conspicuous, incongruous and visually intrusive as a result of its siting, materials and linear/monolithic form.

D APPLICATIONS ON WHICH COMMITTEE 'DEFER' THEIR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO WORK 'DELEGATED' TO THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BEING SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0379/P (GRID REF: SD 373742 440826)
PROPOSED MATERIAL AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED SCHEME (3/2010/0897/P) FOR DEMOLITION OF PRIMROSE MILL SITE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR 12 APARTMENTS AND 2 DWELLINGHOUSES (THIS APPLICATION RELATES TO 12 APARTMENTS ONLY) AT PRIMROSE MILL, WOONE LANE, CLITHEROE

TOWN COUNCIL: No objections.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): No objection in principle on highway safety grounds.

UNITED UTILITIES: No comments received at the time of report preparation.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: No comments received at the time of report preparation.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: No comments received at the time of report preparation.

Proposal

This application takes the form of a full submission for material alterations to a scheme approved previously under 3/2010/0897/P for a replacement building to thea mill to accommodate 12 apartments.

The scheme put forward here details a four-storey building roughly 'L' shaped in appearance with an overall footprint of approximately 18.9m x 16.5m and optimum height of approximately 13.5m. Its design has been revised since initial submission in order that the structure would have a natural stone finish to all elevations and not the expanses of brick and render to the elevations facing into the site as originally put forward. The roofing material would be slate under which would be uPVC windows and steel doors painted black.

Site Location

The site (0.2 hectare) lies to the west of Woone Lane within the identified settlement limit of Clitheroe. To its immediate west are presently commercial buildings, which together with this site and land extending towards the railway line to the north-west form part of a wider approved housing scheme. To the south lies a commercial business with public footpath no 17 passing between that and the application site. The mill building which occupied this site was demolished earlier this year.

Relevant History

3/2012/0394/P – Reserved matters consent for the design and appearance of proposed residential units including adjacent access ways, roads and footpaths, plus ancillary landscaping (78 units) – approved with conditions.

3/2012/0392/P – Proposed amendment of previously approved reserved matters application 3/2010/0756/P at site of Rectella Works – approved with conditions.

3/2010/0897/P – Proposed demolition of existing mill site for residential development for 12 apartments and 2 dwellinghouses, amendment to approved residential scheme 3/2008/0526/P – approved with conditions.

3/2010/0472/P – Adjustment of site access – approved with conditions 8 October 2010.

3/2008/0526/P – Regeneration of site around and including Primrose Mill for residential development (maximum 162 units) including improved site access, highway improvements and provision of public open space – approved with conditions 24 March 2010.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G2 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy A1 - Primrose Area Policy.

National Planning Policy Framework.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The principle of a replacement mill structure has been approved previously under 3/2010/0897/P and thus the matters for consideration under this material amendment scheme are visual and residential amenity, highway safety and how the proposals should be considered against the Section 106 Agreement that covers the wider site.

The mill that has recently been demolished was considered a heritage asset under the terms of PPS5 which was the National Heritage Policy document in force when the previous scheme was considered. The building was neither listed nor within a conservation area and the approach taken in considering the previous scheme was that the wider regeneration benefits of the scheme carry significance and thus the demolition of the mill whilst regrettable was acceptable in principle. The design of the new building was reflective of the commercial architectural style of the mill and combined both the tradition style with more contemporary style fenestration detailing in the use of large expanse of glazing and flat roof sections. The design put forward for consideration under this scheme has been amended since first submission in order to secure the use of natural stone on all elevations – previously the elevations within the body of the site were to have been a mix of render, brickwork and smaller areas of natural stonework. The footprint of the building is slightly reduced from the previous detailed scheme and at an optimum height of approximately 13.5m is approximately 2m below the optimum ridge of the previously approved scheme. Fenestration details now shown provide a more domestic proportion to window openings but I am of the opinion that the scheme shown would still remain sympathetic to the history and heritage of the former mill which occupied this site. Thus in design and visual amenity terms the scheme is considered appropriate.

In assessing residential amenity it is important to have regard to the relationship of the proposed apartment block with surrounding development both existing and proposed. In terms of distances to proposed dwellings under other approvals the relationship between this apartment block and apartment block 2 would provide distances between habitable rooms at less than the 21m advocated in our SPG when considering extensions and alterations to dwellings. The distance would be approximately 17m. However the 21m is an indicative figure when

considering extensions on properties which already exist whereas this is a new residential development where purchasers will be aware of the layout as approved and resultant relationship between properties. This is a distance which has been considered acceptable elsewhere on the wider primrose redevelopment and is also reflective of the characteristics of the surrounding area where facing distances between terrace dwellings can be as little as 12m. I am also mindful of the relationship with the commercial premises operated by Lodematic to the opposite side of the public footpath and the proposed apartment building. In considering the previous outline submission and subsequent detailed replacement mill building application it was deemed appropriate to impose a condition requiring the submission of noise mitigation measures on units on the southern side of the site in order to protect their amenities. I would consider it equally relevant to this submission and subject to this proviso would not conclude there to be any significant residential amenity issues resulting from this scheme.

In respect of highway safety this scheme, as with its predecessor, reduces the total number of residential units on this part of the overall site from that envisaged in the initial outline application. Parking provision is provided in the form of a courtyard parking area to the rear of the building with the County Surveyor commenting that the 12 spaces provided is the minimum acceptable provision for this aspect and that he is satisfied it would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety within the site or on the adjacent local highway network. Having regard to these comments and the phasing mechanisms of the outline consent and requirements for highway improvements, it is important to ensure that this scheme again secures those works.

Turning to Section 106 Agreement issues, it is important to remember that the Agreement contains trigger mechanisms for the payment of money towards open space, highway works and affordable housing with the first two contributions linked towards the legal completion of sale of set numbers of housing units be it market or affordable. Should committee be minded to approve this application, some mechanism will need to link into that Legal Agreement in order that the trigger points previously agreed are still activated at certain points of the overall development. This has been discussed with one of the Council's Legal Officers and a Deed of Variation can be drafted in order to achieve this.

Therefore having carefully considered all the above, I am of the opinion that the design put forward would not prove significantly detrimental to visual amenity, nor would it prove detrimental to residential amenity or highway safety. There is a need to ensure that the scheme is linked to the existing Section 106 Agreement for the wider site and subject to this I recommend accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has no significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity, nor would it have an adverse visual impact or be to the detriment of highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION: That the application be DEFERRED and DELEGATED to the Director of Community Services subject to drafting a Deed of Variation within 6 months of the date of this decision, to the existing Section 106 Agreement and subject to the following conditions:

1. The development must be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed in pursuance to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. apt3/001 – apartment type 3 elevation 1 amended 19 July 2012.
apt3/002 – apartment type 3 elevation 2 amended 19 July 2012.
apt3/003 – apartment type 3 elevation 3 amended 19 July 2012.
apt3/004 – apartment type 3 elevation 4 amended 19 July 2012.
apt3/005 – apartment type 3 ground floor plan, amended 10 July 2012.
apt3/006 – apartment type 3 first floor plan, amended 10 July 2012.
apt3/007 – apartment type 3 second floor plan, amended 10 July 2012.
apt3/008 – apartment type 3 third floor plan, amended 10 July 2012.
csp/002 – coloured site plan.
loc/002 – location plan.
matbound/002 – materials and boundary treatment plan.
SD/SW7 1200mm high screen wall and railings.
3244.001 – landscaping specification.
D3244.001 – landscaping layout plan.
D3244.002 – planting plan.

3. Precise specifications or samples of walling and roofing materials and details of any surface materials to be used including their colour and texture shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority may ensure that the materials to be used are appropriate to the locality in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

4. No works shall take place on the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which shall have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the site in accordance with Policies G1, ENV14 and ENV15 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

5. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme identifying how a minimum of 10% of the energy requirements generated by the development will be achieved by renewable energy production methods shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development and thereafter retained in perpetuity.

REASON: In order to encourage renewable energy and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

6. Prior to commencement of development approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage in development as maybe agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

1. A site investigation scheme, based on desk study report, Primrose Mill, Primrose Road, Clitheroe, Lancashire for Beck Developments Ltd, GEA, June 2008, Ref J07352 to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that maybe affected, including those off site.
2. The site investigation results and the detailed risk assessment (1) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
3. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in (2) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

REASON: To prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential contamination on site in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

7. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface water regulation system has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

REASON: To reduce the increased risk of flooding in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

8. The new estate road will be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estates Roads prior to occupation of any of the dwellings.

REASON: To comply with Policies G1 and T1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and to ensure that satisfactory access is provided for the site before the development hereby permitted is occupied.

9. No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - (i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - (ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - (iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - (iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - (v) wheel washing facilities;
 - (vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - (vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction works.

REASON: In the interests of protecting residential amenity from noise and disturbance in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

10. The parking bays for the apartments as shown on drawing csp/002 shall be provided and made available for use prior to occupation of any of the apartments.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

11. The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following occupation or use of the development and shall be maintained thereafter for a period of not less than 5 years to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. This maintenance shall include the replacement of any tree or shrub which is removed, or dies, or is seriously damaged, or becomes seriously diseased, by a species of similar size to those originally planted.

REASON: In the interests of the amenity of the area and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

12. Prior to commencement of development a scheme detailing noise mitigation measures to be incorporated into the design of the apartment building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures so submitted and approved shall thereafter be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the apartment units to which they relate and thereafter retained.

REASON: In accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan in the interests of safeguarding the amenity of occupiers of the new units.

13. No development shall take place until details of the provisions to be made for building dependent species of conservation concern artificial bird nesting boxes and artificial bat roosting sites have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details shall be submitted on a building dependent bird/bat species development site plan and include details of plot numbers and the numbers of per individual building/dwelling and type. The details shall also identify the actual wall and roof elevations into which the above provisions shall be incorporated [north/north east elevations for birds & elevations with a minimum of 5 hours morning sun for bats] and type and make of bird boxes and bat roof tiles i.e. lbstock.

The artificial bird/bat boxes shall be incorporated into those dwellings/buildings during the construction of those individual plots identified on the submitted plan in accordance with the approved details and under the supervision of the local RSPB Swift/Swallow Officer in liaison with the Council's Countryside Officer.

REASON: To enhance nesting/roosting opportunities for bird/bat species of conservation concern and reduce the impact of development in accordance with Policy ENV7 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and to ensure that bird and bat species are protected and their habitat enhanced, in accordance with the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended, the Conservation [Natural Habitats & c.] Regulations 1994 and the Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plan.

14. This permission shall relate to the S106 Agreement dated 24 March 2010 and Deed of Variation dated.....which include triggers for highway improvements and contributions towards the off-site delivery of public open space.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as the application is the subject of a legal agreement that covers the wider Primrose re-development area.

INFORMATIVES

1. The units hereby approved should achieve a minimum Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.
2. The granting of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a right of way and any proposed stopping up or diversion of a right of way should be the subject of an Order under the appropriate Act. Footpath 17 abuts the site.
3. This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 the County Council as Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works and therefore before any access works can start you must contact the Environment Directorate for further information by telephoning Area Surveyor East 01254 823831 or writing to the Area Surveyor East, Lancashire County Council, Area Office, Riddings Lane, Whalley, Clitheroe BB7 9RW quoting the planning application number.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2012/0455/P (GRID REF: SD 372660 442155)
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENT DATED 13 NOVEMBER 2006 IN
RELATION TO 3/2004/0806/P TO ALLOW OCCUPANCY OF HOLIDAY CARAVANS FOR 12
MONTHS AT SHIREBURN CARAVAN PARK, EDISFORD ROAD, WADDINGTON

PARISH COUNCIL: No comments received at time of report preparation.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: No comments received at the time of report preparation.

Proposal

This application seeks to modify the Section 106 Agreement on Shireburn Caravan Park to enable the owners to visit the caravans throughout the year. At present the part of the overall site that has consent to 76 holiday caravans has a seasonal occupancy restriction limiting use to between 1 March to 6 January in any succeeding year. The request here is for 12 month use which would necessitate a Deed of Variation to the clauses in the current Agreement concerning occupancy.

Site Location

The application site lies to the west of Edisford Road outside any defined settlement limit within land designated open countryside.

Relevant History

3/2004/0806/P – Proposed extension to Shireburn Park creating 72 new caravan spaces, new entrance, reception and swimming pool. Existing site 5.16 hectare, new area 4.1 hectare. Approved with conditions and Section 106 Agreement 15 November 2006.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy RT5 - New Static Caravan Sites and Extensions to Existing Sites.

Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The key consideration in the determination of this application is whether or not the proposed revised terms of the Section 106 Agreement would achieve the same aim as the originally drafted document.

The Section 106 Agreement in force covers the whole of Shireburn Caravan Site and in terms of occupancy restrictions splits the site in two – 12 months' residential occupancy on 105 units and holiday seasonal occupancy 1 March to 6 January in any succeeding year on 76 units. The agreement also serves a number of other functions, namely to limit the exact number of both residential and holiday units, their precise positioning on site, that the residential part of the site only be used for residential purposes, that the part of the site on which the holiday units are situated can be used for holiday purposes only and not as a person's primary residence and not to grant any Leases which would breach any of the covenants in the Section 106 Agreement. What is proposed here is to delete those parts of the Agreement that specify a seasonal occupancy period for the holiday units and substitute with reference to holiday occupancy for 12 months.

For Committee's information the existing Agreement was drafted having regard to the Caravan Compendium which was produced in June 2005 to draw together the Council's policies about the principle statutory regulations that apply to caravan development at that time, including site use for holiday use, second homes and residential use. It sought to help the interpretation of the relevant regulation and clarify how the Council would approach issues such as site occupancy, responsibilities of site operators and individual owners. It provided a vehicle for discussion and starting point for a better understanding between all those involved in the issues surrounding caravans. It was drawn up at a time when the Lancashire Structure Plan was still in force as indeed was PPG21 – Tourism.

In respect of conditions, the Compendium concluded that the length of season would be restricted to 10 months and 6 days based on agreement that had been made in connection with a legal appeal on the open period issue on another site within the borough. This provided for a break in occupancy, thereby avoiding the creation of permanent residential use whilst allowing the growth of this form of holiday accommodation. Significantly however it provided an important means by which the use of the unit could be monitored and subsequently enforced to ensure compliance. Since that time PPG21 has been superseded by the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism (2006) which recognises that the nature of holidays in this country has become increasingly diverse in location, in season and in duration. It acknowledges that

demand for accommodation may occur in areas where the provision of permanent housing would be contrary to Policies that seek to restrict development in order to safeguard the countryside but states: *“the planning system can reconcile these two objectives through the use of occupancy conditions designed to ensure that holiday accommodation is used for its intended purpose”*. Annex B makes reference to holiday occupancy conditions – *the aim of such conditions is generally to ensure that the premises are only used by visitors and do not become part of the local housing stock*. The three principle reasons given for using such conditions are:

- in order that national/local policies on development in the countryside are not compromised;
- to strengthen tourism in a particular area by ensuring there is a wide range of properties available to encourage visitors to come there on holiday;
- to avoid occupation by permanent households which would put pressure on local services.

Conditions such as this will need to be framed by Local Authorities according to local circumstances, but they should be reasonable and fair and framed in such a way that they be readily enforced and are not unduly intrusive for either owners or occupants.

Another consideration is the introduction of NPPF and this document does not make any reference to the aforementioned Good Practice Guide in the list of documents to be replaced by the framework in Annex 3. Therefore in terms of considering this scheme I am of the opinion that regard should be given to both of these national planning documents.

The Compendium and its suggested seasonal occupancy condition was draw up at a time when concerns were emerging about inconsistencies of approach between planning controls and site licensing, the growing use of caravans as a main residence, enforcement over closed periods, health and safety issues and clarification of a planning approach to new sites and extensions to existing sites. Officers have sought over the years to bring a consistency of approach by planning permissions and site licences (issued through the Council’s Environmental Health Service) since that that time, but trends in this form of holiday accommodation have moved on. In particular there has been a significant increase in the construction standards of such units with high levels of insulation, central heating etc – these are far removed from the early designs that originally led to the issues of closed periods due to health and safety. The Good Practice Guide refers to the use of seasonal occupancy conditions to protect the local environment eg protection of important species of birds during breeding seasons, not in particular to restrict permanent residential occupation. Advances in construction technology, changes in the nature of holiday demand and the emergence of more up to date Government guidance, lead me to conclude that to resist the principle of extending the period of occupancy for these 75 units on site may prove difficult to substantiate on appeal.

There have been applications on other caravan sites within the borough to extend occupancy periods and use what is referred to as a ‘holiday occupancy’ condition as opposed to a ‘seasonal occupancy’ condition namely Todber, Rimington and Lower Moss Farm, Longridge with a site at Ribblesdale Park, Gisburn allowed on appeal with the Planning Inspector imposing a similar holiday occupancy condition in 2003. When the Council has imposed such a holiday occupancy condition the wording used has been as follows:

“The terms of occupancy (of the units concerned) shall be as follows:

- (i) The units concerned shall be occupied for holiday purposes only.*
- (ii) The units concerned shall not be occupied as a person’s sole or main place of residence.*

(iii) The owners/operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all owners/occupiers of individual (units) on site, and of their main home addresses, and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In accordance with Policies G5 and RT5 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan in order to ensure that the approved holiday accommodation is not used for unauthorised permanent residential accommodation. The register required in (iii) above shall normally be collected by the caravan site licence holder or his/her nominated person.

What is proposed here is that a Deed of Variation be drafted to the existing Section 106 Agreement to achieve the same aim as the condition outlined above. As stated previously, the Section 106 Agreement covered a number of issues and thus the only parts to be revised are those specifying the “closed period” dates. I would however advocate that an additional clause be inserted into the Agreement regarding (iii) above – (i) and (ii) are already covered by the existing wording. The need for a register is imperative to enable the Local Planning Authority to properly monitor such sites. It is important to ensure that abuse of the regulations does not happen and in order to assist in enabling proactive enforcement the clauses of the Section 106 need to be explicit and precise in their requirements.

Having carefully considered all the above, I am of the opinion that to permit holiday occupancy all year round on this site would be consistent with the approach adopted on other sites within the borough over recent years. The proposal, with an additional clause requiring the keeping of a register of persons main home addresses, would comply with the national planning approach in this respect and would still afford the Local Planning Authority sufficient control over the operation of the site to prevent permanent residential occupation of the 75 units. I thus recommend accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has no significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity nor would it have an adverse visual impact.

RECOMMENDATION: That the application be DEFERRED and DELEGATED to the Director of Community Services for approval following the satisfaction completion of a Deed of Variation within a period of 6 months (from the date of this decision) to amend the period of occupancy of the holiday units on site and request a register of persons main addresses as outlined in this report subject to the following condition:

1. This decision notice must be read in conjunction with the Deed of Variation (in respect of this planning approval) and planning obligation completed under the terms of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) signed and dated 13 November 2006 in respect of planning approval 3/2004/0806/P.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt since the original Section 106 Agreement covering the site has been subject of a Deed of Variation and in order to comply with Policies G5 and RT5 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

ITEMS DELEGATED TO DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES UNDER SCHEME OF DELEGATED POWERS

The following proposals have been determined by the Director of Community Services under delegated powers:

APPLICATIONS APPROVED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2011/1039/P	Erection of one new single storey residential building adjacent to The Pentre. Creation of new crossover over Pendle Rd for The Pentre. Construction of new boundary fence/wall separating the properties	The Pentre Pendle Road Clitheroe
3/2012/0020/P (LBC)	New porch to rear elevation	Dinkling Green Farm Whitewell
3/2012/0177/P	Removal of hard brittle paint top coat on the side elevation and removal of the remnants of the old lime to expose an actual stone and create more a uniform appearance. The walls will then be appropriately repointed	Kingdom Hall Back York Street Clitheroe
3/2012/0239/P	Application for the discharge of condition no. 3 (materials), condition no. 4 (trees), condition no. 5 (hedge), condition no. 6 (car parking) and condition no. 12 (changing room detail) of planning permission 3/2011/0558/P relating to the building for a new community hall with changing facility, kitchen, storage etc. Demolition of the existing changing facilities	Recreation Ground Sawley Road Grindleton
3/2012/0254/P & 3/2012/0255/P	Conversion of barn into one dwelling	Chadwicks Farm Settle Road Bolton-by-Bowland
3/2012/0273/P	Proposed application to discharge condition 3 (materials), condition 4 (surface water scheme), condition 5 (site investigation/risk assessment), condition 6 (buffer strip), condition 9 (renewable energy requirements) and condition 10 (habitat survey) of planning permission 3/2011/0307/P	Barrow Brook Business Village, Barrow
3/2012/0314/P	Proposed seating area outside the shop comprising 3 fixed wine barrels with portable seating	The Whalley Wine Shop Ltd 63 King Street Whalley

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0357/P	Change of use of first floor from recreation use to dance studio, reinstatement of boundary wall and removal of steps to northwest of site, new opening to boundary wall at wall recess on east elevation and to building on south elevation	The Memorial Hall Lowergate Clitheroe
3/2012/0358/P	Change of use of two holiday cottages to residential to allow for longer let by the discharge of planning obligation Section 106 Agreement dated 1 February 2000, relating to planning application 3/1999/0588/P	Mallard and Woodpecker Spring Head Farm Bolton-by-Bowland
3/2012/0361/P	Proposed installation of synthetic pitch surface to pitch 5 together with erection of 5m high perimeter rebound fence and 15m high floodlighting columns	Blackburn Rovers FC & Athletic plc Senior Training Centre Brockhall Village Old Langho
3/2012/0372/P	Application for discharge of condition 3 (materials), condition 4 (highways and drainage layout), condition 5 (foul manhole schedule), condition 8 (landscape proposals), condition 9 (energy statement/solar layout), condition 10 (protected species survey), condition 11 (arboricultural/tree survey), condition 12 (driveway/affected trees), condition 13 (site access/off-site highway improvements), condition 14 (visibility splays) and condition 16 (traffic calming measures) of planning permission 3/2011/0541/P	land bounded by Dilworth Lane and Lower Lane Longridge
3/2012/0394/P	Reserve matters consent for the design and appearance of proposed residential units including adjacent access ways, roads and footpaths plus ancillary landscaping (Ref 3/2008/0526/P – 78 units)	Land around Primrose Mill Woone Lane Clitheroe
3/2012/0409/P	Variation of condition number 2 to allow the premises to inure for the benefit of Ribble Valley Dance in connection with the use of the premises as a dance studio and variation of condition number 3 to allow opening of the premises between 1000 to 2130 Monday to Friday, 0830 to 1400 Saturdays and 0900 to 1700 on Sundays	The Memorial Hall Lowergate Clitheroe
3/2012/0426/P	Static caravan/lodge park for 19 No pitches	Lower Moss Farm Lower Lane, Longridge
3/2012/0432/P	2 No proposed detached garages with associated external works	Pale Farm Cottages Moss Lane, Chipping

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/20120/458/P	Application to discharge condition no. 4 (materials), condition no. 7 (first floor windows), condition no. 12 (tree protection) and condition no. 13 (finished levels) of planning permission 3/2012/0061/P relating to land to rear	Prospect Cottage Lower Lane Longridge
3/2012/0459/P	Proposed single storey side extension	27 Sunnyside Avenue Wilpshire
3/2012/0462/P	Application for the discharge of condition no. 4 (materials), condition no. 6 (structural survey), condition no. 8 (velux conservation type rooflights), condition no. 9 (landscaping), condition no. 10 (Bat Survey) and condition no. 13 (building recording and analysis) of planning permission 3/2011/0826P	Hill Foot Barn Higher Twiston Clitheroe
Cont/ Cont...		
3/2012/0463/P	Conversion of 4 Stanley Street into 2 no. self-contained flats including extensions following the demolition of remains of derelict barn (Re-submission of refused application 3/2012/0153/P)	4 Stanley Street Longridge
3/2012/0464/P	Listed Building Consent for altered rear access to utilise the original opening and re-rendering of lean-to following structural repairs	5 Church Street Clitheroe
3/2012/0471/P	Proposed extension and alterations to an existing property	Frensham, Sawley Road Grindleton
3/2012/0472/P	Pitched roof single storey rear extension and two conservation area rooflights to rear roofslope of the property	45 Whalley Road, Sabden
3/2012/0473/P	Flat roof single storey rear extension with glass roof lantern	43 Whalley Road Sabden
3/2012/0474/P	Erect a single gate across the driveway	Vicarage Farm Old Back Lane, Wiswell
3/2012/0476/P	Proposed erection of one non-illuminated fascia sign and one externally illuminated (static) hanging sign	7 Market Place Clitheroe
3/2012/0480/P	Change of use from workshop/office to residential to create 2 no dwellings at workshop/office building	Roadside Farm Preston Road Alston
3/2012/0484/P	Proposed single storey rear extension to shop to provide additional floor space	10 Towneley Parade Longridge
3/2012/0485/P	Demolition of existing single attached garage. Erection of two-storey side extension and internal alterations. Additional parking hardstanding with permeable surface	97 Hacking Drive Longridge

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0492/P	Retrospective application to demolish modern toilet block from rear yard and remove internal plaster from external boundary wall (LBC)	5 Church Street Clitheroe
3/2012/0496/P	Proposed construction of a roofed slurry store	Horton Grange Farm Horton
3/2012/0510/P	Proposed erection of a bay window to front with conversion of the garage to a dining room	54 Knowsley Road West Clayton-le-Dale
3/2012/0514/P	Proposed side single storey extension	6 Warrington Terrace Barrow, Clitheroe
3/2012/0517/P	Proposed rear dining room extension, side extension to form garage and utility room. Demolition of existing garage and conservatory	29 Coniston Close Longridge
3/2012/0520/P	Proposed dining extension to the existing kitchen and proposed utility room extension	89 Regent Street Waddington
3/2012/0523/P	Renewal of planning permission for single storey front extension	Mellor Brook District Community Centre Whalley Road, Mellor Brook
3/2012/0527/P	Application for the renewal of planning permission 3/2009/0568/P for proposed annex accommodation	Hill Top Farm Forty Acre Lane, Longridge
3/2012/0531/P	Application for 1 no. fence-mounted non-illuminated information sign at BAE systems	Samlesbury Aerodrome Myerscough Road Balderstone
3/2012/0535/P	Proposed change of use from retail (A1) to mixed use Classes A1 and A3 providing kitchen store, coffee bar/lounge area, café/deli sales	Maureen Cookson Ltd George Street Whalley
3/2012/0536/P	Application to discharge condition no. 3 (walling and roofing materials), condition no. 5 (Bats and protected species survey), condition no. 6 (access track materials) and condition no. 8 (Landscaping) of planning permission 3/2009/0440P	Skirden Hall Barn Tosside Skipton
3/2012/0542/P	Application for the renewal of planning permission 3/2009/0035/P for alterations to create a new self contained apartment at first floor level and relocation of external flue pipes	28 Cockerill Terrace Barrow
3/2012/0545/P	Application for partial discharge of condition in relation to walling and roofing materials for units 1-4 on planning permission 3/2009/0399 which was for the erection of 11 dwellings of which 5 affordable and 6 market housing	Kirklands Chipping

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0548/P	Application for the discharge of condition no. 3 (air filtration/extraction system) of planning permission 3/2011/0744/P relating	Shajan Restaurant Longsight Road Clayton-le-Dale
3/2012/0555/P	Proposed rear extension	22 Vicarage Lane Wilpshire
3/2012/0564/P	Application for the discharge of condition no. 3 (materials) of planning permission 3/2011/0378/P relating	10 Fell Brow Longridge
3/2012/0567/P	Proposed detached chalet to provide guest accommodation for visiting friends and relatives of owner, comprising a single bedroom and sitting area	Dove Cottage Whalley Road Sabden
3/2012/0573/P	Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission 3/2011/0731/P to allow provision of a studio room, velux roof lights and access stairs to the approved garage roof void	Woodend Cottage Birdy Brow Hurst Green
3/2012/0575/P	Application to discharge condition 4 (external lighting), condition 5 (landscape scheme for car parking/access), condition 7 (landscaping details), and condition 10 (gateway design) of planning permission 3/2010/0258/P	Land at The Spinney Grindleton
3/2012/0576/P	Application for a non material amendment to planning permission 3/2011/1057/P to allow the proposed dormer to be extended to provide more headroom in the dressing area and to overcome structural issues relating to the existing roof structure	20 The Hazels Salesbury, Blackburn
3/2012/0580/P	Disabled lift provision	St Augustine's RC High School, Elker Lane, Billington
3/2012/0587/P	Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission 3/2011/0838/P to allow the relocation of the lecture room and the addition of a second entrance door (footprint and height remain the same)	Holden Clough Nursery Holden Bolton-by-Bowland
3/2012/0597/P	Application to discharge condition no. 3 (phase one habitat survey) and condition no. 4 (landscaping details) of planning permission 3/2012/0424P	Worston House Worston Clitheroe
3/2012/0610/P	Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission 3/2012/0002/P, to allow proposed alterations to window and door configuration of a recently approved replacement dwelling	Pepper Hill Wiswell, Clitheroe

APPLICATIONS REFUSED

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2012/0096/P	Proposed dwelling with garages, garden and landscaping	Kemple Barn Whalley Road Pendleton	Policies G1, ENV3, ENV19, HEPPG and NPPF – detriment to the setting of the grade II listed Lower Standen Farmhouse and Primrose House and the non designated heritage asset of Primrose Mill, and detriment to the appearance of the open countryside.
3/2012/0199/P & 3/2012/0200/P	Change of use from agricultural access to domestic access and creation of new pedestrian access and listed building consent for removal of garden wall and erection of new drystone boundary wall (1m high)	Backridge House Twitter Lane Bashall Eaves	Policies G1, ENV1, ENV19, and the NPPF – adversely affect the character, appearance and significance of the listed building and the visual qualities of the AONB. Policy H12 – curtilage extension within open countryside.
3/2012/0469/P	Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission 3/2009/0542/P, to allow the addition of solar panel to roof, reduction in roof pitch resulting in increased eaves height and reduced ridge height. Land adjacent	47 Knowsley Rd West Wilpshire	N/A
3/2012/0499/P	Single storey side extension to dwelling	The Granary at Bulcocks Farm Pendleton	G1, ENV16 and H17 – adverse impact on character, appearance and setting of barn conversions and Pendleton Conservation Area.

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2012/0511/P (PA) & 3/2012/0512/P (LBC)	Replace two third storey windows with exact copies of existing windows and; Replace existing windows to front of premises on second floor (where ground floor = 0) with exact copy in hardwood (painted white)	at McFarlane Dental Practice, 33 King Street, Whalley (3/2012/0511/P) and; McFarlane Dental Practice, 33A King Street, Whalley (3/2012/0512/P)	The proposal has an unduly harmful impact upon the character and significance of the listing building and the character, appearance and significance of Whalley Conservation Area because the windows are conspicuous, incongruous and visually intrusive as a result of their oversized and crudely designed frame members, their top-opening mechanism, the relationship of top and bottom lights and the apparency (including beading and double-register of two panes of glass) of the modern double-glazing. This is contrary to Policies ENV20, ENV19 and ENV16 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.
3/2012/0515/P (LBC) & 3/2012/0516/P (PA)	Internal and external alterations	2 Abbey Croft The Sands Whalley	The proposal has an unduly harmful impact upon the character and significance of the listed building because of the loss of important historic fabric and alterations to historic plan form (including heck post screen, internal wall between lounge and

Cont/

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
Cont...			kitchen, formation of external doorway, blocking without memory of door from C19 re-modelling and insertion of new staircase from ground to second floor). This is contrary to Policies ENV20 and ENV19 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.
3/2012/0562/P	Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission 3/2011/1048P to allow the external material of the kiosk to be 18mm plywood, fire resistant with GRP stone effect finish instead of the natural stone clad. Kiosk roof and doors to be as detailed in the original application	The Skaithe Catlow Road Slaidburn	Policy G1 and ENV1 - Materials not in keeping with the character and appearance of the AONB and would thus detrimentally affect the visual amenities of the AONB.
3/2012/0568/P	Installation of 2 No conservation style velux rooflights and roof vents and installation of replacement windows to dwelling	4 Church Raikie Chipping	The proposal has an unduly harmful impact upon the character and significance of the listed building, the setting of St Bartholomew's Church (Grade II* listed) and the character, appearance and significance of Chipping Conservation Area because the proposed roof lights and vents are conspicuous, incongruous and
Cont/			

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
Cont...			visually intrusive in the prominent and otherwise unbroken roof slope.
3/2012/0569/P	Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission 3/2011/0722P, to allow a window in the front elevation to the master bedroom and omit 2no. Velux windows; split window to front elevation lounge and render all elevations of existing house with through render (off-white colour ivory) to match rear extension	2 Bushburn Drive Langho	This scheme in respect of works to the front gable is of such a nature that it is not considered appropriate to determine as a non-material amendment given that it would result in potential overlooking of a neighbouring property.

REFUSAL OF CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0482/P	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed single storey rear extension and replace an existing glazed roof with a new tiled roof	5 Abbot Walk Clitheroe

NOTICE OF DEMOLITION

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0586/N	Application to demolish a portal frame agricultural building to enable the building of four dwellings	Nethertown Close Whalley

OBSERVATIONS TO OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITIES

<u>Plan No:</u>	<u>Proposal:</u>	<u>Location:</u>
3/2012/0506/P	OUTLINE: MAJOR (Access) Demolition of existing buildings and erection of an industrial unit and a foodstore with associated car parking, access, servicing and landscaping.	Land at R Soper Ltd/Albert Hartley Crownest Mill Skipton Road Barnoldswick

SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Date to Committee</u>	<u>Number of Dwellings</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2010/0078P	Old Manchester Offices Whalley New Road Billington	20/5/10	18	With Legal
3/2010/0929P	Land between 36 & 38 Henthorn Road Clitheroe	14/7/11	8	Not Signed yet With applicants solicitor
3/2011/0776	Land off Whiteacre Lane Barrow	12/4/12	7	With Legal
3/2011/0784	Old Whalley Nurseries Clitheroe Road Whalley	12/4/12	6	With Applicant
3/2012/0065	Land off Dale View Billington	24/5/12	12	With Legal
3/2011/1064	Sites off Woone Lane a) rear of 59-97 Woone Lane & b) Land to South-West of Primrose Village phase 1, Clitheroe	21/6/12	113	With Legal
3/2011/1071	Land at Chapel Hill Longridge	19/7/12	53	With Legal
3/2012/0014	Land adj Greenfield Avenue, Low Moor Clitheroe	19/7/12	30	With Planning
<u>Non Housing</u>				
3/2011/0649P	Calder Vale Park Simonstone	15/3/12		Subject to departure procedures so no progress on Section 106

APPEALS UPDATE

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/0820 D	12.1.12	Mr S Davenport Application for the removal of condition no.15 (length of occupancy), of planning consent 3/2006/0836P to allow the house to be used as permanent residential accommodation Butchers Laithe Knotts Lane Tosside	WR	-	APPEAL DISMISSED 10.7.12

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/0300 O	17.1.12	Mr & Mrs Myerscough Outline application for the erection of a country house hotel and spa Land adjacent to Dudland Croft Gisburn Road Sawley	-	Hearing adjourned on 12.7.12	Awaiting response from The Planning Inspectorate
3/2011/0624 D	17.2.12	Mr Ken Dobson Fit secondary glazing (Listed Building Consent) Vicarage House Vicarage Fold Wiswell	WR	-	AWAITING DECISION
3/2011/0567 D	16.3.12	Mr D Ashton Proposed erection of a holiday cottage (Re-submission) Pinfold Cottage Tosside	WR	-	Awaiting site visit
3/2011/0703 O	16.4.12	Mr T Brown Proposed erection of a three-bedroom, two-storey detached dwelling with attached garage (Re-submission of 3/2011/0315P) 43 Hawthorne Place Clitheroe	WR	-	Site visit 31.7.12 AWAITING DECISION
3/2011/0095 D	11.5.12	Mr & Mrs S Cherry Re-submission of refused application application 3/2010/0002P for two affordable dwellings in garden area of existing house, demolition of outbuilding, realigning of vehicular access to Cherry Hall and removal of part of wall to site Cherry Hall Grindleton	WR	-	Site visit 25.7.12 AWAITING DECISION
3/2011/0849 D	16.5.12	Mr K Kay Proposed new detached garage, boundary wall, gates and hard landscaping Great Mitton Hall, Mitton Road, Mitton	Householder appeal	-	AWAITING DECISION

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2011/1001 D	30.5.12	Ms Pamela Oliver New detached dwelling within the curtilage of 1 Portfield Bar Whalley	WR	–	Awaiting site visit
3/2011/0025 O	25.6.12	J-J Homes LLP Outline planning application for residential development (ten dwellings) Land off Chatburn Old Road Chatburn	WR	–	Awaiting site visit
3/2012/0158 C	6.7.12	LPA Receiver for Papillion Properties Ltd Outline application for the erection of 73 open market detached dwellings and 31 social housing properties Site 2 Barrow Brook Business Village Barrow	–	Hearing – date to be arranged	Notification letter sent 16.7.12 Questionnaire sent 18.7.12 Statement to be sent by 16.8.12
3/2011/0729 D	9.7.12	Mrs Joan H Porter Demolition of redundant agricultural sheds. Conversion and extension of existing barns to 1no. new dwelling and improvements to existing access Lawson House Farm Bolton-by-Bowland Road Sawley	WR	–	Notification letter sent 17.7.12 Questionnaire sent 20.7.12 Statement to be sent by 17.8.12
3/2011/0893 D	10.7.12	Mr F P Cherry Outline application for one dwelling situated in the old car park at Hodder Place Old Car Park Hodder Place Stonyhurst	WR	–	Notification letter sent 17.7.12 Questionnaire sent 20.7.12 Statement to be sent by 20.8.12

<u>Application No:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>	<u>Applicant/Proposal/Site:</u>	<u>Type of Appeal:</u>	<u>Date of Inquiry/Hearing:</u>	<u>Progress:</u>
3/2012/0160 D	16.7.12	Mr Ian Scholey Proposed two-storey side extension incorporating kitchen, lounge, two further bedrooms and house bathroom. Single storey rear extension to include downstairs cloaks and utility room. Existing shippon to be demolished 74 Knowsley Road Wilpshire	Householder appeal	-	Notification letter sent 17.7.12 Questionnaire sent 23.7.12 AWAITING DECISION

LEGEND

- D – Delegated decision
- C – Committee decision
- O – Overtum

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 AUGUST 2012
title: HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide Members with information on the most recent results of the Housing Land Availability Survey.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives – The information in this report relates to a number of community objectives but is particularly relevant to the broad objective of conserving our countryside and enhancing the local environment.
- Corporate Priorities - This information is relevant to the local development framework which is the spatial expression of the Community Strategy.
- Other Consideration – None.

2 INFORMATION

2.1 The Council regularly monitors housing land availability and produces a housing land availability report. This document provides the information with which to monitor housing development across the Borough. Monitoring continues to be critical to the process of determining planning applications and the Council's duty to ensure a 5-year supply of developable land. Whilst NPPF anticipates an annual update on the supply of deliverable land, the Council has previously monitored Housing Land bi-annually but is now intending to monitor on a quarterly basis.

2.2 The HLA report itself provides detailed information on sites with planning permission, sites under construction and enables the Council to create a picture of construction trends and activity rates together with base line evidence on the amount of land that is available to be brought forward. Copies of the full report are available for reference at Planning Reception and the members room on Level D.

2.3 Members will be aware that the relevant strategic basis against which housing land supply is currently monitored is the Regional Spatial Plan (RSS). The Council continues to monitor against the provision of 2900 homes between 2003 and 2021 to provide for a strategic provision of some 161 units per year. Although a revised requirement has been established to inform the Core Strategy, the Council has not adopted this for decision-making purposes as yet. The formulation of a revised requirement has been subject to public consultation and remains an issue to be resolved through the Examination in Public to be held as part of the Core Strategy process when those issues/objections that remain, can be considered.

2.4 The supply position for dwelling units as at July 2012 is summarised as follows:

• Units with full planning permission	318
• Units with outline planning permission	491
• Sites commenced, units remaining but not started	50
• Units under construction	92
• Conversions - not started	75
• Conversions –under construction	48
Total	1074

249 Affordable housing units have permission (not started) and are included in the housing land supply report schedules once they commence but for calculating the 5 - year figure are taken into account.

In addition a total of 164 units were the subject of planning applications awaiting the completion of Section 106 agreements. Given that these sites have been agreed in principle and that the Council has put in place measures to monitor progress on the completion of agreements these are included in the supply. Any issues arising from delays in completing the agreements can be monitored and reflected in the Councils Housing Land Monitoring which is now being done on a quarterly basis, this will provide a more accurate position in terms of sites that can contribute to the 5 year supply.

The table at appendix 1 sets out a 5-year statement, as at July 2012 taking account of the necessary adjustments and smoothing to reflect activity over the monitoring period. Given that we currently plan for 161 units per year this shows that the Council can demonstrate an ongoing 5 - year supply of housing land.

For reference the table at Appendix 2 shows the comparable 5 year assessment against the proposed strategic requirement of the draft Core Strategy, which also shows against that requirement the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply position.

COLIN HIRST
HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

MARSHAL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 Housing Land Availability Survey files
- 2 North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 – GONW- Sept 2008

For details of the Housing Land Availability Schedule contact Sharon O'Neill extension 4506.

For further information on housing and strategic policy issues please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

Ref: CH/EL/160812/P&D

Five year supply (2012-2017) based on previously adopted RSS figures and including permissions, completions and commitments up until 1 July 2012

Planned Provision

a) Housing provision 2003/2021	2900	161/yr
b) Net dwellings completed 2003-2012 (9.2yrs)	1200	130 (1200/9.2)
c) Net dwellings required 2012-2021 (8.8 years) (adjusted to a revised annual rate)	1700/8.8	193/yr
d) Adjusted Net 5 yr requirement 2012-2017 (5yrs)	965	193 x 5 (annual equivalent smoothed over plan period)
e) Add Buffer of 20%	1158	20% NPPF guideline (193 + 20% = 232)

- a) Strategic housing provision based on previously adopted RSS figures.
- b) Actual completions in monitoring period divided by number of years.
- c) Residual requirements based on completions and plan period remaining. This figure gives the annualised requirement to attain planned figure.
- d) Five year requirements based on the revised/adjusted annualised rate.
- e) Buffer to allow for previous years under delivery 20% para. 47 – NPPF.

Identified Supply

Supply of deliverable sites over 5 years (Housing Land Availability Survey July 2012)	
Sites subject to Section 106 agreements	164
Affordable units	249
Sites with Planning permission	982
Deliverable sites	(1395)
(discounted by 10% slippage allowance)	1255
Sites under construction	140
Total Supply	1395
Equates to <u>6.0 yrs supply</u> at 5 year adjusted rate at 01/07/12	

supply: 6.0 yrs supply (1395 ÷ 232)

Five year supply (2008-2028) based on proposed Core Strategy requirement including permissions, completions and commitments up until 1 July 2012

Planned Provision

a) Housing provision 2008/2028	4000	200/yr
b) Net dwellings completed 2008/2012 (4.2yrs)	402	96 (402/4.2)
c) Net dwellings required 2012-2021 (15.8 years) (adjusted to a revised annual rate)	3598/15.8	227/yr
d) Adjusted Net 5 yr requirement 2012-2017 (5yrs)	1135	227 x 5 (annual equivalent smoothed over plan period)
e) Add Buffer of 20%	1362	20% NPPF guideline (227 + 20% = 272)

- a) Strategic housing provision based on previously proposed Core Strategy requirement.
- b) Actual completions in monitoring period divided by number of years.
- c) Residual requirements based on completions and plan period remaining. This figure gives the annualised requirement to attain planned figure.
- d) Five year requirements based on the revised/adjusted annualised rate.
- e) Buffer to allow for previous years under delivery 20% para. 47– NPPF.

Identified Supply

Supply of deliverable sites over 5 years (Housing Land Availability Survey July 2012)	
Sites subject to Section 106 agreements	164
Affordable units	249
Sites with Planning permission	982
Deliverable sites	(1395)
(discounted by 10% slippage allowance)	1255
Sites under construction	140
Total Supply	1395
Equates to <u>5.0 yrs supply</u> at 5 year adjusted rate at 01/07/12	

supply: 5.0 yrs supply (1395 ÷ 272)

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 AUGUST 2012
title: RIBBLE VALLEY CORE STRATEGY – SUBMISSION STAGE
SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND PROPOSED CHANGES
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE
principal author: COLIN HIRST

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To receive information on the issues arising from consultation on the draft Core Strategy, consider suggested changes in response and to agree the submission of the Core Strategy

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions - the Core Strategy is the central strategy of the Local Development Framework (LDF). It will help in the delivery of housing, employment and the protection and enhancement of the environment, ultimately presenting the delivery strategy for implementing the vision for the Ribble Valley for the next 20 years.
- Community Objectives – as a tool for delivering spatial policy, the Core Strategy identifies 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 Core Strategy is the central document of the LDF and sets the overall vision and approach to future planning policy which will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – the Council has a duty to prepare spatial policy under the LDF system.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council has recently completed the formal 'Regulation 19' consultation stage in preparing its Core Strategy for the borough. Members have recently considered a report on taking the Core Strategy forward and are now presented with information that summarises the issues raised in response to the consultation and where it is considered appropriate proposed changes to the Core Strategy in response.

2.2 Members should be aware that at this stage, the information is intended to help an Inspector understand the range of issues that has emerged. At this stage, the Council does not present a full or detailed response to the representations as this will emerge through the Examination process. Copies of the full submissions are available for reference at the Council offices. As part of the submission process, the Council will

need to produce a regulatory statement that provides a summary of issues for the Inspector.

- 2.3 Having identified issues at this stage, any amendments that the Council considers are required are highlighted. As previously reported, there are a number of amendments suggested either in response to issues and comments raised, as a reflection of NPPF or to improve the clarity or presentation of the Strategy.
- 2.4 As previously agreed it is proposed to submit the Core Strategy incorporating the changes for Examination. This approach brings with it a number of risks as the changes will not have been tested nor will all parties have had opportunity to confirm if the proposals address the concerns raised. Whilst it would be a more robust approach to build time into the process to undertake this work this will inevitably delay the programme to have an up to date plan in place.
- 2.5 The Council is moving towards the formal stage where the Core Strategy is submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination. An Independent Inspector will be appointed to hold the Examination with the purpose of confirming that the plan is sound. The Council will need to be able to satisfy the Inspector that the plan has been prepared in accord with the duty to co-operate, legal and procedural requirements and whether it is fundamentally sound. (Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF, refers). The NPPF sets out what constitutes a sound plan and consequently to be found sound the Council will need to demonstrate how it has addressed the NPPF tests. These tests are summarised as follows:
- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.
 - **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.
 - **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.
 - **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the framework.
- 2.6 A number of important considerations need to be recognised. Firstly the preparation and publication of the Core Strategy coincided with the publication of the Coalition Government's final version of the NPPF. Attention to which was drawn to Members at the meeting of Planning and Development Committee on 4 April 2012, where the Core Strategy was agreed for public consultation. The publication of the NPPF has raised issues in the consultation responses that the Council will need to address as we need to ensure the plan reflects new National Policy. In addition, the emphasis in NPPF on the duty to co-operate is also an important factor to have regard to in progressing the plan.

3 SUBMISSION STAGE

- 3.1 The Council is now moving towards submission stage in the plan-making process which triggers the start of the Examination stage. Under the provisions of NPPF, Local Planning Authorities are expected to submit a plan for examination that is sound. In terms of Ribble Valley position it has to be recognised that some changes to the published Core Strategy will be required primarily as a consequence of the final version of NPPF. Having identified and agreed those changes it would be preferable to republish the Core Strategy, undertake a further formal six week consultation stage as a re-run of the Regulation 19 publication prior to submitting the Core Strategy. In doing so it would of course be possible that further changes are required and of course the datedness of the supporting evidence base becomes further extended, which also has to be taken into account. Fundamentally however this will serve to delay the current programme that is seeking to have a Core Strategy/Local Plan in place as soon as possible.
- 3.2 As Members are all too aware, Ribble Valley is undergoing increasing pressure from development and there is a clear need to put in place an up to date plan. This is particularly so in light of the National Planning Policy Framework and national agenda which promotes and supports economic growth. This is also a reason why land interests will seek to robustly challenge the Council and its plan-making process as the longer the area is without an up to date plan the more readily the expectation is that National Planning Policy, namely the presumption in favour of sustainable development, will be applied. Bearing in mind the need to balance these considerations, advice has been sought from the Planning Inspectorate and Planning Advisory Service on options to maintain progress given Ribble Valley's circumstances.
- 3.3 Advice from PIN's supports the process of republishing before confirming a submission version as this clearly carries the lowest risk from a plan-making viewpoint yet it was acknowledged that there must be a consequent impact on delivery of an adopted plan. Planning applications will continue to be determined against National Planning Policy Framework considerations in that circumstance.
- 3.4 The suggested approach from a PIN's viewpoint is to submit the Core Strategy with the proposed changes but at the time of submission publish the changes for consultation. This would still be subject to an Inspector accepting the approach, but would reduce the amount of risk although could still be subject to challenge. This would enable the Inspector to use the outcome of the consultation to inform consideration of the Core Strategy. Again this would depend on giving consideration to the extent to which changes were required and whether the plan was fundamentally unsound. There are risks in progressing the plan in this manner. The Inspector may consider the changes to be too significant and that the whole strategy should be republished under Regulation 19 in any event, there is a risk of delaying the Examination if issues that are raised through the consultation need resolving or generate a need for further specific work and there is of course always a risk of challenge by third parties. However this approach would allow progress to continue and has been agreed by Members as the way forward in current circumstances.

3.5 On this basis the programme of key dates is as follows:

STAGE	TARGET DATE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of representations, the Council's response and agree proposed amendments, including resolution to formally submit 	Planning and Development Committee 16 August
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratification of submission 	Full Council 28 August
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commence formal consultation on proposed changes 	week commencing 10 September
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formally submit to the Secretary of State 	week commencing 10 September
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earliest likely hearing dates 	Late November

4 SUMMARY OF ISSUES

- 4.1 As indicated above, at this stage of the process the Council needs to identify, in general terms the range and extent of issues that have arisen from the publication of the Core Strategy. This is not intended as a full and detailed response by the Council rather it will help inform the Inspector's deliberations. The summary schedule is attached at Appendix 1 and leads with a summary of the public response by area and then representations by consultation bodies and interest groups as well as landowners and developer interests.
- 4.2 As can be seen from the summary, there are a wide range of issues raised covering concerns about the distribution of development, the scale and nature of development, technical considerations together with concerns about process and legality. As may be anticipated, many of the issues will remain to be developed and tested as appropriate through the examination.
- 4.3 The schedule at Appendix 2, identifies those changes that are suggested to be made to the publication version of the Core Strategy and which are deemed necessary to deliver a sound plan. These proposed changes have emerged either as a result of consultation responses or in response to the publication of NPPF. Members are invited to consider and agree the proposed changes against the draft Core Strategy, a copy of which is included with this agenda for Planning and Development Committee Members. As Members will see, many of the proposed changes serve to update and clarify the Core Strategy. Editorial and presentational changes are also suggested to assist the use of the document.
- 4.4 It is also suggested that in order to avoid any unnecessary delays in the submission process or indeed in responding to the Inspector during the Examination, that authority is delegated to make and agree changes and amendments where there is no fundamental change to the policy direction of the Core Strategy and where they are intended to improve, clarity, interpretation or meaning of the Core Strategy or where a concern raised by the Inspector can be resolved. It is suggested that authority be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Housing, in consultation with an advisory panel comprising the Chief Executive, Chair and Vice Chair of Planning and Development together with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council.

- 4.5 It is proposed that the Core Strategy Regulation 19 draft as amended by the changes, is agreed to form the submission version of the Core Strategy, from which a composite document will be prepared for reference. Submission of the Core Strategy will also require the preparation of a number of supporting documents to meet the applicable regulations and these documents will be drawn up as part of the submission process.
- 4.6 Members' attention is drawn to the need to ensure that any amendments proposed in response to the Regulation 19 Consultation will need to be the subject of testing through the Sustainability Appraisal work. This will be undertaken by the Council's existing consultants, Hyder Consulting who have undertaken the appraisal work so far. This will be an additional cost to the core work already undertaken, the cost of which will be related of course to the extent of changes proposed. Members will recall that provision has been included in the Core Strategy budget to meet such potential, additional consultancy needs.

5 ADDRESSING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – MODEL POLICY

- 5.1 Many of the changes identified comprise relatively minor adjustments and clarifications, it is important in proposing changes at this stage that changes are not so significant that the change fundamentally alters the plan. Whilst some of the changes go further than correction and refinements, they are considered to be focused in nature and consequently do not introduce significant major changes in that regard.
- 5.2 One issue that has emerged that the Council will need to take on board, is the recommendation by the Planning Inspectorate of a model policy that is suggested for inclusion in Core Strategies in order to reflect the requirements of national policy and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Policy highlights the significant change in stance that is expected of Local Planning Authorities as a result of the NPPF. The wording of the model policy that Inspectors are indicating they will expect to see in order to ensure that authorities are complying with the NPPF, is set out below.

“When considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- *any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or*
- *planning policies in that framework indicate that development should be restricted.*

- 5.3 This clearly emphasises the direction of travel in which Local Planning Authorities are expected to move in terms of dealing with development proposals in their area and this will have an impact upon the approach to making decisions on planning applications and particularly so in those circumstances where the Local Plan is not up to date. Once again, this highlights the importance of making progress through the plan making process to ensure an up to date Local Plan can be put in place. The nature of risks highlighted earlier in this report regarding the process suggested are important factors to take into account but these have to be balanced with the clear need to have in place as soon as possible an up to date Local Plan and particularly so ahead of the close of the transitional arrangements in March 2013 whereby all decisions would fall back on the national planning framework in the absence of an up to date Local Plan.
- 5.4 The NPPF confirms that as a rule, sustainable development should be approved. It also seeks to establish the basis for considering what is sustainable development, which in essence means bringing together the three respective roles that government has identified for the planning system, namely an economic role, a social role and an environmental role. The introduction of the policy into the Core Strategy is recommended as a mean of determining how the Council will address the sustainable development issues.

6 NEXT STEPS

- 6.1 Subject to the consideration of the proposed changes the intention would be, following notification of this Committee's decision at Full Council to prepare the necessary documentation to enable the Core Strategy to be formally submitted for Examination. In addition, in line with advice the changes would be published for consideration to enable the results to be available to the Inspector.
- 6.2 Upon submission the Council would be notified of the appointed Inspector and a date would be likely to be set for a pre-examination meeting, usually around 4 weeks after submission. That meeting would confirm the issues the Inspector considered pertinent to examine, raise any initial concerns identified by the Inspector and set the course for the hearing dates. The hearing dates would usually commence around 10 weeks from the pre-examination meeting depending on matters arising.

7 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:
- Resources – Members have agreed a budget to progress the Core Strategy.
 - Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Council has to follow the statutory regulations in preparing the Core Strategy. The selected approach brings with it a series of risks that the Council may be challenged upon or that an Inspector may not be satisfied with which would have an impact on the process and costs incurred.
 - Political – There is significant public interest in the Core Strategy.

- Reputation – Decisions taken in connection with the Core Strategy will help demonstrate the Council’s obligations to fulfil its statutory duties and meet its objective of being a well run Council.
- Equality & Diversity – No implications identified.

8 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 8.1 Agree the schedule of changes set out in Appendix 2 and agree that they are formally published for 6 weeks public consultation.
- 8.2 Agree that the submission Core Strategy be comprised of the published Regulation 19 document as amended by the agreed changes and that a composite document be prepared as the Submission Core Strategy as soon as practicable.
- 8.3 Agree to delegate authority to the Head of Regeneration and Housing, in consultation with a panel comprising the Chief Executive, Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning and Development Committee together with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council to undertake such further revisions, technical corrections and editorial changes deemed necessary in preparing the Core Strategy for submission to the Secretary of State and to agree changes where appropriate during the Examination.
- 8.4 That subject to confirmation by Full Council and having prepared the necessary submission documents in accord with the relevant regulations, to submit the Core Strategy as amended to the Secretary of State for formal examination as soon as possible.

COLIN HIRST
HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

MARSHAL SCOTT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Core Strategy files – various.

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

REF:CH/EL/16081203/P&D

Response Summary

Summary of the public response by area and representations by consultation bodies, special interest groups, landowners and developers.

This report summarises the main issues raised by the wide variety of private individuals and organisations that responded to the Regulation 19 Core Strategy consultation. It is not intended as an exhaustive list of all the individual points made by each responder together with the Council's response to each point. This latter work is currently in progress and will be presented to the Planning Inspectorate as a part of the preparations for the Core Strategy's forthcoming Examination in Public later this year.

The actual responses were made in a variety of formats; many of those supplied by adjacent local authorities, government agencies and planning consultancies followed the formal structure of the response forms supplied by the Council through its feedback site, online or in hard copy form and specified in detail the individual parts of the document and the individual "soundness" tests prescribed in planning legislation that were felt to be relevant. Many, though by no means all, local private individuals tended to respond in more familiar formats, many through descriptive letters and notes. These different response formats are reflected in the table below. It should also be borne in mind that many responders made more than one point so the number of responses and the number of responders will not be the same.

Redacted copies of all responses made to the Council in the consultation are available on request at Planning Reception in the Council Offices.

Core Strategy Regulation 19 Consultation 2012: Summary of public response by area

The overwhelming number of private individuals who responded to the Core Strategy did not relate their comments to individual specific parts, paragraphs or policies of the plan but instead made descriptive statements of their feelings about a variety of issues. The remainder did relate their comments to specific parts of the document. Also in should be remembered that some respondents made more than one point. Both these sets of comments are summarised below by settlement.

CLITHEROE

Of the responses made by 144 private individuals relating to Clitheroe many revolved around similar general concerns about development in the town and especially the implications of the strategic housing site at Standen, rather than specific policies or statements within the Core Strategy document. In detail these points concerned the following:

1. Proportion of Total New Development for Clitheroe

Some thought that Clitheroe is being required to accept an inappropriately large amount of the new development in the Borough during the plan period. They felt that it should only accept new development in line with its proportion of the Borough's total population, which most respondents felt equated to 25% of total new development.

2. Infrastructure Issues

Many thought that the local infrastructure would not be able to accept the additional pressures that the new development would produce. Some felt that aspects of local infrastructure were already operating at or close to capacity and did not find that the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) that accompanied the Core Strategy gave them the assurances and guarantees they sought that infrastructure would be upgraded to the necessary standard to accommodate new development. There were several specific infrastructure issues regularly quoted:

2A. School Provision

Concern was expressed that local primary and secondary schools would not be able to cope with the new pupils generated by new development. Some went on to express a view that, should a school site be provided at the strategic housing site at Standen, no school would actually be built, and that or others would not be upgraded due to lack of funding at either a local or national level. In addition some felt that the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) implied that there would be provision made for new pupils by bussing them out of the Borough to schools elsewhere.

2B. Roads and Traffic

Many also expressed concerns that the local road network would be unable to cope with the additional traffic and that this had congestion and safety implications. Some went on to say that those living in the new strategic site would not walk or cycle into town but continue to use their car adding to town centre congestion, while others felt that the Standen development would lead to more commuting for jobs outside the town and also extra car use would also be made to shop elsewhere rather than in Clitheroe. Some connected this latter point to a perceived lack of forward public car park provision in Clitheroe. Some went on to detail concerns over traffic and congestion in relation to specific roads that could serve the strategic housing site at Standen, such as Pendle and Whalley Roads. Some added that this would add to local pollution. Again some noted from the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) that the Local Transport Plan does not indicate any significant upgrading of local roads.

2C. Health Services

There was also concern that local health facilities would not be able to accommodate the additional need from new development. Many felt that the local facilities were at or near capacity and that there was no physical room to expand the local Health Centre. Other mentioned the recent withdrawal of plans to develop a new hospital in the town as further evidence of the unlikelihood of new health investment. Some stated that there was no confirmed national health investment funding beyond 2014, and that therefore new facilities would not be put in place and that this would lead to longer waiting lists and other problems.

2D. Utilities (including water and waste water and sewerage)

Some felt that there were already problems with water supply and drainage in the area and that the Standen strategic site, by virtue of its size, would create more problems. Again there was a perception that local facilities are at or close to capacity and that the LIP did not contain guarantees that this would be addressed.

2E. Car Parking

Some noted that the LIP did not contain a commitment to increase public car parking to deal with the extra traffic that the town and its centre would experience and were concerned about this.

2F. Leisure and Recreation Provision

Some felt that new development should require an increased provision of leisure facilities and noted that the LIP did not indicate this.

2G. Refuse Collection

Some felt that the new development would cause problems with the provision of this service

In addition to the above the following none infrastructure related points were raised:

3. Effect on local environment and wildlife and recreational opportunities

Some objected to the loss of countryside and associated biodiversity and wildlife should the strategic site be developed. Also some objected to the perceived loss of footpaths and informal recreation development of the site would entail.

4. Loss of Farmland and Greenfield Land

Allied to the loss of countryside and wild life was the concern that the strategic site would use up valuable farmland and a Greenfield site when planning should be concentrating on developing on brownfield sites in smaller locations in the area. No such individual brownfield alternative sites were quoted.

5. Loss of Local Character of Clitheroe and Locality

Also many felt that the new development would change the character of the town for the worse. Some added to this that the strategic site would be of such a scale as to produce this effect and make the area more urban in character.

6. Lack of Associated Employment

Some were concerned that in the current economic climate there would not be the local jobs for the residents of future new development, some adding that therefore this would only add to current perceived high levels of commuting.

7. Overall Housing Figure and Current Dwellings For Sale

Some felt that the overall housing requirement for the Borough was too high and added that the many house for sale in the area and in Clitheroe proved that there was not the need for so many new houses.

8. Build More New Development in Other Parts of the Borough or in Adjacent Boroughs

Some felt that it would be better to place more new development either elsewhere in the Borough, such as in local villages or in adjoining towns such as Accrington where they felt development would help support struggling communities and services such as shops and schools.

9. Effect on Tourism

Some felt that the level of new development proposed for Clitheroe would affect the local tourist trade, such as through appearance of increased urbanisation and increased traffic.

BARROW and WISWELL

50 individual residents, 48 from Barrow, (including 36 residents responding in identical format) stated their concerns regarding the traffic and noise implications of development at Barrow Enterprise Zone for both Barrow and Wiswell.

In addition they expressed concerns over the lack of infrastructure in relation to traffic, waste water, excessive school class sizes and some felt that this meant that the settlement should not receive any further development. Several also stated that they wished to see development permitted within the area since 2008 taken into account in any further apportionments.

LONGRIDGE

In Longridge there were 29 responses in total. They fell into two main categories.

The first related to the general feeling that the proposed levels of development were excessive and that account should be taken of developments proposed nearby within the Preston City Council area. The need for greater liaison with Preston Council was also mentioned. In addition some mentioned that they were concerned that elements of local infrastructure would not be able to cope.

The second issue related to the issue of Open Space as defined in Core Strategy policy DMB4 "Open Space Provision" (P97 para 10.26). 21 of the Longridge responses related to this matter with 9 supporting the Core Strategy text and 12 feeling that the policy undermined the protection given to some local sites under the current Local Plan policy G6. These latter respondents cited a recent local planning appeal decision on a G6 local site in support of their position and suggested an alternative wording to the DMB4 policy that sought to include reference to "private open space" within the policy.

WHALLEY

There were 9 responses from private individuals from Whalley. In general they questioned whether the local infrastructure could sustain the levels of proposed development, which was felt to be excessive given Whalley's size and infrastructure and cited traffic congestion,

drainage, water supply and inadequate school places as examples of this problem. Some felt that Whalley should not be classed as a key service centre.

OTHER SETTLEMENTS

There were 10 responses from 10 individuals who did not live in the above places. These came from Sabden, West Bradford, Hurst Green, Downham, Chatburn, Langho and Mellor. While some deal with issues particular to a place a general view was that no more development was required in these settlements and that also, for some, infrastructure was a limiting factor.

OTHER COMMENTS

In addition to the comments above 15 responses mentioned concerns over a variety of issues relating to the process of the consultation. Some felt that various consultation documents were not written in an accessible way; others that they had insufficient knowledge to make a judgement on some technical points; others felt that their comments would be ignored and that the results of the process were pre-determined by government policy.

Core Strategy Regulation 19 Consultation 2012: Representations by consultation bodies, special interest groups, landowners and developers

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
Wyre BC	Cumulative impacts of development in Ribble Valley, Wyre and Preston on highway infrastructure, especially M6, M55 and A6 at Broughton
	Matters related to Gypsy and traveller policies
Pendle BC	Matters related to Gypsy and traveller policies
CPRE	Matters related to landscape character and protection
	Protection of farmland
	Housing numbers
	Need for policy to reflect presumption in favour of sustainable development
Network Rail	Rail infrastructure and level crossings
English Heritage	Adequacy of policies in relation to heritage assets (generically and in relation to Standen)
	Clarity of the plan (distinction between policy and reasoned justifications)
Simonstone PC	Need to protect potential cycle route for completion of NCN6
Longridge TC	Need to undertake strategic review of plan in view of economic situation
	Housing matters: Annual housing provision too high; provision for Longridge too high; housing mix
	Unique situation of Longridge not recognised
	Need or cross boundary working
	Matters related to former policy G6
	policy for listed buildings should be strengthened
	Possibility of Neighbourhood Plan
Environment Agency	Recognise need for SFRA level 2 (generically and possibly in relation to Strategic Site at Standen)
	Need for strategic objectives to include reference to climate change
	Matters relating to Water Framework Directive
Theatres Trust	Plan does not adequately assess social and cultural wellbeing; social role of planning
	Plan not clear on how area will change
	Plan not robust in respect of protecting and enhancing social, community and cultural facilities
	Lack of policies to guide leisure infrastructure
	Lack of guidance for range of town centre uses
Save Whalley Village	Inappropriate designation of Whalley as Key Service centre
	Level of housing requirement for Whalley
	Traffic and congestion issues in Whalley (including provision of commissioned report)
	Consideration of community views
	Challenge education forecasts/education infrastructure
	Impact on sustainability matters (housing need, transport, public transport, land use, economic growth)
	Impact conservation area and tourism
	Views of community gathered in a survey

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
Blackburn with Darwen BC	Support for housing matters
Natural England	Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF in relation to Environment Chapter.
	Incorrect conservation objectives used for SPA and SAC in relation to the HRA
	Infrastructure Plan comment in relation to natural environment sections compliance with NPPF.
Lancashire County Council (Environment Directive)	Supports the Core strategy in principle and welcomes the plan.
	Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF in relation to Environment Chapter
	States commitment to work with District on Infrastructure/CIL
	Stress importance of phasing the strategic site.
	Request for updates regarding Enterprise zone to be included.
	Delete DM policy reference to Minerals and Waste Developments (not a s106 issue).
	Clarify Key Statement EC2 relating to public sector property.
	Include reference to travel plans and sustainable provision.
	Implications of development on both designated and undesignated heritage assets and amend DME4 to reflect final NPPF.
	Include reference to upland landscapes and associated habitats
	Include reference to BHSs
	Clarify open space contributions on smaller sites
	Amend source for monitoring indicator
	Reference Forest of Bowland AONB renewable Energy Position Statement
	Amend SSSI, BHS and priority habitats and species figures.
Forest of Bowland AONB	Welcomes the Core Strategy
	Provide sufficient reference to wider landscape and visual impact of development on landscape character of AONB.
	Reference botanically-rich roadside verges
	Reference AONB Landscape Character Assessment 2010
	Highlight ecosystem services offered by blanket bog habitat
	Reference Forest of Bowland AONB renewable Energy Position Statement
Clitheroe Residents Action Group	Matters relating to infrastructure, leisure provision
	Considers Infrastructure Plan does not meet DMG1 points.
	Matters relating to housing distribution calculations
Hyndburn BC	Requests further detail of DM policies
The Woodland Trust	Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF in relation to Environment Chapter (specifically ancient woodland other irreplaceable semi natural habitats)

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
Lancashire Fire and Rescue	Core Strategy does not have the potential to increase the risk profile of the area from a fire and rescue perspective.
Clitheroe Civic Society	Matters relating to housing distribution calculations
	Matters relating to infrastructure
	Matters relating to affordable housing provision- request for clarification
Read PC	Matters relating to housing distribution calculations
Whalley PC	Matters relating to housing distribution calculations
	Matters relating to infrastructure
Whittingham PC	Matters relating to housing distribution calculations- considers it not clear why development is needed in the area.
	Development on boundary not acceptable
	Request for option D- consider that this would make plan sound.
	Matters relating to infrastructure
Preston City Council	Notes the identification of Longridge as a KSC
	Considers the focus on Longridge contributes to a sustainable pattern of development
	Acknowledges meetings proceeding the duty to cooperate have taken place at officer and Member level to discuss impact on the highway network towards Broughton and Grimsargh
	Notes protection of AONB and is consistent with Central Lancs. Core Strategy and Preston Site Allocations DPD
	Affordable housing percentages consistent with requirements in Central Lancs.
Grimsargh PC	Matters relating to infrastructure
Lancashire County Council (Adult and Community Services)	Welcomes changes/additional inclusions that have been made to the Core Strategy at DMG2.
	Welcomes changes/additional inclusions that have been made to the Core Strategy at DMH1: Affordable Housing:
	Welcomes changes/additional inclusions that have been made to the Core Strategy at DMG3: Transport and Mobility:
The Coal Authority	Welcomes the inclusion of the supporting text associated with Key Statement EN3 drawing attention to the fact that reference should also be made to relevant policies within the Lancashire Minerals and Waste development Framework.
	Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF in relation to Environment Chapter.
The Wildlife Trust	Matters relating to compliance with final version of NPPF.
	Amend SSSI, BHS and priority habitats and species figures.
	Consider ANGSt
	Suggest RVBC should have an Environmental Strategy
	Define wider local environment
	Further reference SUDSs
	Clarify text relating to 'local sites'

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	Request clarification in relation to monitoring
	Update Phase 1 habitat survey
	Sustainability appraisal to any potential ecological impact of EN4.
	Matters relating to planning obligations
	Request for statement regarding the need to protect any retained trees / adjoining habitats during the construction process.
	Reference to a presumption against development, which has an adverse effect on protected areas etc
	Supports DME1, DME2, DME6 and DMH2
	Further reference to bats
	Reference potential impact on biodiversity
	Include reference to any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure being properly surveyed, then any loss adequately mitigated.
	Highlights significant potential for open spaces to contribute towards the enhancement of biodiversity.
	Include additional monitoring indicator
	Amend BHS definition in glossary
	Amend evidence base author of an evidence base document
	Request further detail of having worked with neighbouring authorities to develop the policies
Clitheroe Town Council	Housing distribution comments/requests
	Requests Infrastructure clarifications and environmental policy detail
	Request involvement in future Clitheroe development (as a technology hub and in Town Centre Masterplan work)
Sport England	Compliance of evidence base in relation to NPPF in terms of an open space assessment.
Stonyhurst Carter Jonas	Acknowledges that the Core strategy has been positively prepared. Principle concern relates to the soundness of the Strategy and subsequent legal compliance of the approach as a result of publication of NPPF. In order to address deficiencies the strategy needs to be extensively reviewed together with the SA/HRA and the evidence base to ensure consistency with NPPF. Promotes the inclusion of the “model policy to reflect the Presumption in favour of sustainable development.
	Concern that text does not reflect NPPF and that the approach in the document to include detailed policies may not be appropriate and would be best delivered through an allocations DPD
	Suggests as appropriate a reference to Stonyhurst college be included as a significant employer and unique collection of heritage assets in the borough. The section would benefit from some clarification of definitions and meanings and to a more consistent approach to the referencing of the evidence base with relevance to the Core Strategy explained and findings summarised.
	Concern that the objectives are not consistent with NPPF and some clarification is needed. Absence of NPPF core principles relating to High quality design and health and well being should be addressed.
	Concern that the derivation of the spatial principles is not referenced
	The general approach of policies that seek to protect the high quality

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	environment is viewed as unsound as it policy should also reflect the need to both conserve and enhance in line with NPPF
	Does not think that green Belt policy is a relevant environment policy but would be better located within the spatial/strategic element of the Core Strategy.
	A reference to the AONB management plan would assist with clarity
	Considers that the policy would be better re titled Sustainable Construction Standards but that a balance is maintained between standards and viability
	Broadly support the policy however suggest reference should be made to linkage and the creation of a network of sites
	Broadly support the policy however consider it could be more positively phrased by replacing preservation with conserve and enhance
	Support for an uplift of housing requirements above RSS provision.
	For consistency suggest that wording is amended to refer to "at least 4000" dwellings The policy wording needs to reflect viability and economic return in order to comply with NPPF. Concern is expressed about the focus upon SHMA which may not reflect prevailing market conditions
	Broadly supported but need to take account of market conditions and the constraints of SHMA assumptions
	Reference is sought to importance of Stonyhurst to the local economy
	Policies in the Core Strategy should support housing growth in rural settlements where it will underpin community facilities and services.
	Core Strategy should give regard to viability and costs.
	Core Strategy should give regard to the need to recognise competitive economic returns.
	No need seen for the policy nor should it refer to retention of specific sites rather it should be done by way of site allocations DPD
	Not clear what the purpose of the policy is and therefore should be deleted
	General question around the need for many of the policies, concern regarding repetition and the impact the inclusion of the suggested model policy would have by removing need for duplication
	Does not consider the provisions of the policy to add significantly to national policy and that the drafting could be clarified
	General concern re iterated about the format and clarity of the policies and unnecessary duplication
	Policy needs to be updated to reflect NPPF
	Concern that the policy contradicts itself in terms of application of the policy and there is a need to recognise viability
	Seeks amended policy wording to enable consideration to be given to there being "no greater impact upon the landscape" rather than no adverse impact. The restriction on change of use for holiday accommodation is viewed as contrary to policy.
	Considers the policy to be contrary to national policy provisions consequently the 1 st bullet should be deleted. The requirement for genuine history is meaningless and unnecessary.

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	Provision 2 of the policy is meaningless and should be deleted
	The narrative to the first part of the policy is unclear and provides no guidance or certainty
Mike Gee	Supports the housing distribution set out in Development Strategy. Concerned about deliverability and certainty for developers.
	Object to proposed review of housing requirements identified in the policy.
	Does not support provision for elderly in all housing developments
	Does not support provision for elderly in all housing developments
	Concerned that the DM policies do not provide adequate clarity guidance and certainty. The policies need to be fully justified and written in a more positive manner. The intention to refuse the removal of holiday let conditions is seen as inappropriately negative and a criteria based approach setting out when applications would be approved is suggested.
	Objects to the presumption against the conversion of isolated buildings to residential use.
	Concerned that the Core Strategy should be accompanied with a comprehensive proposals map and that the intentions are not clear.
Trustees of Huntroyd Estate and Clitheroe Auction Mart Dickman Associates	Objects to references to NLP report as being out of date and does not reflect NPPF.
	Paragraph needs to be updated to reflect NPPF
	The vision is not achievable as highways and background documents do not categorise the accessibility of different locations and weigh them to provide a comparison.
	Allocation of a Strategic site will not address housing requirements. Other sites should be identified. Standen will create an isolated development that will not relate to Clitheroe. The need for Infrastructure will not enable the site to be sustainable or contribute to supply in the first 5 years. The distribution of development in the strategy to smaller settlements is not justified.
	This policy is supported. Clients site is highlighted as the most sustainable site in Clitheroe
	Concerned that paragraph makes a confusing reference to RSS and does not reflect the proposed housing requirement or the NPPF consideration for supply buffering
	The policy does not address the need for a mix of housing by type and tenure across all sectors of society and overemphasises elderly needs. Any elderly provision needs to be reflected in education requirements
	Comment expressing the suitability of Standen as an employment site
	Object to continued recognition of long standing employment site contrary to NPPF
	Considers the wording needs revising to say "others should be involved in the implementation"
	Objects to the extent of list of potential contributions and considers the

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	wording should reflect economic circumstances and not be optimistic
	Considers the requirements too onerous and reference should not be made to CIL
	Concerned that the policy implies a priority for rail and should be worded so that no grading or priority to transport modes is given
	Concerned that the options have not been adequately tested. The strategic site will fail to achieve the objectives of NPPF or address housing requirements in RVBC. Other sites should be identified. Standen will create an isolated development that will not relate to Clitheroe. The need for Infrastructure will not enable the site to be sustainable or contribute to supply in the first 5 years. The council will be unable to meet its 5 year requirement. The strategic site may be better suited to employment use. The reality of the connectivity the site is questioned.
	Support the wording of the paragraph. Identifies a lack of physical features at Standen and highlights the view that the clients site is better defined, closer to town centre and the transport interchange.
	The considerations listed need to be prioritised and weighted to help interpretation
	The policy is too restrictive
	Glossary needs to reflect relevant strategic housing requirement
	The appendix needs to be updated to show current housing land supply figures and should not be based on RSS
Trustees of Standen Estate Steven Abbott Associates	The representation highlights a range of factors in relation to the Strategic site that demonstrate the proposals consistency with NPPF. These are set out in an associated supporting statement and overview to which reference should be made.
	Supports the Key diagram and the identification of the Standen Strategic Site. Suggests as good practice the inclusion of a separate OS based plan.
	Identifies the need to show the boundary of the Strategic Site on an OS base and highlights that the boundary is in fact shown in the document. The paragraph therefore needs to be updated.
	Want to see the word “necessitate” replaced with “secure”
	The policy is supported with the proviso that reference to the strategic allocation is incorporated. Concerns are raised regarding some of the supporting text and views expressed in paragraphs 4.3 – 4.5 Clarification is sought on paragraph 4.11, namely to ensure the context of the site is not misunderstood.
	Want to see the word “necessitate” replaced with “secure”.
	Support for the policy expressed. DS1
	Support for the policy expressed. EN2
	Support for the policy expressed. EN3
	Support for the policy expressed. EN5
	Support for the policy expressed. H1
	Support for the policy expressed. H2
	Support for the policy expressed. Concern raised about need to clarify when viability assessments are required and a need to define elderly provision
	Support for the policy expressed. EC1

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	Support for the policy expressed. DM2
	Support expressed for the policy. DMG1
	Support expressed for the policy. DMG2
	The policy needs to be clarified to avoid ambiguity.
	Concerned about the implementation of the policy, particularly if applicants are required to undertake Need surveys
	Support expressed for the policy DME1
	Consider the policy exceeds what is necessary given other controls and that the policy should be written in the positive.
	Supports the policy although considers that there are no such features on the strategic site
	Supports the policy. DME6
	Supports the policy. DMB5
The Co-operative	Considers the Strategy is unsound as the distribution of housing development is not justified and that more development should be directed towards the main settlements.
	Supports the proposed housing provision but promotes the inclusion of the NPPF based supply buffer
Tom Croft Janet Dixon Town Planners	Supports the housing distribution set out in Development Strategy. Concerned about deliverability and certainty.
	Object to proposed review of housing requirements identified in the policy.
	Does not support provision for elderly in all housing developments
	Concerned that the DM policies do not provide adequate clarity guidance and certainty. The policies need to be fully justified and written in a more positive manner.
	The intention to refuse the removal of holiday let conditions is seen as inappropriately negative and a criteria based approach setting out when applications would be approved is suggested.
	Objects to the presumption against the conversion of isolated buildings to residential use.
	Concerned that the Core Strategy should be accompanied with a comprehensive proposals map and that the intentions are not clear.
SAINSBURY's Supermarkets Turley Associates	Vision and supporting text should be expanded to acknowledge the importance of retail for local employment opportunities.
	Objectives and supportive text should be expanded to acknowledge the importance of retail for local employment opportunities.
	Objective should be expanded to make provision for future expansion of existing large scale retailers.
	Policy should acknowledge non B class uses as important employment generators and act as buffers between employment uses and residential
	Seeks the expansion of the policy to recognise that additional convenience retail floorspace may be allowed to serve community needs in sustainable locations. In addition that non B class uses can promote sustainable development in Greenfield locations
	The policy is not consistent with NPPF in ensuring the vitality of retail centres by supporting sustainable economic growth.

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
Mr and Mrs Hartley De Pol Associates	The policy should be more explicit regarding the role of the existing Barrow Enterprise Park to remove uncertainty and clarify if its expansion would be acceptable. Clarification is sought with regard to the role of Samlesbury Enterprise Zone in contributing towards the identified employment land requirements.
Duchy of Lancaster Smith Gore	Objects to the use of a strategic site at Clitheroe. A broader distribution is promoted to support smaller settlements. The ability for Dunsop Bridge to accommodate additional sustainable development is identified.
	Considers that the opportunity should be taken to review Green Belt boundaries
	Supports the protection of the AONB and the principles of policy EN2
	Considers that the housing numbers proposed should be uplifted to circa 220 – 260, although notes that some flexibility is included in the policy
	Supports the approach in policy H2 however promotes the importance of recognising the viability of schemes
	Supports the approach in policy H3 with regard to affordable housing thresholds but highlights the need to recognise viability
	Supports the proposals in policy EC1 however would prefer to see the importance of Greenfield sites recognised
	Need to consider residential conversions as alternatives to tourism or economic use in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development
	Supports the approach to planning obligations and the recognition of viability
	Policies do not adequately reflect NPPF with regard to re use of rural buildings for residential use and needs to be amended
Adlington	Promotes the need to include a specific policy in the Core Strategy for Specialist older persons accommodation
Trustees of the Standen Estate Steven Abbott Associates	Supports the approach in the Development Strategy and highlights a clients site in Sabden that would help address issues relating to car parking community infrastructure and affordable housing
Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes Turley Associates	Policy H2 is not positively worded and needs to recognise flexibility in determining housing mix. There is duplication with other policies and it should be part of the DM policy section
	Definition of affordable housing in policy H3 does not match that of annex 2 of NPPF
	Clarification is needed in DS1 to explain how development will be accommodated. Concerns about the approach to establishing the distribution. Deliverability and over-reliance upon a single strategic site, need to demonstrate why Whalley should not accommodate larger share of development
	Does not accept the proposed housing requirement as it has not been fully justified why it was selected in preference to other scenarios and that it fails to address the requirements of NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing.
	Needs to be made clear that settlement boundaries will need to be reviewed and clarification given on how the new development will be

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	accommodated.
	Strategic site is not justified, is too inflexible to rely on a single site and there is a need to evidence the deliverability of the site. There is a risk of the site preventing other sustainable development coming forward.
Hawthorne Farm Ltd ARUP	Suggests additional housing land will need to be identified. Account needs to be taken of NPPF supply buffering. Clarification on delivery of the Strategic site proposal needs to be given and phasing in relation to other sites. Limited information is available on-line regarding the Standen Proposal.
Vernon & Co.	The responder states that the Core Strategy needs to be updated to take into account the new requirements of the NPPF, particularly with regards to housing numbers and the need for supply buffering as per paragraph 47 of NPPF
Gladman Developments	The Core Strategy provides for insufficient Housing development and is not adequately evidenced. This will have an impact upon affordable housing delivery and deprives the community of an adequate supply of market housing and housing opportunity to live and work in Ribble Valley. Need will be displaced outside the borough. There is no evidence under the duty to co-operate that any co-operation agreement is in place with neighbouring authorities to support displacement. The CS vision will not be achieved. The Cs needs to provide for a total of around 330 to 350 dwellings per year.
	The Development Strategy fails to recognise the scale of population growth and the need for additional development that is much higher than the proposed 200 dwellings per annum. The use of a Strategic Site is not supported, as it will not provide sufficient housing within the plan period.
BAE SYSTEMS BNP PARIBAS	Supports the approach to the recognition of Bae Samlesbury as a key strategic employment location.
	Supports the recognition of Bae Samlesbury in policy EC1, however considers that the policy should more closely reflect South Ribble Borough Council's strategy as this would demonstrate collaborative working and would support the duty to co-operate. It would also wish to see wider operations and opportunities at the site supported directly in the policy.
	Supports the recognition of the Enterprise Zone in policy DMG2 .
	Policy DMB 1 is not consistent with NPPF as it will not accommodate development expected at the EZ and could restrict future expansion of activities at Bae Samlesbury. Similarly it could restrict expansion of other firms that would contribute to the local economy.
W MONKS JWPC	Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out.
	Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations..
	The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised.

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed.
	Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate.
	Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications
	The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward.
	Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception.
The Clitheroe RGS Foundation JWPC	Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out.
	Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations..
	The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised.
	Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed.
	Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate.
	Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications
	The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward.
	Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception
Beck Developments	Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
JWPC	sufficient justification is set out.
	Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations..
	The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised.
	Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed.
	Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate.
	Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications
	The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward.
	Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception
Clitheroe Royal Grammar School JWPC	Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out.
	Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations..
	The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised.
	Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed.
	Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	amount of development each settlement would accommodate.
	Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications
	The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward.
	Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception
Fort Vale Engineering	Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out.
JWPC	
	Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations..
	The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised.
	Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed.
	Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate.
	Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications
	The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward.
	Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception
Leehand Properties	Concerned that the approach within the document is unclear with inconsistencies to the presentation of policies and questions whether sufficient justification is set out.
JWPC	
	Seeks clarification on the justification of Housing requirement and that the requirement should be increased and more aspirational given likely opportunities for growth in Ribble Valley. The policy needs to set out a strategic approach to guide subsequent allocations..
	The policy should recognise that some of the 4000 units proposed are already committed the Core Strategy will not influence these and this should be recognised.
	Considers that the scale of development proposed is too great for a single site within Clitheroe. In addition the ability to deliver the site within the plan period is questioned and in any event would have a significant

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	impact on the housing market. The allocation of the site needs to be clarified and a contingency recognised if delivery is delayed.
	Concerned about impact of the strategic site on the opportunities to provide growth at Clitheroe with a range of sites and its impact therefore upon the settlement strategy. The policy should promote greater growth at Longridge than proposed and that the CS fails to justify why less development is proposed. Concerns that the distribution to other settlements is not appropriate and should provide more detail on the amount of development each settlement would accommodate.
	Clarification on the reliance on SHMA information to determine planning applications
	The thresholds established in the policy are not sufficiently evidenced and may prevent a site coming forward.
	Concerned that there will be no flexibility for minor changes to the Green Belt and this should be referenced as an exception
Commercial Estates Group INDIGO Planning	The draft Core Strategy is neither legally compliant nor sound as it does not reflect the Council's evidence base in a number of ways, in particular, with regards its approach to housing delivery.
	The draft Core Strategy does not appear to plan for economic growth which is contrary to the principles underpinning the NPPF.
	With regards housing provision, the Council's evidence suggests a requirement of 220 dwellings per annum (NLP) but our own independent research identifies that there is actually scope for in the order of 310 dwellings per annum. Therefore, the overall residential requirement over the plan period should be a minimum of 4,200 dwellings, but if the Council is planning for economic growth (in line with NPPF) then the housing requirement should be more in the order of 6,200 dwellings over the plan period.
	The Council's evidence base points to apportionment based around existing key service centres, namely Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge, i.e. to benefit from, sustain and potentially improve access to existing services, facilities and public transport. This points to even apportionment in key centres but the Council's approach is to suppress growth outside of Clitheroe with 50% of new development being focused into Clitheroe. There is a significant lack of evidence that supports this approach which will result in an unsustainable pattern of development and will undermine delivery of growth in other key centres, to the detriment of meeting inter alia local housing needs. On this basis, we can only conclude the approach is politically motivated rather than based on a sound evidence.
	Overall, the Council should plan to deliver between 4,200 and 6,200 dwellings over the next 20 years, with 25%-30% of this growth apportioned to the key service centre of Whalley. In order to demonstrate deliverability of this approach, strategic sites should be identified to ensure development in the most appropriate locations comes forward. In this regard, the Lawsonsteads site represents a suitable and sustainable location for meeting planned growth in Whalley.
Barrow Lands Company Ltd	Consider that the housing requirement is far too low and will not meet identified need or address affordability issues and the under-provision of

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
(David Lock Associates)	housing experienced in the recent years. The requirement is not justified or consistent with National Policy and is fundamentally unsound.
	Policy H3 will not address identified need given the scale of housing requirement proposed.
	The development strategy does not represent the most appropriate strategy and is unjustified. It is too reliant on the Strategic site and ignores the potential of Barrow as a receptor for housing growth given the relationship with strategic employment land.
	The strategic site to the exclusion of Barrow is unjustified. Deliverability is not evidenced and there is inadequate assessment of its impacts upon heritage assets. The site has poor connectivity to Clitheroe and insufficient jobs to serve the population within Standen.
	Querying size of strategic site- believe that the site has increased from previously published location plan.
	SHLAA shows the Barrow site as not available immediately but the site now is. Considers SHLAA should be re-written.
	Approach to affordable housing is a narrow approach with no justification as to why.
	Considers that Barrow has not been given adequate weight in choosing where to locate new housing growth and that housing should not be distributed on basis of existing population.
	Barrow should be named as not just 'other settlements' with an allocation for a minimum of 500 homes.
	Wording of policy EN5 should be amended to remove "a presumption in favour"
	Believes the housing figures are lower than national projection and are not justified by any evidence and should be increased to at least 330dpa.
	Phased approach to the release of land should not be the approach due to the scale of housing shortage in the borough.
	Photographs used to separate sections of the plan are misleading
	Omission of Barrow from Borough overview is not justified
	Use of inflammatory language in relation to effects of "in migrants" on house prices; misrepresents causes of high house prices. Need to explain role of shortage of housing on house prices; need for more homes and affordable homes in particular
	Need to amend reference to A59 as a key to strategic employment development in the Borough
	Housing requirement should be increased to reflect affordable needs
	Adequacy of Settlement Hierarchy
	An up to date Vision is required
	Distribution of housing
	Absence of timetable for Site Allocations DPD
	Consider there is an error in the justification to DS1 regarding Sustainability Appraisal and explanation of Preferred Option
	Lack of clarity on detailed distribution of remaining housing development
	Preferred Option does not address issues in SA Options report
	Distribution of employment sites within Borough only to key settlements re DS1
	Effect on status of Barrow employment sites of recent housing

NAME	ISSUES RAISED
	permissions re EC1
	Status of Barrow as in relation to transport accessibility re DMI2
	Evidence of Infrastructure capability of Standen site re P 76
	Evidence of boundaries, capacity and viability of Standen site as marked on images P77
	Implications of development of Standen on heritage assets DMG1
	Appropriateness of Barrow site for a railway station re SA re 10.6
	Development at Standen re settings of listed buildings re 10.15
	Justification and evidence underlying overall housing requirement figure re 15.1
	Graphic acknowledgement of Barrow Enterprise Zone on Key Diagram p 139
Edward Hine LPA receiver for Papillion Properties Avalon Town Planning (Late Representation)	Concerned at a mis-match between aim of the policy and distribution of development. Deliverability of employment land at the Strategic site is questioned, as is the principle of the proposal for growth at the site at Standen. The amount of employment land at Barrow is too great for the size of the village. There is a need to direct a larger proportion of housing provision to Barrow and acknowledge that it can no longer be a small village. Given the constraints elsewhere it is appropriate to allow development in areas like Barrow.
	The housing requirement is not high enough
	No definition of elderly is provided in the glossary and there is inadequate controls relating to elderly provision
	The policy EC1 does not make reference to Barrow Enterprise Site and the policy should be more closely linked with DS1

Identified changes

Changes to be made to the Core Strategy necessary to
deliver a sound plan

Identified changes:
Changes to be made to the Core Strategy necessary to deliver a sound plan

The table below sets out the proposed changes identified in the response to representations, to reflect NPPF or improve clarity and meaning. *Text in Italics/blue represents a proposed insertion* and ~~Strikethrough-Text represents a proposed deletion.~~

No.	Details of change
1	<p>1 Introduction and Context</p> <p>Amend/update para. 1.2 in relation to NPPF/remove references to PPSs</p>
2	<p>2 Understanding the Area</p> <p>Amend second sentence of para. 2.8 as follows:</p> <p>There are 39 293 Biological Heritage Sites, 6 16 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs).....</p>
3	<p>2 Understanding the Area</p> <p>Amend para 2.9 as follows:</p> <p>“Equally impressive is Ribble Valley’s unique built heritage. Across the borough there are 21 Conservation Areas, and over 1000 Listed Buildings, 29 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 4 Registered Historic parks and gardens.” <i>The historic town of Clitheroe has an impressive skyline which includes the Castle set on a limestone knoll.</i> The Ribble Valley village of Ribchester is particularly special as it is built on the site of a Roman station and is home to a superb museum, housing information and artefacts relating to Roman life. Both Whalley and Sawley are also home to Cistercian Abbeys, Billington dates back to Saxon times and a pre-historic burial site was discovered at Worston. <i>The borough also has a significant mill heritage. In the village of Hurst Green, Stonyhurst College is an important heritage asset and significant employer.</i>”</p>
4	<p>2 Understanding the Area</p> <p>Add new text at the end of para 2.24:</p> <p><i>“A more detailed Level 2 SFRA will be required if insufficient land is available to accommodate the required levels of development outside the areas identified as being at risk of flooding”</i></p>
5	<p>3 Setting a Vision for the Area</p> <p>Amend final sentence of para. 3.9 as follows:</p> <p>“The biodiversity of the district will continue to be protected and enhanced with waste reduction, recycling and energy efficiency being promoted.”</p>

6	<p>3 Setting a Vision for the Area</p> <p>Insert sentence at end of sentence 1 of para. 3.9 as follows:</p> <p>“The physical, social, environmental and economic regeneration of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley will be supported together with existing retail businesses, whilst also ensuring a high quality retail offer in the key service centres and smaller village settlements, <i>especially where this supports local employment opportunities.</i> Improvements will have been made...”</p>
7	<p>3 Setting a Vision for the Area</p> <p>Amend strategic objective at 3.11 as follows:</p> <p>Respect, protect and enhance the high quality environment and biodiversity in the borough. A large proportion of the Ribble Valley falls within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it has two Local Nature Reserves, thirteen priority habitats and species, and sixteen Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and 293 Biological Heritage Sites. Protection, <i>enhancement</i> and conservation of these will form an important part of the Development Strategy. In addition the area has a rich built heritage with the most <i>more</i> significant elements <i>having statutory protection as designated heritage assets. protected through Conservation Area and Listed Building designations. In addition there may be nationally important but unidentified archaeological assets</i>”</p>
8	<p>3 Setting a Vision for the Area</p> <p>Amend final strategic objective at 3.19:</p> <p>Contribute to local, regional and wider sustainable development, <i>including addressing and mitigating against the impacts of climate change.</i> The overall Development Strategy will incorporate these aims. Development should be located where opportunities to reduce the use of the car can be encouraged. This issue has been gaining in importance over the past few years and has even been linked to issues such as overcoming obesity through the design of and location of developments. Facilitating employment growth in the area and providing more affordable housing will be key themes in addressing sustainability in the borough. <i>In addition, high quality services which meet the needs of the Borough’s communities and support their health, social and cultural well-being will be protected and enhanced.</i></p>
9	<p>4 Development Strategy</p> <p>Amend text at 4.1 (bullet point 1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and enhance the wider local environment, <i>both natural and built environment, in rural and urban areas.</i>
10	<p style="text-align: center;">4 Development Strategy</p> <p>Amend text at 4.7 to add marked text at end of para. The number of units proposed for the strategic site has been reduced to 1040 dwellings</p>

	<p>over a 20-year period. This will result in an average annual provision of 52 units per year for the site. Phasing of the development will need to be considered and this will be done through the Development Management process including the detailed preparation of associated master plans, together with development and design briefs, working with the landowner <i>and considering the practical implications of, and timing for, the delivery of key infrastructure.</i></p>
11	<p>4 Development Strategy</p> <p>Amend figures at 4.11. Residual figures for Clitheroe, Longridge, Whalley, Standen and Other Settlements will be updated when revised housing figures (monitoring date June 2012) are ready for insertion.</p>
12	<p>Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy</p> <p>Add text to beginning of second para. As follows:</p> <p><i>“In addition to the identified strategic site at Standen, in general, the scale.....”</i></p>
13	<p>Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy</p> <p>Amend final sentence of Key Statement DS1 to reflect the NPPF: <i>“Through this strategy, development opportunities will be created for economic, social and environmental well being and development for future generations”</i></p>
14	<p>Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy</p> <p>Add new paragraph to supporting text after 4.11 as follows: <i>4.12 The development strategy and the Core Strategy as a whole seek to deliver sustainable development. In particular this demonstrates the economic, social and environmental roles that planning has in contributing to sustainable development.</i></p>
15	<p>Key Statement DS2: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>Add new policy DS2:</p> <p><i>When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</i></p> <p><i>Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</i></p> <p><i>Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</i> • <i>Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</i>
16	<p>Key Statement EN3: Sustainable Development and Climate Change</p> <p>Add new paragraph after the second paragraph:</p> <p><i>"New development in vulnerable areas should ensure that risks can be managed through suitable measures, including through the conservation of biodiversity, improvement of ecological networks and the provision of green infrastructure."</i></p>
17	<p>Key Statement EN3: Sustainable Development and Climate Change</p> <p>Add new paragraph after third paragraph</p> <p><i>Ribble Valley Borough Council will liaise with the County Council over development within Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) in both proposing future site allocations and in determining planning applications. This liaison will include consideration of the issue of preventing the unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources within MSAs and, where feasible and practicable, the prior extraction of mineral resources.</i></p>
18	<p>Key Statement EN3: Sustainable Development and Climate Change</p> <p>Add new sentence to end of para. 5.3:</p> <p>Lancashire County Council has responsibility for the designation of Mineral Safeguarding Areas, which will be shown on the Proposals Map for Ribble Valley Borough Council.</p>
19	<p>Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>Add new sentence to end of first paragraph</p> <p>"Where appropriate, cross-Local Authority boundary working will continue to take place to achieve this".</p>
20	<p>Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>Amend second paragraph:</p> <p><i>"Negative impacts on biodiversity through development proposals should be avoided. Development Proposals that adversely affect a site of recognised environmental or ecological importance will only be permitted where a developer can demonstrate that the negative effects of a proposed development can be mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for. This could be managed through a variety of mechanisms such as conservation credits....."</i></p>

21	<p>Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>Amend third paragraph/bullet list of policy as follows:</p> <p>These sites are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) • Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) • County Local Biological Heritage sites (CBHs) • Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) • Local Geodiversity Heritage Sites • Ancient Semi-Natural Woodlands • Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species • European Directive on Protected Species and Habitats - Annex 1 Habitats and Annex II Species • Habitats and Species of Principal Importance in England
22	<p>Key Statement EN4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>Add new final sentence at end of final paragraph:</p> <p><i>For those sites that are not statutorily designated any compensation could be managed through a mechanism such as biodiversity off-setting via conservation credits.</i></p>
23	<p>Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets</p> <p>Amend Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets to read as follows:</p> <p>There will be a presumption in favour of the preservation of heritage assets and their settings where they are recognised as being of importance.</p> <p>The Historic Environment and its Heritage Assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance for their heritage value; their important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place; and to wider social, cultural and environmental benefits.</p> <p><i>This will be achieved through:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Authority Recognisinges that the best way of ensuring the long term protection of heritage assets is to find an optimum viable use that strikes the correct balance between economic viability or other uses and their impact on the significance of the asset. • Keeping Conservation Area Appraisals will be kept under review to ensure that any development proposals respect and safeguard are in keeping with the historic character and architectural interest of the area the character, appearance and significance of the area. • Carefully considering any development proposals that adversely affect a designated heritage asset or its setting will be given careful consideration in line with the Development Management policies.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Requiring all development proposals to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place.</i> • <i>The consideration of Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights where the exercise of such rights would harm the historic environment.</i> <p>Note: final policy wording subject to agreement with English Heritage</p>
24	<p>Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets</p> <p>Amend first sentence of 5.5 as follows:</p> <p>The SA Scoping report highlighted a need to protect and enhance the historic environment of Ribble Valley. <i>This includes heritage assets and their settings.</i></p>
25	<p>Key Statement H2: Housing Balance</p> <p>Planning permission will only be granted for residential development providing it can be demonstrated that it delivers a suitable mix of housing that accords with the projected future household requirements and local need across the Ribble Valley as a whole as evidenced by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Determination of planning applications for residential development will be informed by the most recent Housing Needs Surveys, Addressing Housing Needs statement and the most recently adopted SHMA, to identify the type, tenure and size of residential dwellings, required at different locations throughout the borough, <i>as well as reference to relevant housing market information as appropriate.</i></p>
26	<p>7 Economy</p> <p>Add sentence at the end of sentence 7.4 as follows:</p> <p><i>The Council considers Barrow Enterprise Pak to be an important employment land resource that has the significant potential to provide for economic growth and deliver sustainable development for the borough.</i></p>
27	<p>7 Economy</p> <p>Amend penultimate sentence of 7.4 as follows:</p> <p>“Growth at the BAe Samlesbury site is anticipated to occur given that it is a regionally significant site and now intended to form part of the Lancashire Enterprise Zone”.</p>
28	<p>Key Statement EC1: Business and Employment Development</p> <p>Amend final sentence of last paragraph</p> <p>“The Council considers, in line with neighbouring authorities and other bodies that the BAe Samlesbury site is a regionally significant employment site with considerable</p>

	<p>potential to accommodate a variety of advanced knowledge based industries in the future. This has been recognised by the Government's proposal to create creation of an Enterprise Zone at this location". <i>As such the site is not considered part of the boroughs general employment land supply.</i></p>
29	<p>Key Statement EC2: Development of Retail, Shops, and Community Facilities and Services</p> <p>Further supporting text to be added to 7.12 as follows:</p> <p>This is predominantly led by evidence base research that confirms the requirement for the development of retail, shops and the facilities on offer. <i>The NPPF identifies a range of uses that are appropriate to the town centre which contribute to their vitality and viability and include retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, community, cultural and residential uses.</i> The Clitheroe Town Centre Masterplan will inform the preparation of more detailed policies as appropriate. Recommendations and suggestions from this work will be disseminated across the borough where applicable.</p>
30	<p>8 Delivery Mechanisms and Infrastructure</p> <p>Amend para 8.3 to add text at end of para</p> <p>Each have had the opportunity to contribute to the development of the evidence base for the LDF and in drawing up the options presented at this stage. As the preferred strategy is formed and greater certainty is established these groups and bodies will be involved further as detail is established. <i>The need for infrastructure improvements has been identified in the infrastructure plan. The exact implications for infrastructure can only be determined once more detail on the location of the sites and the nature of the development is known. This allows a better understanding of the implications for infrastructure and the identification of holistic solutions in the context of all the development that is proposed in an area through the details established in the site allocations development plan document. It is clear that the phasing of development will be necessary to ensure the capacity of infrastructure can be enhanced.</i></p>
31	<p>8 Delivery Mechanisms and Infrastructure</p> <p>Remove tenth bullet point from 8.7</p> <p>• Minerals and Waste Development</p>
32	<p>Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations</p> <p>Insert new text in second para as follows:</p> <p>"In general, schemes offering opportunities for more sustainable means of transport <i>and sustainable travel improvements</i> will be supported. Sites for potential future railway stations at Chatburn and Gisburn will be protected from inappropriate development."</p>
33	<p>Key Statement DMI3: Development Management</p> <p>Delete policy text box DMI1: Development Management</p>

	To help determine planning applications and deliver the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy, the Council will apply a range of Development Management policies.
34	<p>9 Strategic Site</p> <p>Amend 3rd and 4th paragraphs of text underneath text in highlighted box</p> <p>Work undertaken on infrastructure planning as part of the Core Strategy process has shown that in principle, there are no significant barriers to the development and that the site is deliverable within the plan period <i>with appropriate phasing of the development to allow infrastructure enhancements to be co-ordinated and delivered</i>. It is envisaged that the site will be accessed by a minimum of two access points from the existing local highway network with a through route for public transport. The development will also necessitate <i>secure</i> improvements to the strategic highway network at the A59/Clitheroe Road/Pendle Road Junction. Any development should take account of the presence of <i>heritage assets within and in the vicinity of the site, including</i> the line of the Roman Road that runs through the site, which is of archaeological and historic significance. There will be a need for high quality structural landscaping to contribute a good quality development and address the landscape impacts of a development of this scale. <i>On the basis of currently known development in the area and regulatory requirements, United Utilities has stated that the development of this strategic site would necessitate the need for improvements in water and wastewater infrastructure and has therefore identified a need for appropriate phasing to allow for the practical implications associated with infrastructure enhancement.</i></p> <p>The Core Strategy is seeking to identify the site in principle. and t.The precise mix of uses, developable areas, and development, <i>detailed infrastructure requirements and the need for phasing</i> will be determined in more detail in subsequent Development Plan Documents, Supplementary Planning Documents which will be subject to separate consultation and through the Development Management process.</p>
35	<p>10: Development Management policies</p> <p>Presentation of the text will be amended to make clearer what is policy and what is reasoned justification for all Development Management policies (chapter 10).</p>
36	<p>Key Statement DMG1: General Considerations</p> <p>Insert new bullet point between 6th and 7th bullet points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Consider the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access”.</i>
37	<p>Key Statement DMG1: General Considerations</p> <p>Replace 7th bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also consider the implications of development on heritage assets such as Scheduled Ancient Monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, registered

	<p>parks and gardens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development must protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings.
38	<p>Key Statement DMG1: General Considerations</p> <p>8th bullet point to be amended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “With regards to possible effects upon the natural environment, the council propose that the principles of the mitigation hierarchy be followed. This gives sequential preference to the following: 1) enhance the environment 2) avoid the impact 3) minimise the impact 4) restore the damage 5) compensate for the damage 6) offset the damage”
39	<p>Key Statement DMG1: General Considerations</p> <p>11th bullet point to be amended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. Particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.
40	<p>Key Statement DMG1: General Considerations</p> <p>Add new bullet point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the potential impact on social infrastructure provision
41	<p>Key Statement DMG1: General Considerations</p> <p>Bullet point one to be amended to state the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 building in context principles (from the CABE/ English Heritage building on context toolkit)
42	<p>Key Statement DMG1: General Considerations</p> <p>Amend bullet 17 and add a new bullet 19 as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the potential impacts of development on air quality and mitigate adverse impacts where possible. • The Code for Sustainable Homes and Lifetime Homes should be incorporated into schemes. • Have regard to the availability of key infrastructure with capacity. Where key infrastructure with capacity is not available it may be necessary to phase development to allow infrastructure enhancements to take place.

43	<p>Key Statement DMG2: Strategic Considerations</p> <p>Need to insert a definition of “Settlement” within Glossary to allow full understanding of this and other policies that refer to settlement</p> <p>Additional paragraph to be added at end of 10.5:</p> <p>For the purposes of this policy the term settlement is defined in the Glossary. Current settlement boundaries will be updated in subsequent DPDs.</p> <p>Definitions of “consolidate”, “expansion” and “rounding off” to be included in the Glossary.</p>
44	<p>Key Statement DMG3: Transport and Mobility</p> <p>Amend first bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the availability and adequacy of public transport <i>and associated infrastructure</i> to serve those moving to and from the development”
45	<p>Key Statement DMG3: Transport and Mobility</p> <p>Amend third bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals which promote development within existing developed areas <i>or extensions to them</i> at locations which are highly accessible by means other than the private car.
46	<p>Key Statement DMG3: Transport and Mobility</p> <p>Further supporting text to be added at the end of Key Statement DMG3: “In using this policy reference will be made to the Guidance on Transport Assessments. <i>This should also include an assessment of the impacts on existing bus and rail infrastructure, including level crossings. Where necessary developers will be expected to contribute towards improvements in public transport provision and infrastructure.</i>”</p>
47	<p>Key Statement DME1: Protecting Trees and Woodlands</p> <p>Text will be added to at end of first paragraph of 10.7 as follows: <i>“The Council encourages successional tree planting to ensure tree cover is maintained into the future”</i></p>
48	<p>Key Statement DME1: Protecting Trees and Woodlands</p> <p>Amend text at para. 10.10 to include additional wording. as follows: “Veteran and Ancient Trees The Borough Council will take measures through appropriate <i>planning conditions</i>, legislation and management regimes to ensure that any tree classified identified as veteran/ancient tree is afforded sufficient level of protection and appropriate management in order to ensure its long term survivability”.</p>

49	<p>Key Statement DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection</p> <p>Amend first sentence of 10.13:</p> <p>Development proposals will be refused which <i>significantly</i> harm important landscape or landscape features including</p>
50	<p>Key Statement DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection</p> <p>Add new bullet point to DME2 para. 10.13 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Upland landscapes and associated habitats such as blanket bog</i>
51	<p>Key Statement DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection</p> <p>Add new bullet point to list a 10.13 of DME2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>botanically rich roadside verges (that are worthy of protection)</i>
52	<p>Key Statement DME2:Landscape and Townscape Protection:</p> <p>Amend second sentence of final paragraph of 10.13 as follows:</p> <p>In applying this policy reference will be made to a variety of guidance including the Lancashire County Council Landscape Character Assessment, <i>the AONB Landscape Character Assessment 2010</i> and the AONB Management Plan.</p>
53	<p>Key Statement DME3: Sites and Species Protection and Conservation</p> <p>Amend final two sentences of 10.14 as follows:</p> <p>In terms of the protection of the soil resource and high quality agricultural land development and land management practices should seek to avoid soil erosion; avoid contamination of land and promote restoration, protect the peat resource and recognise the importance of peat in particular for its carbon sequestration value, <i>water quality improvements for both drinking water and biodiversity, reduction of local flood risk and reduction of moorland wildfire risk. The and recognises the important link between soil quality, the natural environment and the landscape should be recognised.</i></p>
54	<p>Key Statement DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets</p> <p>Amend opening sentence of Key Statement DME4 as follows:</p> <p>10.15 In considering development proposals the Council will make a presumption in favour of the preservation of important <i>protection and enhancement of</i> heritage assets and their settings.</p>
55	<p>Key Statement DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets</p> <p>Amend text at 10.15 of DME4</p>

	<p>Conservation Areas</p> <p>Proposals within or closely related to Conservation Areas should not harm the Area. This should include considerations as to whether it is in keeping with respects and safeguards the architectural and historic character of the area as set out in the relevant Conservation Area Appraisal. Development in these areas will be strictly controlled to ensure that it reflects respects the character of the area in terms of its location, scale, size, design and materials and also respects trees and important open space existing buildings, structures, trees and open spaces .</p> <p>In the Conservation Areas there will be a presumption in favour of the preservation of elements that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Listed Buildings and Other Buildings of Significant Heritage Interest</p> <p>Development proposals on sites within the setting of listed buildings or buildings of significant heritage interest, which cause visual harm to the setting of the building, will be resisted. Any proposals involving the partial or full demolition of or loss of important historic fabric from listed buildings will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that this is unavoidable.</p> <p>Registered <i>Historic</i> Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest <i>and other Gardens of Significant Heritage Interest</i></p> <p>Developments within or immediately adjacent to registered parks and gardens will be expected to take their special qualities into account and, where appropriate, to make a positive contribution to them.</p> <p><i>Proposals affecting Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Other gardens of significant heritage interest, or their settings, should respect and safeguard their character.</i></p> <p>Scheduled Monuments</p> <p>Applications for development that would impact a Scheduled Monument will need to demonstrate that they have taken the particular importance of the monument and its setting into account and that Scheduled Monument Consent has either already been obtained or is likely to be granted. Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5) and its associated practice guide, National policy gives additional policy guidance on dealing with both designated and undesignated heritage assets, and will be applied by the Council when determining proposals. Proposals that affect such sites as those mentioned above should also give adequate consideration of how the public understanding and appreciation of such sites could be improved.</p> <p>Note: final policy wording subject to agreement with English Heritage</p>
56	<p>Key Statement DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets</p> <p>Include the following text at the end of policy DME4 (new paragraph following paragraph relating to Scheduled Monuments)</p> <p><i>In line with NPPF, Ribble Valley aims to seek positive improvements in the quality of the historic environment through the following:</i></p> <p>a) <i>Monitoring heritage assets at risk and;</i> <i>i) supporting development/ re-use proposals consistent with their conservation;</i></p>

	<p><i>ii) considering use of legal powers (Building Preservation Notices, Urgent Works Notices) to ensure the proper preservation of listed buildings and buildings within conservation areas.</i></p> <p><i>b) Supporting redevelopment proposals which better reveal the significance of heritage assets or their settings</i></p> <p><i>c) production of design guidance</i></p> <p><i>d) Keeping conservation area management guidance under review</i></p> <p><i>e) Use of legal enforcement powers to address unauthorised works where it is expedient to do so.</i></p> <p>Note: final policy wording subject to agreement with English Heritage</p>
57	<p>Key Statement DME5: Renewable Energy</p> <p>Delete second bullet point at 10.16 (it is a repeat of the first)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The immediate and wider impact of the proposed development on the landscape, including its visual impact and the cumulative impacts of development
58	<p>Key Statement DME5: Renewable Energy</p> <p>Add additional bullet point at 10.16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The potential impact on biodiversity</i>
59	<p>Key Statement DME5: Renewable Energy</p> <p>Add further sentence to the end of second paragraph of 10.16 as follows:</p> <p>This target will be updated in line with national targets. Implementation of this requirement will be monitored and enforced by the planning authority. <i>The Council will also have regard to the AONB Renewable Energy Position Statement 2011 in assessing proposals.</i></p>
60	<p>Key Statement DME5: Renewable Energy</p> <p>Add reference to Biological Heritage Sites to penultimate paragraph of 10.16 as follows: “Development proposals within or close to the AONB, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas, notable habitats and species, Local Nature Reserves, <i>Biological Heritage Sites</i> or designated heritage assets and their setting will not be allowed unless:”</p>
61	<p>Key Statement DME 6 Water Management</p> <p>Add new para at end</p> <p>All applications for planning permission should include details for surface water drainage and means of disposal based on sustainable drainage principles. The use of the public sewerage system is the least sustainable form of surface water drainage and therefore development proposals will be expected to investigate and identify more sustainable alternatives to help reduce the risk of surface water</p>

	flooding and environmental impact.
62	<p>Key Statement DMH2: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation</p> <p>Amend final bullet point and add two additional bullet points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals must have good access <i>and not have an adverse impact on highway safety</i> • <i>Proposals should not place undue pressure on local infrastructure and services</i> • <i>Proposals are not located in areas at high risk of flooding</i> •
63	<p>Key Statement DMH3 Dwellings in the Open Countryside</p> <p>Amend title to Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB</p> <p>Also amend para 10.20 first sentence to</p> <p>Within areas defined as Open Countryside <i>or AONB</i> on the proposals map...”</p> <p>Also amend final para to: The creation of a permanent dwelling by the removal of any condition that restricts the occupation of dwellings to tourism/visitor use or for holiday use will be refused <i>on the basis of un-sustainability.</i></p>
64	<p>Key Statement DMH4: The Conversion of Barns and Other Buildings to Dwellings</p> <p>Add to the following bullet point after first five bullet points at 10.21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure are properly surveyed and where judged to be significant preserved or, if this is not possible, then any loss adequately mitigated.</i>
65	<p>Key Statement DMH5: Residential and curtilage extensions</p> <p>Add in the following at the start of the last sentence in 10.22 (DMH5)</p> <p><i>Any existing nature conservation aspects of the existing structure should be properly surveyed and where judged to be Significant preserved or, if this is not possible, then any loss adequately mitigated.</i></p> <p>Also amend last para to</p> <p>Proposals to extend a curtilage in other circumstances will not be approved other than where it will support the health of the local economy <i>or for highway safety reasons.</i></p>

66	<p>Key Statement DMB4: Open Space Provision</p> <p>Text at second sentence of para 10.26 to be amended as follows: On all residential sites of over 1 hectare, the layout will be expected to provide adequate and usable public open space. <i>On a site-by-site basis</i>, the Council will also negotiate for provision on smaller sites, or seek to secure a <i>an off-site</i> contribution towards provision for sport and recreational facilities or public open space within the area where the overall level of supply is inadequate.</p>
67	<p>Key Statement DMB5: Footpaths and Bridleways</p> <p>Add new sentence at the end of the first sentence at para. 10.27 as follows: “In situations where a public right of way will inevitably become less attractive (due to adjacent/surrounding development), the policy should require compensatory enhancements such that there is a net improvement to the public right of way network.”</p>
68	<p>Key Statement DMR2: Shopping in Longridge and Whalley</p> <p>Amend policy as follows: “Proposals for new small scale shopping developments <i>including expansion of existing facilities</i> will be approved on sites which are physically closely related to existing shopping facilities. All proposed shopping developments, will be subject to other relevant policies in the plan and the Borough Council will have particular regard to the effect of the proposals on the character and amenities of the centre and the consequences in respect of vehicular movement and parking.</p> <p>Longridge and Whalley will continue to be the other main shopping areas of the Borough. Their size and facilities are more closely related to local shopping needs than those of Clitheroe. <i>However it is recognised that Longridge serves a wide hinterland.</i> This may change...”</p>
69	<p>11: Monitoring</p> <p>1. Respect, protect and enhance the high quality environment and biodiversity in the Borough: Amend source of monitoring indicator 1.4 from LCC to ‘<i>AMR</i>’</p>
70	<p>11: Monitoring</p> <p>1. Respect, protect and enhance the high quality environment and biodiversity in the Borough: Add new indicators 1.5 and 1.6 to monitoring framework: <i>1.5 Number of applications granted contrary to Natural England advice</i> <i>1.6 The number or proportion of the population that has full access to the requirements of the Accessible Natural Green space Standard.</i></p>
71	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Definition of Biological Heritage Site to be amended:</p> <p>BIOLOGICAL HERITAGE SITE - A national designation <i>A county designation given weight through the NPPF</i> that carries with it certain obligations on the Local Planning Authority when formulating policy or assessing planning applications.</p>

72	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Definition of “community facilities” to be added to glossary as follows:</p> <p><i>Community Facilities: Facilities which provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community</i></p>
73	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Definition of “Heritage Assets”, “Setting of Heritage Assets” and “Significance (for Heritage Policy)” to be added to glossary as per NPPF as follows:</p> <p><i>“Heritage asset: A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).</i></p> <p><i>Setting of a heritage asset: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.</i></p> <p><i>Significance (for heritage policy): The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.”</i></p>
74	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Add following definition:</p> <p><i>Elderly provision: Generally taken as provision for people aged 55 years or over.</i></p>
75	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Amend following definition:</p> <p>FIVE-YEAR SUPPLY - Each Local Planning Authority is required to demonstrate a five-year supply of land for housing <i>based upon the appropriate strategic requirement. The five year supply position is monitored on a quarterly basis..</i> Ribble Valley is required to provide 161 residential units each year and therefore is required to demonstrate that 805 units (161x5) can be provided. If a five-year supply cannot be demonstrated then it becomes difficult to resist applications for residential development, even if they are not suitable.</p>
76	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Remove references to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PPS—Planning Policy Statements ● PPS1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPS 3 • PPS12 • PPS 25
77	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Add reference to:</p> <p><i>NPPF- National Planning Policy Framework. This contains the Government’s planning policies for England and must be taken into account in preparing local and neighbourhood plans and is a material consideration in planning decisions. The NPPF was issued in March 2012 and supersedes guidance formerly contained in Planning Policy Statements and Guidance (PPS and PPGs).</i></p>
78	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Add a definition of “Settlement”. This will be the definition currently used in the District Wide Local Plan (see page 13, para 3.2.15 of the Local Plan) which was used to define village boundaries in the area and is considered to remain an adequate guide to settlements. It is</p> <p><i>A settlement for the purposes of this plan is an area that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Includes all properties physically linked to the main (built) part of the settlement</i> • <i>Includes all undeveloped areas of existing planning consents relating to the settlement</i> • <i>Includes residential curtilages</i> • <i>Boundaries do not include properties separated from the main body of the settlement by areas of open land not forming a residential curtilage</i> • <i>In most cases single depth development (ribbon development) along roads leading out of settlements will be excluded unless they are physically well related to the settlement</i>
79	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Add definitions of <i>Consolidation, Expansion and Rounding off</i> (as per saved Local Plan)</p>
80	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Replace reference to Affordable Housing Memorandum of understanding (AHMU) with <i>Addressing Housing Need.</i></p>
81	<p>12 Glossary</p> <p>Add to definition of Open Countryside</p> <p>This is a designation <i>currently defined</i> within <i>the proposals map of</i> the RV Districtwide Local Plan mainly of land outside Settlement Areas but not designated Greenbelt or AONB.</p>

82	<p>13 Evidence Base Documents</p> <p>Add new sentence under chapter heading. Create new 13.1. Text as follows:</p> <p><i>13.1 In addition the Council has drawn on information submitted through extensive consultation, which is available for reference.</i></p>
83	<p>13 Evidence Base Documents</p> <p>Add:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Addressing Housing Need in Ribble Valley June 2011 (RVBC) CABE/English Heritage Building in Context Toolkit Employment Land position Statement June 2011 (RVBC) Forest of Bowland AONB Renewable Energy Statement 2011 </p> <p><i>G6 Essential Open Space Designation Audit 2011 (RVBC)</i></p> <p><i>LCC Historic Environment Record</i></p> <p><i>LCC Extensive Urban Survey reports</i></p>
84	<p>15 Appendices</p> <p>Amend footnote 20 at 15.1 of Appendix 2 to explain which are the other 32 settlements</p>
85	<p>15 Appendices</p> <p>Amend figures for housing requirement and distribution to reflect most up to date monitoring period (June 2012) once figures are ready for insertion.</p>
86	<p>Miscellaneous</p> <p>Any other minor textual/typographical/editorial/factual updates</p>
87	<p>Miscellaneous</p> <p>Amend any necessary issues relating to compliance with NPPF in relation to Wildlife Trust comments or other.</p>
88	<p>Miscellaneous</p> <p>Development Management policies: need to clarify what is policy/supporting text</p>

INFORMATION

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No 8

meeting date: 16 AUGUST 2012
 title: REVENUE OUTTURN 2011/12
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
 principal author: TRUDY HOLDERNESS

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform members of the revenue outturn for this committee for the year ended 31 March 2012.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- ❖ Community Objectives – none identified
- ❖ Corporate Priorities – to continue to be a well managed Council providing efficient services based on identified customer need and meets the objective within this priority, of maintaining critical financial management controls, ensuring the authority provides council tax payers with value for money.
- ❖ Other Considerations – none identified.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council's draft Statement of Accounts have now been produced and have been approved by Accounts and Audit Committee and are currently subject to audit by the Council's external auditors. Accounts and Audit Committee will approve the final audit version of the statement at the end of August.

2.2 The information contained within the Statements is in a prescriptive format. However the service cost information is being reported to Committees for their own relevant services in our usual reporting format in the current cycle of meetings.

3 FINANCIAL INFORMATION

3.1 Shown below, by cost centre, is a comparison with the revised estimate. You will see an overall underspend of £147,067 on the net cost of services. After allowing for transfers to and from earmarked reserves, this underspend is reduced to £86,822. Please note that underspends are denoted by figures with a minus symbol.

Cost Centre	Cost Centre Name	Revised Estimate £	Actual £	Difference £
PLANG	Planning Control & Enforcement	196,590	141,330	-55,260
PLANP	Planning Policy	157,530	154,770	-2,760
PLDEV	Planning Delivery	163,620	113,208	-50,412
BCSAP	Building Control SAP Fees	-1,240	-1,526	-286
BLDGC	Building Control	82,060	81,446	-614
CINTR	Clitheroe Integrated Transport Scheme	6,910	6,914	4

Cost Centre	Cost Centre Name	Revised Estimate £	Actual £	Difference £
CONSV	Conservation areas	11,820	11,550	-270
AONBS	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	11,340	11,250	-90
COMMG	Community Groups	18,500	17,800	-700
COUNT	Countryside Management	36,090	32,883	-3,207
FPATH	Footpaths & Bridleways	5,340	4,169	-1,171
HIGHH	High Hedges	2,060	2,020	-40
FORBW	Forest of Bowland Bridleways	27,140	-7,500	-34,640
PENDU	Pendle Hill Users	-7,750	59	7,809
PLSUB	Grants and Subscriptions	14,670	9,240	-5,430
Total net cost of services		724,680	577,613	-147,067

ITEMS ADDED TO / (TAKEN FROM) BALANCES AND RESERVES				
PLBAL H234	Building Control Reserve Fund	-28,360	-33,036	-4,676
PLBAL H253	Local Development Framework	-7,750	-7,754	-4
PLBAL H268	Planning Delivery Reserve Fund	-132,850	-132,846	4
PLBAL H273	Pendle Hill User Reserve Fund	7,750	-59	-7,809
PLBAL H274	Forest of Bowland Bridleways Reserve Fund	-27,140	7,500	34,640
PLBAL H336	Planning Reserve Fund	-41,950	-103,167	-61,217
PLBAL H358	Core Strategy Reserve Fund	0	87,411	87,411
CPBAL H330	Capital Reserve Fund	0	11,896	11,896
NET BALANCES AND RESERVES		-230,300	-170,055	60,245
NET EXPENDITURE		494,380	407,559	-86,822

3.2 We have extracted the main variations and shown them, with the budget holder's comments at Annex 1. However a summary of the main variations is given in the table below. However a summary of the main variations is given in the table below.

SERVICE AREA	DESCRIPTION OF VARIANCE	AMOUNT £
PLANG Planning Control	Savings on costs in planning control, mainly as a result of a freeze on non-essential expenditure and changes in services provided. Part of which has been added to capital reserve fund to purchase a replacement scanner/printer	£12,793
PLANG Planning Control	Increase in consultancy costs mainly incurred on Henthorn road planning appeal, this expenditure is funded from the planning reserve fund.	£24,217
PLANG Planning Control	Increase in planning application fees, mainly as a result of four large applications, Calderstone Park, Cobden Mill, Woone Lane and Chapel Hill being received after estimates prepared.	£60,383
PLDEV Planning Delivery	Slippage of planning delivery expenditure. This is to be set aside with an additional £37k from planning reserve, previously approved by this committee, to fund the core strategy.	£50,412
BLDGC Building Control	Reduced building control fee income, mainly due to current economic climate partly offset by reduced costs of £5,160 and income from flood defence work of £4,012. This has resulted in more resources being required from the building control reserve fund.	£13,403
FORBW Forest of Bowland Bridleway	Additional contribution from Lancashire County Council for Forest of Bowland Bridleway project, expenditure for which has slipped into 2012/13, resulting in funds being added to Forest of Bowland reserve fund	£7,500
PENDU Pendle Hill Users	Contributions to Pendle Hill lengths-man scheme and 400 th anniversary of witches sculpture trail. To be funded from Pendle Hill user reserve fund	£8,000

- 3.3 As can be seen from above, the key variances have been met from, or have been set aside in the council's earmarked reserves. There are a number of smaller variances as can be seen in the Annex 1, many of which are as a result of officers continuing the prudent approach to non-essential expenditure in the year.
- 3.4 A substantial increase in planning fee income has largely contributed to the financial position for this Committee at year end.

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 The comparison between actual and budgeted expenditure shows an underspend for the financial year 2011/12 of £147,067. After transfers to / from balances and reserves this is reduced to £86,822.
- 4.2 The position is largely due to additional income, and underspends that have now been set aside in earmarked reserves

SENIOR ACCOUNTANT

DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

PD3-12/TH/AC
6 August 2012

Background working papers:
Planning and Development closedown 2011/12

For further information please ask for Trudy Holderness, extension 4436

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE – VARIANCES 2011/12

	VARIANCE IN EXPENDITURE	VARIANCE IN INCOME	VARIANCE IN SUPPORT	VARIANCE IN CAPITAL	TOTAL VARIANCE
Planning Control & Enforcement					
Below average number of agricultural planning consultations from LCC	-4,600				
A freeze on non-essential expenditure has resulted in reduced expenditure on microfilm maintenance, software maintenance, photocopying, census information, local plan costs and general equipment maintenance.	-4,043				
Statutory adverts are now being placed direct rather than via an agent resulting in reduced expenditure.	-1,571				
Ordnance survey service was in process of changing when estimates prepared, the estimate was left at previous year level	-2,579				
Increase in consultancy costs mainly for the attendance and preparation for Henthorn Road, Clitheroe planning appeal. This cost is met from earmarked reserves.	24,217				
Increase in planning fee income due to four large planning applications being received in respect of Calderstones Park, Whalley (£15k), Cobden mill, Sabden (£15K), Woone Lane, Clitheroe (£19K) and Chapel hill, Longridge (£17K)		-60,383			
Reduction in support costs mainly from community services and also chief executives and Legal services			-5,892		-54,851
Planning Delivery Grant					
Slippage on core strategy expenditure	-49,902				-49,902

	VARIANCE IN EXPENDITURE	VARIANCE IN INCOME	VARIANCE IN SUPPORT	VARIANCE IN CAPITAL	TOTAL VARIANCE
Planning Policy					
Reduction in support costs mainly from community services and chief executives			-2,740		-2,740
Building Control					
Reduction in tuition fees, professional fees, car allowances, microfilm maintenance, purchase of equipment and materials, printing and stationery, reference books, subscriptions, promotional activities and provision for consultants fees as a result of freeze on non essential expenditure	-5,160				
Increase in income from Flood defence grant as a result of staff working on the project		-4,012			
Reduced Income from building regulations fees. This is mainly due to current economic climate and also due to some organisations using private competitors.		13,403			
Reduction in support costs mainly from chief executives and computer services due to reduction in costs in those sections			-3,220		1,011
Countryside Management					
Increase in expenditure on emergency tree work due to health and safety issues	405				
Increase in income from emergency tree work mainly from internal recharge of costs		-2,845			
Reduction in support costs mainly from community services			-400		-2,840
Forest of Bowland Bridleways					
No expenditure has taken place on the project due to agreement still to be reached between Natural England and farm tenant (funded from earmarked reserve fund)	-27,140				

	VARIANCE IN EXPENDITURE	VARIANCE IN INCOME	VARIANCE IN SUPPORT	VARIANCE IN CAPITAL	TOTAL VARIANCE
Additional contribution from LCC (added to earmarked reserve fund)		-7,500			-34,640
Footpath & Bridleways					
No expenditure on repairs of footpaths or statutory notices of diversion orders in the year	-1,790				
Only 1 footpath diversion order completed in the year		729			-1,061
Pendle Hill Users					
Contributions to Pendle hill lengths-man scheme and 400th anniversary witches sculpture trail. (Funded from earmarked reserve fund)	8,000				
Additional contributions received during year (to be added to earmarked reserve fund)		-191			7,809
Planning Grants & Subscriptions					
Subscription to archaeological service less than anticipated and subscription to Lancashire economic partnership no longer required	-5,430				-5,430
Other	-2,816	-912	-691	-3	-4,424
TOTAL	-72,409	-61,712	-12,943	-3	-147,067

Variances on items Added to / (taken from) Balances and Reserves	
Establish a Core strategy reserve from the balance left in planning reserve fund and a contribution from planning reserve	87,411
Increase in funding from planning reserve fund mainly as a result of increase in anticipated cost of Henthorn road appeal and contribution to core strategy reserve.	-61,217
Increase in funding from Building control reserve mainly as a result of a reduced income partly offset by reduced expenditure	-4,676
Reduction in funds required from Forest of Bowland reserve due to slippage of expenditure plus additional contribution from LCC	34,640
Reduction in contribution from Pendle Hill users reserve fund as a result of expenditure offset by additional contributions received during the year	-7,809
Contribution to capital reserve fund to purchase a new scanner/ printer in planning funded from underspends in Planning Control.	11,896
TOTAL	-86,822

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL INFORMATION

REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No 9

meeting date: 16 AUGUST 2012
 title: REVENUE MONITORING 2012/13
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
 principal author: TRUDY HOLDERNESS

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To let you know the position for the first three months of this year's revenue budget as far as this committee is concerned.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- ❖ Community Objectives – none identified
- ❖ Corporate Priorities – to continue to be a well managed Council providing efficient services based on identified customer need and meets the objective within this priority, of maintaining critical financial management controls, ensuring the authority provides council tax payers with value for money.
- ❖ Other Considerations – none identified

2 FINANCIAL INFORMATION

2.1 Shown below, by cost centre, is a comparison between actual expenditure and the original estimate for the period. You will see an overall under spend of £47,635 on the net expenditure, after allowing for estimated transfers to and from balances and reserves. Please note that underspends are denoted by figures with a minus symbol.

Cost Centre	Cost Centre Name	Net Budget for the full year £	Net Budget to the end of the period £	Actual including Commitments to the end of the period £	Variance £	
CORES	Core Strategy	86,000	4,781	2,009	-2,772	A
PLANG	Planning Control & Enforcement	147,130	-87,835	-122,695	-34,860	R
PLANP	Planning Policy	190,390	-59	-25	34	G
BCSAP	Building Control SAP Fees	360	-874	-851	23	G
BLDGC	Building Control	53,880	-41,820	-34,268	7,552	R
AONBS	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	11,890	0	0	0	G
COMMG	Community Groups	21,800	6,100	4,000	-2,100	A
COUNT	Countryside Management	48,670	13,738	8,624	-5,114	R
FPATH	Footpaths & Bridleways	4,440	74	0	-74	G
HIGHH	High Hedges	2,060	0	0	0	G
CONSV	Conservation Areas	11,880	0	0	0	G
PENDU	Pendle Hill User Group	0	0	1,650	1,650	G
PLSUB	Grants and Subscriptions	15,280	0	0	0	G
CINTR	Clitheroe Integrated Transport Scheme	7,030	5,316	11	-5,305	R
Total net cost of services		600,810	-100,579	-141,545	-40,966	

Items added to / (taken from) balances and reserves					
PLBAL H234	Building Control Reserve Fund	-1,080	45,726	37,935	-7,791
PLBAL H273	Pendle Hill User Reserve Fund	0	0	-1,650	-1,650
PLBAL H358	Core Strategy Reserve Fund	-86,000	-4,781	-2,009	2,772
Net Balances and Reserves		-87,080	40,945	34,276	-6,669
Net Expenditure		513,730	-59,634	-107,269	-47,635

- 2.2 The variations between budget and actuals have been split into groups of red, amber and green variance. The red variances highlight specific areas of high concern, for which budget holders are required to have an action plan. Amber variances are potential areas of high concern and green variances are areas that currently do not present any significant concern.

Key to Variance shading	
Variance of more than £5,000 (Red)	R
Variance between £2,000 and £4,999 (Amber)	A
Variance less than £2,000 (Green)	G

- 2.3 We have then extracted the main variations for the items included in the red shaded cost centres and shown them with the budget holder's comments and agreed action plans, in Annex 1.
- 2.4 The main variations for items included in the amber shaded cost centres are shown with budget holders' comments at Annex 2.
- 2.5 In summary the main areas of variance which are unlikely to rectify themselves by the end of the financial year are summarised below. Please note favourable variances are denoted by figures with a minus symbol.

Description	Variance to end of June 2012 £
BLDGC - Building Control – reduced income from applications	11,174
PLANG – Planning Control – Major applications received to date – upward trend anticipated for next three months	-34,898

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The comparison between actual and budgeted expenditure shows an under spend of £47,635 for the first three months of the financial year 2012/13.
- 3.2 The main reasons for the under spend is the additional income of £34,898 from major planning applications.
- 3.3 The main area of concern for this committee is the reduced income from building regulation fees. Total income received for building regulation fees for the first quarter of this year was £44,243, which does not compare favourably with the estimate of £55,417.

TRUDY HOLDERNESS
SENIOR ACCOUNTANT

DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

PD4-12/TH/AC
16 JULY 2012

BACKGROUND WORKING PAPERS
Planning & Development Committee budget monitoring working papers 2012/13

For further information please ask for Trudy Holderness, extension 4436

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RED VARIANCES

Ledger Code	Ledger Code Name	Budget for the Full Year	Budget to the end of the period	Actual including Commitments to the end of the period	Variance		Reason for Variance	Action Plan as agreed between the Budget Holder and Accountant
BLDGC/8405n	Building Control / Building Regulation Fees	-212,000	-55,417	-44,243	11,174	R	Reduced income from applications.	Expenditure on staffing being reduced to offset reduction in income.
PLANG/8404u	Planning Control / Planning Fees	-418,310	-88,850	-123,748	-34,898	R	Major applications received to date - upward trend expected for the next three months.	No action at present Estimate to be reviewed as part of the budget setting process
CINTR/4677	Clitheroe Integrated Transport Scheme / Grants to Precepting Bodies	5,280	5,280	0	-5,280	R	Awaiting invoice from Lancashire County Council for Contribution towards the Clitheroe Line Community Rail Partnership	No action at present

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

AMBER VARIANCES

Ledger Code	Ledger Code Name	Budget for	Budget to	Actual	Variance		Reason for Variance
		the Full Year					
			the period	Commitments			
				to the end of			
				the period			
COMMG/4678	Community Groups / Grants to Voluntary Organisations	4,100	4,100	2,000	-2,100	A	RSPB to confirm project is still continuing.
COUNT/4677	Countryside Management / Grants to Precepting Bodies	10,000	10,000	7,000	-3,000	A	Awaiting annual reports from Parish Council's to be submitted for work carried out in 2011/12 to ascertain that all work is being completed.