

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: 3 November 2014

Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414488

www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

The next meeting of the **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** is at **6.30pm** on **THURSDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2014** 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 16 October 2014 – 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.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- ✓ 7. Appeals:
- (a) 3/2014/0342/P – increase in height of garden wall adjacent to Primrose Road by one course and the fitting of a gate at 11 Primrose Road, Clitheroe – appeal dismissed.
 - (b) 3/2014/0175/P – erection of a single dwelling at 20 Brookside, Old Langho – granted with conditions.
 - (c) 3/2014/0307/P – erection of up to 32 dwellings and associated works at land at Albany Drive, Salesbury – appeal dismissed.
 - (d) 3/2014/0447/P – proposed demolition of existing attached garage and rear porch to create the space for new single storey rear and side extension at 10 Chatburn Park Drive, Clitheroe – appeal dismissed.
 - (e) 3/2013/0448/P – poultry unit at land south of Oakfield, Showley Road, Clayton-le-Dale – appeal dismissed.
 - (f) 3/2014/0204/P – erection of one new residential dwelling at The Warren, Hurst Green – appeal dismissed.
 - (g) 3/2014/0401/P – conversion of a former agricultural building into a holiday cottage without complying with a condition attached to planning permission 3/2008/0105/P at Boococks Barn, Knotts Lane, Tosside – appeal dismissed.
8. Reports from 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 15 JANUARY 2015						
<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:						
3/2014/0822/P	1		SK	AC	Land off Preston Road Longridge	
3/2014/0944/P	6		SK	AC	Land off Middle Lodge Road Barrow	
3/2014/0958/P	13		CB	AC	The Laund Bowland-with-Leagram	
3/2014/1044/P	15		JM	AC	Carr Hall Garden Centre Wilpshire	
C APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL:						
3/2014/0961/P	20		CS	R	Skirden Hall Farm Tosside	
D APPLICATIONS UPON WHICH COMMITTEE DEFER THEIR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO WORK DELEGATED TO DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BEING SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED						
3/2014/0597/P	27		CS	DEFER	Land off Waddington Road Clitheroe	
3/2014/0742/P	70		SK	DEFER	Land off Pimlico Road Clitheroe	
E APPLICATIONS IN 'OTHER' CATEGORIES:						
				NONE		

LEGEND

AC Approved Conditionally
R Refused
M/A Minded to Approve

AB Adam Birkett
AD Adrian Dowd
CB Claire Booth
CS Colin Sharpe

JM John Macholc
SK Stephen Kilmartin
SW Sarah Westwood

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No

meeting date: THURSDAY, 15 JANUARY 2015
 title: PLANNING APPLICATIONS
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

PLANNING APPLICATIONS UNDER THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990:

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0822/P (GRID REF: SD 360011 436102)
 REPLAN FOR PLOTS 32-45 OF RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION 3/2013/0307
 INCLUDING ADDITON OF 3 NO. UNITS AT LAND OFF PRESTON ROAD, LONGRIDGE

PARISH COUNCIL: No response received.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE
 (COUNTY SURVEYOR): The County Surveyor has no objection to the proposal.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY No objection subject to the imposition of conditions.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: One letter of representation has been received in respect of the application objecting on the following grounds:

- The re plan will result in a loss of privacy and a dwelling being located closer to an existing property than that of which was originally approved.
- Devaluation of property.
- The current development is of a poor quality and appearance.

Site Location

The site lies to the west of Preston Road outside but immediately adjacent to the settlement limit of Longridge lying within land designated open countryside. The site is currently under development.

The scheme has its main area of development filling the land between an existing small group of properties at Grimbaldeston Farm and the housing estate of Lindale Road – the latter which lies within the settlement boundary.

There are open fields beyond to the south and south-west. The smaller section of development lies to the immediate south of the access road and runs parallel to Preston Road filling in a parcel of land between the aforementioned access and a pair of semi-detached dwellings on Preston Road.

Members will note that the principle of the development was originally established through the granting of outline consent on site for the erection of a residential development of up to 60 dwellings (3/2011/0316), with reserved matters having been approved (Ref: 3/2013/0771) for the erection of 58 no. dwellings.

Proposal

The application seeks full consent for the re-plan of plots 32 – 45 of the development including an increase in numbers by 3 dwellings. The area of the development to which the application relates is located to south eastern extents of the development which backs onto 32 – 42 Lindale Road.

The previous approval granted consent for 14 x 4 bedroom detached dwellings within the area in question with consent now sought for the erection of 6 x 3 bedroom dwellings and 11 x 4 bedroom dwellings. The applicant has stated that the need for the re-plan has been borne of the need to provide an increase in housing mix and due to demand for 3 bedroom dwellings.

Relevant History

3/2014/0590: Discharge of conditions 1- in accordance with drawings, 2 - landscaping scheme, 3 - design details and specifications of the internal streetscape and its associated lighting, street furniture, walls, fencing and boundary treatments and 4 - precise specifications and samples of walling and roofing materials and details of any window and door surrounds. (Approved)

3/2013/0307: Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval for the erection of 58 no. dwellings including details of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping. (Approved)

3/2011/0316: Outline application for residential development of 60 no. dwellings (Approved)

Relevant Policies

Ribble Valley Core Strategy

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.

Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside

Policy DMH1 – Affordable Housing Criteria

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The matters to be considered in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development in policy terms; the impact of the development in visual terms; the effects upon ecology and trees (where relevant); the impact on neighbouring residential amenities; highway safety; and the matter of financial contributions requested by Lancashire County Council.

Principle of Development

Members will note that the principle of development has been established as acceptable though the previous outline consent (3/2011/0316) and that of the granting of reserved matters (3/2013/0307).

The current submission seeks to increase the number of dwellings approved by 3. It is not considered that there have been any significant changes in adopted local or national policy that would warrant a change in assessment at this stage based on the submitted layout/house types or when taking into consideration the increase in the number of dwellings approved.

It is noted that the Ribble Valley Core Strategy has been fully adopted since the original full consent was granted, the proposal at that time was assessed against the Core Strategy, albeit at pre-adoption stage and no immediate significant conflicts were considered to be present at that time.

It is therefore considered that there are no reasons, in respect of the principle of development, to withhold the granting of planning consent.

Contributions/Legal Agreement

The applicant has put forward a draft deed of variation, discussions are on-going on this matter but it is recommended that planning permission be granted with a condition attached that will ensure no development takes place unless and until a suitable mechanism has been entered into and completed, to deliver the planning obligations pursuant to the grant of Outline Planning Permission reference 3/2011/0316 which will ensure continuity between the current application and the original consent to which it relates.

Highways safety

The County Surveyor has no further comments to make in respect of the application insofar that it does not result in any additional highways impact or deviation from the previously approved development.

Residential Amenity

In respect of potential impact upon residential amenity, representations have been received in respect of the revised layout, location and orientation of plot 38. Amended plans have been received that are more reflective of the original reserved matters consent granted which in my view mitigates these concerns and consider that the proposal, as submitted, would not result in any significant detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of existing/neighbouring occupiers.

I am therefore mindful of the relationship between the proposed dwellings and the existing properties/uses within the area and given the layout and spatial relationships as detailed on the submitted plans, consider the scheme acceptable.

Layout

The proposal maintains the previously approved layout which adopts a clear hierarchy of a primary route that serves an individual cul-de-sac and an element of courtyard style housing with the majority of the dwelling being afforded direct access off the primary vehicular route.

Appearance & Visual Amenity

In respect of the appearance of the proposed dwellings, I consider that the overall scale and design of the properties represents an appropriate response to the immediate context and will be read well in the context of the existing development within the vicinity.

The house types proposed are generally considered to be reflective of the approach adopted throughout the remainder of the site in terms of external appearance and that of the original reserved matters consent.

I am therefore mindful of the design and appearance of the proposed dwellings in relation to the wider and immediate and consider the proposed housing-types acceptable.

Conclusions/Recommendation

It is considered that the proposed re plan and increase in the number of dwellings on site raise no significant concerns in respect of conflict with adopted policy or would result in any significant strategic implications for the Borough.

It is additionally considered that the proposal would have no additional detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity nor would it have an adverse visual impact upon the immediate or wider context or character of the area.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following condition(s):

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. Unless explicitly required by condition within this consent, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the proposals as detailed on the submitted drawings:

- Revised site plan 809145/PL02/Rev A
- MH/ORW/001
- MH/ORW/002
- MH/DAR/001
- MH/DAR/002
- MH/TRA/001
- MH/TRA/002
- MH/CRO/001

- MH/CRO/002
- MH/SG/001

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify which plans are relevant.

3. Precise specifications or samples of walling, roofing and window/door framing materials 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 DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

4. Notwithstanding the submitted details no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until design details and specifications of the internal streetscape and its associated lighting, street furniture, walls, fencing and boundary treatments has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall then be completed in accordance with approved details

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version)

5. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until full details of the proposed landscaping have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall indicate, as appropriate, the types and numbers of trees and shrubs, their distribution on site, their maturity at the time of planting, those areas to be seeded, turfed, paved or hard landscaped, including details of any changes of level or landform.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season prior to commencement of the development unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, whether in whole or part and shall be maintained thereafter for a period of not less than 15 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 Policies DMG1, EN2 and DME3 of Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

6. Notwithstanding any indication on the approved plans, no development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters for the entire site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, surface water must drain separate from the foul and no surface water will be permitted to discharge directly or indirectly into existing sewerage systems. The development shall be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site. In accordance with Policies EN2, EN4, DME2 and DME3 Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

7. No development shall take place unless and until a suitable mechanism has been entered into and completed, to deliver the planning obligations pursuant to the grant of Planning Permission reference 3/2011/0316.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority may ensure that the appropriate planning obligations are secured in accordance policies DMI1 and DMH1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

NOTES

1. 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 Ribble Valley District Highways Office, Lancashire County Council, Riddings Lane, Whalley BB7 9RW (tel. 0845 0530011) and quote the planning application number.
2. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the Local Planning Authority detailing how this suspected contamination can be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0944/P (GRID REF: SD 373964 438141)
SUBSTITUTION OF HOUSE TYPE FOR 13 DWELLINGS APPROVED UNDER PLANNING PERMISSION 3/2013/0771. LAND OFF MIDDLE LODGE ROAD, BARROW, BB7 9WD.

PARISH COUNCIL: No response received

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE (COUNTY SURVEYOR): The County Surveyor has no objection to the proposal

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS: No letters of representation have been received in respect of the current application.

Site Location

The proposal site is located to the south of the Printworks off Ribble Valley Enterprise Park, Hey Road, the A59 is located approximately 68m to the east of the development site with properties fronting Whiteacre Lane to the south backing onto the site. The site is also bounded to the west by properties on Ash Close and Birch Grove also backing onto the site.

Proposal

The application seeks full consent for the substitution of 13 house types as originally approved under consent Ref: 3/2013/0771 for the erection 102 dwellings (20 are proposed affordable housing) with associated landscaping, public open space and highways works at land off Middle Lodge Road Barrow.

The development will served from Middle lodge Road with a main vehicular pedestrian route running north to south serving a cul-de-sac arrangement with elements of courtyard style housing located to the western extents of the site.

The approved proposal will provide an element of public open space to the southeast extents of the site in the form of an informal route through an existing area of tree-planting/woodland. The previously approved proposal also makes provision for the erection of two two-storey apartment blocks to the northeast extents of the site each accommodating 6 x 2 bedroom apartments all of which being affordable in nature.

The details relating to the current submission proposes house type substitutions for plots 13-14, 16-21, 47-49 and plot 43. The plot locations in question are mainly located to the northern extents of the development fronting the main access (Plots 16-20), with the remainder being within the central portion of the site.

Relevant History

3/2013/0771: Proposed residential development of 102 No. Dwellings (Including 20 no. affordable units). (Approved with conditions)

3/2012/0158: Outline application for the erection of 73 open market detached dwellings and 31 social housing properties. (Refused - Appeal Allowed)

Relevant Policies

Ribble Valley Core Strategy

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.

Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside

Policy DMH1 – Affordable Housing Criteria

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The matters to be considered in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the development in policy terms; the impact of the development in visual terms; the effects upon ecology and trees (where relevant); the impact on neighbouring residential amenities; highway safety; the mechanism by which the properties have been made affordable; and the matter of financial contributions requested by Lancashire County Council.

Principle of Development

Members will note that the principle of development has been established as acceptable though the previous full consent (3/2013/0771) and that of the outline application allowed at appeal (3/2012/0158).

The current submission does not seek to increase the number of dwellings approved and it is not considered that there have been any significant changes in adopted local or national policy that would warrant a change in assessment at this stage.

It is noted that the Ribble Valley Core Strategy has been fully adopted since the original full consent was granted, the proposal at that time was assessed against the Core Strategy, albeit at pre-adoption stage and no immediate significant conflicts being present at that time.

It is therefore considered that there are no reasons, in respect of the principle of development, to withhold the granting of planning consent.

Contributions/Legal Agreement

The applicant has put forward a draft deed of variation, discussions are on-going on this matter but it is recommended that planning permission be granted with a condition attached that will ensure no development takes place unless and until a suitable mechanism has been entered into and completed, to deliver the planning obligations pursuant to the grant of Planning Permission reference 3/2013/0771 which will ensure continuity between the current application and the original consent to which it relates.

Highways safety

The County Surveyor has no further comments to make in respect of the application insofar that it does not result in any additional highways impact or deviation from the previously approved development.

Residential Amenity

In respect of potential impact upon residential amenity, given the proposed relationship to adjoining/nearby dwellings and that the plots in question are located wholly within the central portion or northern extents of development site, consider that the proposal, as submitted, would not result in a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of existing/neighbouring occupiers.

I am therefore mindful of the relationship between the proposed dwellings and the existing properties/uses within the area and given the layout and spatial relationships as detailed on the submitted plans, consider the scheme acceptable.

Layout

The proposal maintains the previously approved layout which adopts a clear hierarchy of a primary route that serves individual cul-de-sac's and an element of courtyard style housing.

The internal layout of the development proposes a mixture of parking being accommodated behind the building line, on front driveway arrangement and within integral garaging on a number of the house types.

Appearance & Visual Amenity

In respect of the appearance of the proposed dwellings, I consider that the overall scale and design of the properties represents an appropriate response to the immediate context and will be read well in the context of the existing development within the vicinity.

The house types proposed are generally considered to be reflective of the approach adopted throughout the remainder of the site in terms of external appearance. The house type substitution introduces a number of 2.5 storey dwellings, but given the plot locations and distances from existing properties do not consider that these will result in any additional impact upon residential amenity.

I am therefore mindful of the design and appearance of the proposed dwellings in relation to the wider and immediate and consider the proposed housing-types acceptable.

Conclusions/Recommendation

It is considered that the plot/house type substitutions raise no significant concerns in respect of conflict with adopted policy or would result in any significant strategic implications for the Borough.

It is additionally considered that the proposal would have no additional detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity nor would it have an adverse visual impact upon the immediate or wider context.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following condition(s):

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. Standard amended plans condition. (Full drawing list to be added to decision notice)

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify which plans are relevant and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

3. Precise specifications or samples of walling, roofing and window/door framing materials 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 DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

4. 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 for that phase have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be submitted on a dwelling/building dependent bird/bat species development site plan and include details of plot numbers and the numbers of artificial bird nesting boxes and artificial bat roosting site 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. The artificial bird/bat boxes shall be incorporated into those individual dwellings/buildings during the actual construction of those individual dwellings/buildings identified on the submitted plan before each such dwelling/building is first brought into use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of biodiversity and to enhance nesting/roosting opportunities for species of conservation concern and reduce the impact of development in accordance with Policies DMG1 and EN4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

5. Notwithstanding the submitted details no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until design details and specifications of the internal streetscape and its associated lighting, street furniture, walls, fencing, boundary treatments and details of any surface materials to be used including their colour and texture has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall then be completed in accordance with approved details.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy Policies DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

6. No development shall take place until details of the public open space, woodland track and any associated play equipment/surfacing at the southeast extents of the development site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority may ensure that the materials to be used are appropriate to the locality in accordance with Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version), ensuring a satisfactory standard of appearance and given its location.

7. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until full details of the proposed landscaping have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall indicate, as appropriate, the types and numbers of trees and shrubs, their distribution on site, their maturity at the time of planting, those areas to be seeded, turfed, paved or hard landscaped, including details of any changes of level or landform.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season prior to commencement of the development unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, whether in whole or part and shall be maintained thereafter for a period of not less than 15 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 Policies DMG1, EN2 and DME3 of Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

8. Notwithstanding any indication on the approved plans, no development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters for the entire site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, surface water must drain separate from the foul and no surface water will be permitted to discharge directly or indirectly into existing sewerage systems. The development shall be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site. In accordance with Policies EN2, EN4, DME2 and DME3 Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

9. Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plans, the proposed driveway/hard surfacing to the front of the property shall be constructed using permeable materials on a permeable base, or provision shall be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the boundaries of the property (rather than to the highway), unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of Highway Safety and to prevent flooding. In accordance with Policies EN2, EN4, DME2 and DME3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

10. No phase of development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and shall provide for:

- The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- Loading and unloading of plant material;
- Storage of plant materials used in the construction of development;
- The erection and maintenance of security hoardings;
- Wheel washing facilities;
- A management plan to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction identifying suitable mitigation measures;
- Details of the storage of potential ground and water contaminants
- A scheme for protecting trees;
- A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction work; and
- A scheme to control noise during the construction phase.

REASON: In the interests of protecting residential amenity from noise and disturbance in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

11. The new estate road shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire county Council specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least a base course level before any development takes place within the site.

REASON: To ensure that satisfactory access is provided to the site before the development hereby permitted becomes operative.

12. Prior to any phase of the development being occupied a Framework Travel Plan for the whole development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, prior to the commencement of development on any phase or portion of the development, a separate Travel Plan (or up-dated information for the Framework Travel Plan) for each phase shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall be implemented, audited and updated within the timescale set out in the approved plan.

REASON: To ensure a multi-modal transport provision for the development and reduce the traffic impact on the local road network, in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

13. Prior to the commencement of the development, a written scheme of archaeological investigation relating to that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each scheme will outline (if required) a programme of archaeological work which is to be implemented within the phase. The development of the phase shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological importance associated with the site in accordance with Policies EN5, DME3 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

14. No development shall take place unless and until a suitable mechanism has been entered into and completed, to deliver the planning obligations pursuant to the grant of Planning Permission reference 3/2013/0771.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority may ensure that the appropriate planning obligations are secured in accordance policies DMI1 and DMH1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adoption Version).

NOTES

1. 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 Ribble Valley District Highways Office, Lancashire County Council, Riddings Lane, Whalley BB7 9RW (tel. 0845 0530011) and quote the planning application number.
2. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the Local Planning Authority detailing how this suspected contamination can be dealt with and obtained written approval from the Local planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0958/P

(GRID REF: SD 362797, 444648)

NEW MACHINERY STORAGE SHED AT THE LAUND, BOWLAND WITH LEAGRAM, PR3 3GS.

PARISH COUNCIL: No objections to the proposal and state that they fully support it.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE
(COUNTY SURVEYOR): Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS: None received.

Proposal

Permission is sought for a storage building for machinery that will be located between an existing agricultural building and two feed hoppers at Laund Farm. The building would have a length of 13.8m, a width of 9.7m and a ridge height of 6.3m and would be clad with tantalised timber boarding above concrete panels. The building would have a natural grey cement fibre roof.

Site Location

The application relates to a farm situated on the Leagram Hall Estate within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Aside from the farmhouse, which is from the Georgian period, and a traditional stone barn, the agricultural buildings on the agricultural unit are of modern construction.

Relevant History

3/2010/0612 - Change of use and re-build from an agricultural storage building to an education building for farm visits. Approved with Conditions.

3/2009/0221 – Storage Building. Approved with Conditions.

3/2007/0935 - Extension of existing sheep housing and proposed new manure store. Approved with Conditions.

3/2006/0739 - To roof over current feeding area and to extend height 3m to eaves. Approved.

3/200210636 - Replacement of old telepole building with a proprietary timber framed agricultural building for the over wintering of milking sheep. Approved.

3/1999/0305 - New Stock Building - Approved Conditionally.

Relevant Policies

Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version)
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development.
Key Statement EN2 – Landscape.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.
Policy DME2 – Landscape Protection.
Policy DME6 – Water Management.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The primary issues for consideration include the principle of development and the visual impact of the building on the landscape.

New agricultural buildings are acceptable in the countryside where they are considered to be reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture. Laund Farm is an established working farm, running a sheep milking business of 500 ewes, and commercial beef and sheep flocks. The applicants farm approximately 189 hectares and have 90 head of cattle, a number of calves, and 1200 head of sheep with lambs at foot. Given the substantial nature of the enterprise it is clear that a building of the nature proposed is acceptable in principle subject to the usual development control criteria.

The main issue arising from this application is the visual impact of the building in this location. The design and style of the proposed building is considered appropriate for the area as it will be similar in design and materials to the existing agricultural buildings on site. The siting of the building is also considered to provide the most appropriate location given that it will effectively be an infill development to the nucleus of buildings already on the farm. A previous application for a new building at the farm sought landscaping at the boundary of the site and when I visited the site, this planting is now established. Overall, the landscape and scenic beauty of the Area or Outstanding Natural Beauty will not be harmed as a result of the proposed building.

Policy DME6 of the Core Strategy requires development to prevent pollution of surface and / or groundwater. The farm is not within a Flood Zone and this building is for the storage of farm machinery consequently it is highly unlikely that this building would cause any pollution to ground or surface waters. On this basis, the proposal is compliant with this policy. In addition, all agricultural buildings must comply with legislation outside of planning control, namely; The Water Resources (Control of Pollution) (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) (England) Regulations 2010 and The Code of Good Agricultural Practice (COGAP) for the protection of water, soil and air (produced by DEFRA) and thus an informative will be used to make the applicant aware of this legislation.

For the above reasons I can see no objections to this proposed development and the proposal is recommended accordingly.

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

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

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

2. The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Drawing Numbers:

339/201 – Proposed Plan & Elevations, and,

339/202 – Proposed Site Plan.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details.

3. The building hereby permitted shall not be used except for the purposes of agriculture at Laund Farm, Leagram Estate only as defined by section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

REASON: To safeguard the amenities of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in accordance with Key Statement EN2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

INFORMATIVE:

1. The proposed development must fully comply with the terms of The Water Resources (Control of Pollution) (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) (England) Regulations 2010 and The Code of Good Agricultural Practice (COGAP) for the protection of water, soil and air (produced by DEFRA).

Only clean surface water from roofs and paved areas should be discharged to any surface water soakaway

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/1044/P (GRID REF: SD 370064 433182)
PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM GARDEN CENTRE TO OFFICE AND RETENTION OF SOME EXISTING STORAGE AT CARR HALL GARDEN CENTRE, WHALLEY ROAD, WILPSHIRE, BB1 9LG

PARISH COUNCIL: Strongly object to industrial/commercial building in the Green Belt. A granting for B8 usage would increase the industrial appearance and extend the scope for a haulage depot:

- concern about traffic impact;
- not designated as employment area.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (HIGHWAYS): Advise no objection in principle but subject to improvements to the infrastructure including footway and bus stop improvement which would be the subject of a Section 278 Agreement. Also need for more details on cycle storage and shower facilities to encourage sustainable transport measures.

**ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS &
STATUTORY
ADVERTISEMENT:**

Two letters of objection have been received which raises the following issues. Inappropriate use in a green belt location and that it could encourage industrial user on site which should be clearly directed to other sites in Clitheroe or Samlesbury:

- Danger to highway safety due to volume of traffic.
- Also concern regarding possible traffic increase and light pollution in the green belt.

Proposal

This proposal seeks change of use of a former garden centre for office use and retention of some of the existing storage elements of the scheme. It would create about 3,600m² of office floor space by utilizing existing building which although unoccupied was previously used for a range of garden centre and craft uses and with a large cafeteria on the first floor. The proposal would involve significant internal alterations to create a central office core both on the ground floor and on the first floor with café and dining area and various meeting rooms to be used by the users of the building. The building would be used by up to 300 employees.

In relation to parking areas, 350 spaces exist within the confines of the curtilage of the building, mostly at the front and side and it is the intention to utilize these spaces for the proposed staffing and visitor spaces associated with the building. It has been indicated at pre-application that not all would be used initially but there it is important to have the facility to expand as required. The outside storage area is likely to be located at the rear and this was discussed at pre-application stage but no formal plans have been shown indicating the storage area at the back.

The access to the site is via the existing access from Whalley Road. The applicant has agreed with the improvements for the existing bus stops and footways to the site which would be carried out under Section 278 Agreement.

A Travel Plan has been submitted with this application which indicates measures to reduce the need for car borne visits and include the financial support for cycle to work schemes, shower rooms and a monitoring schedule to review travel patterns.

Site Location

The application site is on the outskirts of Langho and situated within the green belt. Access to the property is by Whalley Road.

Relevant History

3/2004/1020/P – Redevelopment of the existing site and buildings to garden centre and craft centre (amendments). Approved with conditions.

Relevant Policies

Adopted Core Strategy:
Key Statement EN1 – Greenbelt.
Key Statement EC1 – Business and Employment Development.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.
Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Section 9 Protecting Green Belt Land.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

It is clear that this proposal is situated within the Green Belt and that there has been an existing history of use in connection with the garden centre and ancillary activities. The proposal seeks to obtain change of use from garden centre to office with ancillary storage.

In terms of impact on the Green Belt regard needs to be given as to whether or not this proposal would materially harm the aim of protecting the Green Belt from inappropriate development. In doing so it is important to assess both the visual impact of any changes resulting from new development or new extensions and whether or not the activity itself would significantly impinge on the safeguarding objective associated with Green Belt land.

The proposal does not involve any extensions or alterations of significance to the main building and although it may result in more cars parked on a permanent basis than the garden centre activity, the footprint of the car parking area is not altered.

In relation to physical harm I therefore conclude there will be no impact on the Green Belt status associated with the plan and as such no tangible harm as a result of the change of use application.

In terms of highway activity, the County Council have been consulted and recognise the existing consent and the traffic implications of the current consent and conclude that this proposal would not significantly impinge on the highway network to the detriment of highway safety. It is a requirement to improve the pedestrian access to the site as well as some improvements to enable better access to bus provision and on that basis the County Surveyor raises no objection to the proposal. I note the objections which raise concerns about the appropriateness of such a development, and I recognise that in normal situations an office of this size would be better located within the main settlements. However, it is also relevant to have regard to the extent of the existing activity and also the importance of utilizing vacant buildings. The Parish Council raise concern about the storage (B8 use). This is ancillary to the main office use and relates to external storage of vehicles and some equipment. The site does offer reasonable accessibility, with both a train station and bus route in close proximity to the site. The objections also relate to the traffic flow and it is clear that the Highway Authority does not object to the scheme having regard to the implications of the trips generated from such a use.

In relation to light pollution it is accepted that there may be some limited activities that take place outside the existing consent of a garden centre but the hours of use proposed for the scheme are effectively controlled to limit the main core business to 0700 to 1900 hours and 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturday. However I am of the opinion that a limited hours of use outside this area would not significantly impinge on light pollution or residential amenity to warrant a scheme to be unacceptable.

In summary having regard to all material considerations I consider that the re-use of a vacant building for office purposes is acceptable in this situation. Accordingly it is recommended that the application be approved.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following condition(s):

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. This permission shall relate to the development as shown on drawing numbers SK012 REVA, SK03 REVA and revised site plan received on 26 November 2014 and layout plan received 16 December 2014.

REASON: For avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

3. Prior to commencement of development precise details of the parking area and storage compounds, which shall include the height of any external pallets and associated products shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained for that purpose in perpetuity.

REASON: In order to ensure adequate storage and parking areas are shown to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Adopted Version.

4. The use of the premises in accordance with this permission shall be restricted to the hours between 0700 to 1900 on weekdays and 0800 to 1300 on Saturdays and there shall be no operation on Sundays or bank holidays.

REASON: To comply with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Adopted Version. The use of the premises outside these hours could prove injurious to the character of the area and in order to safeguard residential amenities.

5. Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall provide details of:

- i) Sustainable travel options for journeys to and from work for the site operatives, including pedestrian routes, travel by bicycles, journeys by train, car sharing schemes and other opportunities to reduce journeys by motor car.
- ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- iii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iv) storage of plant and materials used in the construction of the development;
- v) the erection and maintenance of security fencing;
- vi) wheel washing facilities, if deemed appropriate;
- vii) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; and
- viii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction works.
- ix) Periods when plant and materials trips should not be made to and from the site (mainly peak hours, but the developer to suggest times when trips of this nature should not be made).
- x) Measures to ensure that construction vehicles do not impede adjoining accesses.

The approved construction method statement shall be adhered to throughout the entire period of construction works.

REASON: In order to ensure safe working practices on or near the highway in the interests of safety and in the interests of the amenities of nearby residents in accordance with the requirements of Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Adopted Version.

6. Prior to commencement of use a scheme for improvements to the footway extension and upgrading of bus stops on the A666 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to encourage sustainable transport in accordance with the requirements of Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Adopted Version.

7. Prior to commencement of development precise details of the external storage area and nature of plant and machinery stored shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external storage area shall remain ancillary to the main office use and not become a separate planning unit.

REASON: In order for the Local Planning Authority to effectively control the nature of the development.

NOTES

1. In accordance with condition 6 the applicant is advised that it would be necessary to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with Lancashire County Council.

C APPLICATIONS WHICH THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES RECOMMENDS FOR REFUSAL

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0961/P (GRID REF: SD 376477 455930)
PROPOSED NEW BUNGALOW WITH GARAGE TO PROVIDE SUITABLE
ACCOMMODATION FOR A DISABLED CHILD AT SKIRDEN HALL FARM, TOSSIDE,
BD23 4SX

PARISH COUNCIL: No representations had been received at the time of report preparation.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE
(COUNTY SURVEYOR): Comments that the property would be served by an existing access to which no changes are proposed. The proposal includes the provision of three vehicle parking spaces and a turning area within the curtilage of the proposed dwelling. This area would also facilitate the possible parking and turning of an ambulance. Overall, it is believed that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant effect on the adjacent highway network and there is therefore no objection to the proposal on highway grounds.

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS: A letter has been received from a nearby resident who has no objections to the application provided that the new dwelling does not adversely affect their shared water supply.

Proposal

Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached bungalow with maximum dimensions of 17.85m x 17.1m with an eaves height of 2.2m and a ridge height of 3.8m. The proposed external materials are natural stone walls and stone effect slates.

The bungalow would contain an integral garage, utility room, kitchen, dining room, lounge, conservatory, four bedrooms and a family bathroom. The largest of the bedrooms would have an attached wet room designed to serve the medical needs of the applicant's disabled 18 year old son.

In addition to the integral garage, the submitted plans show the provision of three car parking spaces to serve the proposed bungalow.

Site Location

Skirden Hall is a semi-detached property that is one of three dwellings located at the north-western end of an approximately 180m long access track off the north-west side of the main Tosside to Slaidburn Road. The junction of the access track with the main road is approximately 280m to the west of the village boundary of Tosside. The site is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The other properties within the group are Ballyragget Barn (a barn conversion that is the other half of the semi-detached pair – and is in separate ownership) and Skirden Hall Barn (a detached dwelling located to the rear of the semi-detached pair – that is in the ownership of the applicant's brother).

At the junction of the access track with the main road, there is a chapel with an attached chapel house.

Relevant History

The following applications relate to the group of three properties.

3/2003/0741/P – Garden room extension to Ballyragget Barn – refused.

3/2004/0755/P – Additional window at Ballyragget Barn – approved.

3/2007/0825/P – Proposed agricultural building at Skirden Hall Barn – approved subject to conditions.

3/2009/0440/P – Proposed construction of 3no holiday lets and a garage conversion for ancillary use at Skirden Hall Barn – approved subject to conditions.

Relevant Policies

Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version)

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy.

Key Statement DS2 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.

Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development and Climate Change.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility.

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.

Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

A pre-application enquiry relating to the proposed erection of a detached bungalow (to meet the specific medical needs of the applicant's then, 17 year old son) was received earlier in 2014. In drafting response to that enquiry, regard was paid to the sustainability requirements of NPPF; the relevant saved Policies of the Districtwide Local Plan and the relevant Policies of the (then) emerging Core Strategy; the "personal circumstances" weighed against planning policies and considerations; and the planning history of the group of buildings. Following consideration of those matters, the conclusions stated in the Council's response letter dated 8 April 2014 were that the Council was "unable to offer any encouragement of the submission of a planning application for a detached bungalow in this location". The Council also advised that further consideration should be given to the provision of the required accommodation in an extension to the existing dwelling such that no additional dwelling unit would be created in this relatively isolated rural location.

Notwithstanding that pre-application advice, the applicant has chosen to submit this application for a detached bungalow. The considerations relative to the determination of the application are basically the same as those made at pre-application stage but updated to reflect the new adopted status of the Core Strategy.

Those matters will therefore be discussed under appropriate headings below.

NPPF/Sustainability

The main intention of NPPF is the achievement of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The economic role seeks to contribute towards building a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation. The social role seeks to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations and by creating a high quality built environment with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and supporting its health, social and cultural wellbeing. The environmental role seeks to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

Whilst all three of these dimensions need to be considered, in my opinion, it is the environmental role that is most relevant to this application. The site is within the AONB and, in my opinion, it could not be argued that the erection of a detached bungalow in this location would enhance the natural environment. The creation of an additional residential unit in this location, that is not served by any significant services, would also not help with the environmental roles of minimising waste and pollution and mitigating and adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

Members are advised that there have been a number of recent appeals in the borough in relation to applications for the formation of additional dwellings in isolated countryside locations that the Council has refused due to the unsustainable location of the proposed dwellings. The Council's decision to refuse these applications have been supported by Appeal Inspectors. In one case, the proposal relates to the sub-division of an existing large dwelling to form 2 smaller dwellings. That proposal did not therefore involve any built development and therefore had no effects upon the local environment. In dismissing that appeal, the Inspector commented as follows:

"The proposed dwelling would add unnecessarily to the sporadic development in the countryside and, due to its remote unsustainable location, it would not represent the sustainable form of development promoted by NPPF. In addition it would not represent a suitable location for residential development as required by Policies H2 of the Districtwide Local Plan, and so it would be contrary to both this Policy and Policy G5 of the Local Plan.

The saved Local Plan Policies referred to by the Appeal Inspector are effectively now superseded by the equivalent policies in the adopted Core Strategy. Compliance or otherwise with the relevant policies will be discussed in the next section of this report.

With regards to national guidance, however, it is not considered that the proposed development complies with the sustainability requirements of NPPF.

Local Plan/Core Strategy Policies

Following the recent adoption of the Core Strategy, the saved policies of the Local Plan are no longer of any relevance to the determination of planning applications. However, saved policies

G5 and H2 that were given some consideration in the pre-application advice, are effectively carried forward by equivalent Key Statements and Policies in the adopted Core Strategy. Key Statement DS1 defines the Development Strategy, the principal feature of which is the concentration of development within the Standen Strategic Site, the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and, to a lesser extent, the more sustainable Tier 1 Settlements. This application site is not within any settlement but is within the open countryside and the AONB.

Core Strategy Policy DMH3, in-keeping with the intentions of the Development Strategy, limits 'new-build' residential development in the open countryside to dwellings essential to agriculture or development which meets an identified local need (ie affordable housing). The bungalow proposed in this application would therefore not comply with the overriding intentions of the Development Strategy or the specific requirements of Policy DMH3. It would cause harm to the Development Strategy set out in the adopted Core Strategy and would not represent a sustainable development.

Personal Circumstances weighted against Planning Policies and Guidance

As explained in the previous two sections of the report, the proposed development is considered contrary to the recently adopted Core Strategy and to the NPPF. Consideration, however, needs to be given to the personal circumstances involved in this particular application.

In a letter submitted with the application, the applicants state that the reason they need a bungalow is their son's medical condition. He has had a rare form of epilepsy since he was 4 years old. They record over 800 seizures per year, which are mostly at night. He is now 18 years old and his adult size has become a real problem for them to manage in their existing house. He regularly goes into hospital twice a year and his stay is typically for 2 weeks.

Also enclosed with the application is a letter of support from their son's Paediatric Consultant who recommends a new bungalow in preference to trying to adapt their existing house. The applicants also state that the Paediatric Occupation Therapist based in Accrington, has visited their house and made an assessment of both their needs and the facilities available, and she has also come to the conclusion that a new bungalow would meet these needs far more effectively in the long term than trying to make a temporary fix. The applicants further explain that building the bungalow would help them to manage their son's condition at home more easily when he goes through one of his bad spells, as they would be able to watch him in bed and access toilet and bathing facilities when needed. They say it would mean that his hospital stays would be shorter which would benefit his home life. When he is having a bad spell, they say, he can have seizures every few minutes so needs to be watched 24 hours a day which is impossible in their existing house.

The applicants explain that they have 13 years' experience in managing their son's condition and use a lot of medical equipment which requires storage space. They would be able to do this much more effectively in a purpose built bungalow. The open plan nature of the living area of the bungalow would enable them to watch their son far more easily while getting on with other things. It would also allow the use of his wheelchair indoors as the existing house does not have sufficient room for this. Having the garage integral to the bungalow will improve access to the car, particularly helpful in poor weather and when their son needs to use his wheelchair. Also, during normal day to day life, the applicants explain that the stairs are an ever present danger as their son can have random seizures at any time and anyone of these of stairs could be very

serious. For this reason they can't allow their son to go up or down stairs by himself so again a bungalow would be preferable as it would give him access to the whole building safely.

The applicant explains that he works locally to Tosside as the Parish Lengthsman and as a dry stone waller for nearby farmers; and that his wife is a qualified nurse and is George's full time career, and together they devote their time looking after him. With three other children, the applicants say that they have a large family by modern standards so this bungalow would be beneficial to them all.

These personal circumstances are fully appreciated, but the question that needs to be asked is whether they are such that a planning permission could be granted for the proposed bungalow. In relation to this question, relevant case law has been examined. From this examination, I would advise Members of the following points:

- That **exceptionally** the personal circumstances of an occupier or personal hardships may be material to the consideration of a planning application. In such circumstances, a planning permission could be granted subject to a condition that it is personal to the applicant. However, it is stated that such arguments will seldom outweigh more general planning considerations.
- It is advised that conditions restricting occupancy to a particular occupier, should only be used when special **planning** grounds can be demonstrated, and where the alternative would normally be refusal of permission. It is, however, stated that personal conditions will 'scarcely ever be justified' in the case of the erection of a permanent building.

Therefore, in order to be consistent with relevant case law, whilst it might be possible to grant personal permission for the conversion of an existing building, for reasons relating to the applicant's special circumstances, that course of action could not, in my opinion, be followed in relation to this proposal for a new detached bungalow.

Whilst fully understanding all the points made by the applicants (and the support for their case that has been put forward by the relevant NHS personnel) I regret that, based purely on its planning merits (but having taken account of general planning practice guidance in relation to 'personal circumstances') I am unable to recommend to Committee that this application be approved.

An alternative that would be acceptable in Policy/NPPF terms would be an extension to the existing dwelling that is specifically designed to satisfy the particular needs of the applicant's son and the rest of the family. This option would obviously not result in the creation of an additional dwelling in an unsustainable location.

The applicants consider this option to be difficult due to changes in the external ground levels around the existing house and the internal layout of the house. I consider, however, that it would be possible to design an extension that would satisfy the applicant's needs and would also be acceptable to the LPA in respect of visual amenity considerations. I therefore remain of the opinion expressed at pre-application stage that further consideration should be given to this option.

Other Matters

1. The Planning History of the Group of Buildings – the applicant refers to a permission (3/2009/0440/P) that has been granted for the construction of 3 No new-build holiday lets at the adjoining property, Skirden Hall Barn as possibly setting a precedent for the proposed bungalow. That permission, however, was granted in 2009 and was in accordance with the relevant policies at that time concerned with the promotion of tourism development. However, the current application for a new dwelling is not, in the Council's opinion, in accordance with the current policies and guidance in relation to the principle of the development.
2. Visual Amenity – the approved holiday let would be within a single storey detached building similar in appearance to a bungalow. That application in 2009 was considered to be acceptable in relation to visual amenity considerations.

A bungalow could be considered inappropriate within the setting of the two storey traditional buildings at this location. However, the bungalow would be on higher ground than the applicant's existing two storey dwelling such that there would not be a significant difference between the eaves and ridge heights of the two buildings. The bungalow would also be constructed using appropriate external materials. I do not therefore consider that the application should be refused for any reasons relating to the effects of the development on the visual amenities of the AONB.

3. Residential Amenity – a letter of 'no objection' from the occupiers of Ballyragget Barn was submitted with the application. Due to the proposed location of the bungalow to the side of the applicants dwelling, I do not consider that it would have any detrimental effects upon the amenities of the applicant's dwelling or upon Skirden Hall Barn or Ballyragget Barn.
4. Highway Safety/Traffic Implications – as stated earlier in the report, the County Surveyor has no objections to the application in relation to these considerations.

Conclusion

For the reasons explained in the report, it is considered that the proposal represents unsustainable development, contrary to the requirements of NPPF and the relevant policies of the now adopted Core Strategy; and that (having fully considered relevant case law and guidance) the 'personal circumstances' put forward in support of the application do not outweigh the planning policy considerations. Additionally, the Council is of the opinion that there is an alternative (an extension to the existing dwelling) that would be acceptable in principle in planning policy/guidance terms. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed erection of a new dwelling in the open countryside in a location that is distant from any significant services or facilities would represent unsustainable development contrary to the requirements of NPPF and contrary to Key Statements DS1 (Development Strategy), DS2 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), EN3 (Sustainable Development and Climate Change) and Policy DMH3 (Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB) of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version). A permission for the

development would undermine the Council's Development Strategy as defined in the adopted Core Strategy.

2. Permission for the proposed development would create a harmful precedent for the acceptance of other proposals for dwellings in isolated locations which would have an adverse impact on the implementation of the policies of the Council contrary to the interests of the proper planning of the area in accordance with the core principles and policies of the NPPF.

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

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0597/P (GRID REF: SD 373905 442207)
OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 275 DWELLINGS ON LAND OFF WADDINGTON ROAD, CLITHEROE, BB7 2DE

INTRODUCTION

This application was considered by Committee at its meeting on 16 October 2014. Committee resolved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation that the application be DEFERRED and DELEGATED to the Director of Community Services for approval following the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement (in the terms described in the Section 106 Agreement sub-heading of the report) within 3 months from the date of the Committee meeting or delegated to the Director of Community Services in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Planning and Development Committee should exceptional circumstances exist beyond the period of 3 months and subject to the imposition of a number of conditions.

It was stated in the Section 106 Agreement sub-heading of the original report that the Agreement would cover the matters of affordable housing, education contribution, highways/sustainable transport contribution and a contribution in the region of £350,000 towards the provision of off-site recreation facilities.

The reason for this report back to Committee relates to the originally requested contribution towards off-site recreation facilities. It had been stated earlier in the original report that the Council was in the process of undertaking an assessment of need in respect of the open space and sports facilities in the borough and that, whilst this was currently in draft form, the assessment was at an advanced stage of production and would be presented to both the Planning and Development Committee and the Community Committee once it had been finalised. It was stated in the original report that, in respect of Clitheroe, the assessment had identified specific areas for improvement in respect of the quality of the facilities available for use by residents and attributed a cost to these improvements based on information produced by Sport England. The improvements identified for Clitheroe were listed in the original report and it was stated that "the contribution towards improvement of facilities which would include the swimming pool would be in the region of £350,000 (£1,270 per dwelling) would be required to mitigate the impact of the development on sports and open space facilities in Clitheroe and to improve the quality of provision".

The applicants/agents have made points and raised questions about this particular requested contribution as follows:

1. The document – Ribble Valley Sports Facilities Needs Assessment dated September 2014 – is not an adopted document and has not been through any public consultation or the Council's own committee or statutory process. It includes some inconsistencies and makes no allowance for any off-set against on-site provision of POS. The document therefore has little weight and should not be taken into account.
2. In any event, any request should be based on the number of dwellings that are actually built and not the maximum number of 275 dwellings stated in the application.

3. Against this background the applicants do not agree to the £1,203 per dwelling set out in the document. Having given consideration to contributions requested of other developers, and also taking into account the proposed approximately 20,000m² of on-site POS provision including a LAP within the scheme they consider that a figure of £370 per dwelling to be reasonable. This would equate to approximately £100,000 dependent upon the final number of units at reserved matters application stage and they suggest that this could be linked to the proposed outdoor gym in the Castle grounds, this being the closest location to the application site referred to in the document which is also shown to be a cost of around £100,000.

The applicants comments have been considered by the Council's Community Leisure and Sports Development Manager. He has commented that the document has been updated since Committee considered this application in October and that in the current version, the amount to be requested for Clitheroe is £216.90 per person or, effectively, £520.56 per dwelling if based upon 2.4 persons per unit. Whilst the amount of £370 per dwelling now being offered by the applicants is less than the amount in the current version of the document, we are not in a position to fully apply the requirements of the document for the reasons referred to by the applicant.

The Community Leisure and Sports Development Manager questions whether the provision of a LAP is needed and whether it would be maintained by the applicants. He also comments that whilst £100,000 is being offered this does not necessarily have to be for the provision of an outdoor gym in the Castle Grounds.

In terms of the overall planning balance, a development of up to 275 dwellings in this highly sustainable location just outside Clitheroe, the main settlement in the borough, would bring about substantial benefits to the local economy; would provide open market and "affordable" dwellings as well as the provision of substantial on-site public open space.

Weighed against these benefits (and in view of the current unadopted status of the Sports Facilities Needs Assessment document) I do not consider that the reduction in the contribution towards sports provision from approximately £520 per dwelling (as stated in the current draft version of the document) to the £370 per dwelling being offered by the applicants would affect the balance so significantly that refusal of the application would be justified. For these reasons, and in the present circumstances, it is considered that the offer of £370 per dwelling should be accepted in this case. Members are therefore requested to re-affirm their resolution of "minded to approve subject to a Section 106 Agreement" but with the content of the Agreement amended to require the payment of the sum of £370 per dwelling (with the precise number of dwellings to be finalised at reserved matters application stage).

The original report is reproduced below with amendments as appropriate under the headings of Relevant Policies (to reflect the now adopted status of the Core Strategy), Public Open Space and Section 106 Agreement Content. The reasons for the recommended conditions have also been amended to reflect the adoption of the Core Strategy.

TOWN COUNCIL: Clitheroe Town Council objects to this application on the following grounds:

1. The development is outside the settlement boundary as defined by saved Policy G5 of the Local Plan and because the application precedes the emerging Ribble Valley Core

Strategy and the work being done on the Development Land Document.

2. The land adjoining Kirkmoor Road and Back Commons is valuable green space amenity land adjoining an area of high housing density. Protected species frequent this land including barn owl, otters and bats. An important hedgerow would be lost.
3. Traffic and parking conditions make the Bawdlands Bridge junction, Castle View and Kirkmoor Road unsuitable for a regular bus service. Due to the location of the junction being off Bawdlands Bridge and Castle View being on top of a bridge, the Town Council considers that there is no possible realistic financial engineering solution to this problem.
4. At the Appeal the Inspector said that he agreed that significant congestion at Waterloo Road/Shawbridge Street junction would be a moderate to strong reason for resisting this proposal in the absence of highway improvements. Since the Appeal, the Standen application for 1,040 dwellings at the top of Pendle Road has been approved. The application has only one egress which is from Pendle Road and all traffic into town would go through this junction. The schemes proposed to alter the junction are merely tinkering. Traffic lights would increase congestion not decrease it.
5. The Town Council also object on highway congestion grounds due to the effect that the development will have by increasing the volume of vehicles to the pinch point of the Waddington Road/Railway View junction (under the railway bridge). At the Appeal, the revised traffic flow forecasts seem to be grossly understated. The Inspector accepted a figure of 7 journeys per dwelling per day and we saw no reason to depart from that even for affordable housing. 275 dwellings at Waddow View could create 1,925 journeys per day and 50 dwellings at the already agreed Milton Avenue development could create 350 journeys giving a total of 2,275 additional journeys per day along Waddington Road. Waddington Road bridge has a height limit of 3.5m and flood warning signage confirms that this is a current hazard.
6. Owing to these highway concerns in points 3 – 5 the Town Council believe that this development is contrary to Policy G1 of the Local Plan, paragraphs 32 and 35 of NPPF and Policy DMG1 of the emerging Core Strategy.

PARISH COUNCIL:

Waddington Parish Council has made a formal objection to the application on the following grounds:

1. Although the proposed development is not situated in the parish of Waddington, its approval would adversely affect the residents of Waddington village when they travel to and from Clitheroe. The adverse effect would mainly be in the form of increased flow of traffic on Waddington Road.
2. The Parish Council understands that the Appeal Inspector is of the opinion that each dwelling would generate 7 journeys per day, so, as approval has already been granted for 50 dwellings on a development off Milton Avenue, then a definitive increase of 350 journeys per day will take place. This would again have an adverse effect on the traffic on Waddington Road.
3. If the new development was for 275 dwellings that would result in a further 1,925 journeys per day taking the total additional journeys up to 2,275 per day.
4. Unacceptable delays already occur where Waddington Road meets Railway View Road so the additional journeys as a result of this proposed development would mean that gridlock would undoubtedly happen, particularly at peak times in the morning and late afternoon.
5. The schools in the area surrounding the development are already full so the infrastructure is not in place to cope with the increased population which would result from building the proposed development.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE

The LCC Highways comments on the application are as follows:

(COUNTY SURVEYOR):

1. There are extensive comments in this letter below on the highways aspects of this development. This paragraph highlights outstanding matters relating to the new development, which still need to be resolved but which I anticipate are solvable. These outstanding matters relate to the Waterloo Road/Shawbridge Street junction and will require a fundamental reconsideration of this junction by the transport consultant. I would ask for an agreement from the developer to the proposals made in this letter concerning the need for a more comprehensive improvement to the local roads in order to accommodate traffic flows from other local developments such as Standen. I would have an objection to this application on highway safety and capacity grounds if this matter and other outstanding issues are not resolved to the satisfaction of LCC Highways.

Introduction

2. Lancashire County Council (LCC) as the local highway authority is responsible for providing and maintaining a safe

and reliable highway network. With this in mind, the present and proposed highway systems affected by this proposed development have been investigated to highlight areas of concern that potentially could cause significant problems for the public: motorists, cyclists, public transport users and other vehicles in and around the area.

3. As a consultee in the planning process, LCC is bound by the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires that we only object to a proposed development where we have robust evidence of severe impacts that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level (by amended proposals or by the developer's investments).
4. The highways comments take account of the historic nature of Clitheroe town centre roads. Many of the roads potentially affected by the proposed development are fronted by homes or local shops, where occupiers have little or no convenient access to off-street parking opportunities. This inevitably leads to on-street parking, which can reduce the width of road available for passing traffic. With a mixture of private cars, vans and waggons serving local businesses, agricultural vehicles passing through and touring vehicles/caravans accessing the attractions of the town centre and the wider Ribble Valley, Clitheroe's roads can at times be very busy. Whilst this activity is often a strong indicator of welcome economic activity, it can also frustrate local people who find it adds unacceptable delays to their journeys by private vehicle at particular times of the day or week when they encounter permanent physical restrictions and/or delays created by on-street parking.
5. With this in mind, the highway-related assessments undertaken focus on peak travel times (mid-week am peak 8 – 9am, pm peak 5 – 6pm) to identify the most likely times when new residential development close to the town centre is likely to generate new road users in greatest numbers, who will impact on existing users of local roads and also on already planned-for road users (arising from committed development). It should be noted that at other times of the week, there are only limited incidents of delay on the local road network which are not considered to be severe and which are not expected to be severely impacted by the proposed development.
6. Saturday shopping periods are an exception, as at this time people from outlying villages are likely to drive into Clitheroe to use shops, supermarkets and the town centre market, combining with weekend/tourist traffic and contributing to delays on local roads. This period has been excluded from assessment in relation to the proposed development as it is

a particular feature of Clitheroe town centre and whilst it may appear severe to observers, it does not appear in practice to discourage town centre visitors.

7. I should like to take this opportunity to identify to you that some of the highway impacts arising from the proposed development will be experienced some distance away from the proposed development if it were to go ahead, and these will be experienced by people who may not be aware of the impact on them. I recommend that you take all reasonable steps to make this information available to such people to minimise the risk of their confusion and disappointment at a later date.

Development now proposed

8. This application is a re-submission of an earlier application (3/2012/0913) for residential development on this land. The earlier application was refused by RVBC and subsequently this decision was upheld on appeal. The Inspector's report discusses in some depth the traffic and transport related issues and proposed mitigation measures. He concluded that some of the highways related issues had not been satisfactorily resolved. It is these issues that remain to be resolved, to the extent that they are relevant to the new development proposals. This response from LCC as the Highway Authority to the 2014 development proposals is informed by the discussions and conclusions drawn from previous communications with the developer, documents submitted during the appeal hearing, the decision of the Secretary of State and the Planning Inspectorate's report on the appeal.
9. The 2012 development proposals were a development of 345 dwellings with access onto Waddington Road and also onto Kirkmoor and via Castle View to Bawdlands. The traffic using the Waddington Road access was generated by 220 dwellings and a 50 bed care home. The new application is for a development of 275 dwellings with access onto Waddington Road and bus and emergency vehicle access only onto Kirkmoor Road.
10. As with the 2012 development proposals, I understand that the Milton Avenue access is for a self-contained residential development and there will be no vehicular linkage to the proposed development site.
11. Mitigation measures and sustainable transport improvements will be required for this 2014 proposed development as finally agreed for the 2012 proposed development, with exceptions where appropriate because of the changes in the development proposed (e.g. reduced

mitigation measures for the Castle View / Bawdlands junction).

Traffic flows and junction analysis

12. A new Transport Assessment has been prepared for this application. Where the Inspector in the appeal has agreed mitigation measures during consideration of the first (2012) application, the new TA has not reconsidered these junctions and improvements, and this is accepted.
13. The 2012 development proposed that the Waddington Road access would be used for 220 dwellings plus a 50 place children's nursery, whereas the new development proposes that all 275 of the new dwellings would use Waddington Road. There are some small increases in the predicted traffic flow as the assessment year for this application is 2019, two years later than for the previous application. This means that the current TA takes account of two more years of background traffic growth in the Clitheroe area, which is an acceptable approach. Having reviewed the current proposals, I do not anticipate any problems arising from use of the proposed access provided that visibility is secured as shown in plan J087/Site access/Fig 1.
14. In Section 6 of the 2014 TA, the trip rates per dwelling have been reviewed and reduced by the transport consultant and this would result in a reduced peak period traffic flow. However, the trip rates are reconsidered in the TA Addendum and the trip rates to be used in the traffic modelling are the same as those used in the 2012 TA (these are the same trip rates as used for the Gladman development in Henthorn Road). The trip rates used produce a robust assessment of the future situation for this 2014 Waddow View development.
15. The junctions that were considered by the Inspector to have unresolved traffic related issues have been reconsidered in the new TA. These junctions, with a brief comment on the issues at each one, are:
 - Waddington Road – Railway View Road. The mitigation measures proposed in 2012 were amongst other things, a mini-roundabout. The Inspector considered that the ARCADY modelling shows that the mini-roundabout would work satisfactorily, notwithstanding that the 2012 TA showed that the evening ratio of flow to capacity (RFC, an indicator of whether the junction can pass traffic through at the same rate as it arrives at the junction) was in excess of 0.9 on two arms, and evening peak queues of 13 vehicles could be expected on arm C of the junction

(Waddington Road north). It is appropriate for the new TA to consider the implications here for a mini-roundabout operating with current assessed/higher flows.

- Waterloo Road – Shawbridge Street. The 2012 TA showed that during peak periods the capacity of this roundabout is inadequate and there will be lengthy queues. The developer proposed improvements to the junction, including improvements to the approaches and the installation of traffic signals. The Inspector considered that a 'do nothing' approach was not appropriate as the resulting congestion would be a reason for refusing the application. It is appropriate for the new TA to consider the implications here for different junction treatments operating with current assessed/higher flows.

16. The TA Addendum assesses these two junctions using the trip rates in the 2012 TA. The 2014 development now under consideration is called scenario 3. (Scenario 1 was the development under consideration in 2012.) The developer has presented information to show how the 2014 development trips vary from the 2012 development trips. This information is in the first table in the TA Addendum under the title 'Background' in 'Section 2 Junction Assessments'. For clarity, for the Waddington Road access to the site, I have included a table below for which I have used data from the table in the TA Addendum; but corrected for scenario 1. The increase in traffic flows for the 2014 development is slightly greater than that shown in the 2014 TA Addendum.

Junction	Scenario 1 – 2012 proposal				Scenario 3 – current proposal			
	am		pm		am		Pm	
Site access at Waddington Road	arr	dep	arr	dep	arr	dep	arr	dep
	45	110	107	62	39	122	120	62
Two way flows	155		169		161		182	

17. The proposals now made by the developer in the 2014 TA are discussed below.

Waddington Road – Railway View Road

18. The 2012 TA proposed to improve the priority T junction with a mini roundabout. This improvement did not fully mitigate the impact of the Waddow View development on

this junction, with increased delays predicted in 2017 compared with the priority T junction operation modelled for the 2017 base flow. However, the Inspector considered that the predicted queuing and delays would not be 'of such significance as to amount to a severe delay' (see paragraph 223 of the PINS report to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government dated 26 November 2013).

19. The 2014 TA Addendum reconsiders this mini-roundabout with modelling of the impact of the development for the assessment year, 2019. The resultant congestion and queuing is predicted to be marginally worse than the 2017 estimates, and I consider that the mitigation measures proposed can be viewed in the same way as they were viewed in the Planning Inspector's report (see paragraph 18 above). The proposed mini-roundabout treatment at this junction is therefore acceptable in highway terms subject to detailed design at a later stage of development.
20. LCC does not consider that the risk of flooding under the railway bridge on Waddington Road to be a constraint on development at Waddow View. In 2012 LCC made significant investment in improved drainage in this area and has subsequently maintained the drainage here in good condition. Since 2012 the numbers of incidents, their severity and duration have been much reduced.

Waterloo Road – Shawbridge Street

21. In the 2012 TA, for the existing mini-roundabout, the RFC for 2017 base only traffic flow on the most congested arm (arm C – Waterloo Road north) was determined to be: am 0.95, and pm 1.11. For the 2017 base flow plus the development flow the RFC was: am 1.04, and pm 1.17. These values indicate that the existing mini-roundabout will operate with regular congestion and queuing during peak periods, and the developer suggested that the geometry of the mini-roundabout should be improved.
22. The improved mini-roundabout was modelled using ARCADY (2012 TA). For the 2017 base plus development flows the RFC was: am 0.93 (Arm C), and pm 1.05 (Arm C). The am peak RFC and the pm peak RFC for the other arms were less than 0.76. The values for the peak periods on Arm C show a small improvement compared to the predicted 2017 base flow RFC. However, during peak periods there will be regular congestion and delays. The Inspector considered that with a 'do nothing approach' the resulting queuing and delays would comprise a 'moderate to strong reason for resisting this proposal without the phase 1 improvements' (paragraph 226 of Inspector's report dated 26 November 2013).

23. The 2014 TA Addendum reconsiders this improved mini-roundabout with modelling of the 2019 base flow plus the development flow. The estimated RFCs are: am 0.95 (Arm C), and pm 1.07 (Arm C). These values show that delays will be slightly increased compared to the 2017 RFC values. I advise that these delays are not acceptable in highway terms and mitigation will be required in order for the impact at this junction to be managed down to acceptable levels.
24. The extent to which mitigation measures should alleviate congestion is dependent on the extent that congestion would occur with no development. A comparison of the predicted Arm C RFC values from the 2017 base flow (existing roundabout) to the 2019 base plus development flow (improved roundabout) indicates a marginal improvement only. In other words the congestion and queues at this improved junction for the fully built out development will be much the same as it would be in 2017 with no development. Note there is no data for RFC values for a 2019 base flow with the existing roundabout. The relevant RFC values are given in the following table:

Waterloo Road / Shawbridge Street				
2012 TA	2017 base flow		2017 base + development flow	
	am	pm	am	pm
Arm C existing mini roundabout (ARCADY)	0.948	1.112	1.036	1.166
Arm C mini roundabout with improvements (ARCADY)			0.93	1.05
2014 TA			2019 base + development flow	
			Am	pm
Arm C mini roundabout with improvements (ARCADY)	-	-	0.95	1.07

25. The developer has also considered the improvements to traffic flow through this junction that might be achieved by the introduction of traffic signals. Modelling of this junction with traffic signals was carried out in the 2012 TA for a 2017 assessment year, and this showed that the DoS (degree of saturation) for each arm is approaching a value of 90%, which is considered to be the desirable maximum in order to result in a reasonably efficient junction. A similar exercise has been carried out in the 2014 TA Addendum for a 2019

assessment year. The results of the modelling showed that the values of DoS exceeded 90%. The use of MOVA at this junction would improve the efficiency of the traffic signals at this junction, as suggested by the developer in the TA.

26. There are two issues arising from the improvement of this junction.
 - (1) Looking at the mitigation required at this junction for the Waddow View development, in isolation from any other developments proposed in Clitheroe, the increased efficiency of the junction provided by the improved roundabout does mitigate the impact of the development. However, it does so without providing any surplus capacity. Consequently this mitigation measure would be beneficial for the Waddow View development alone, but any additional increase in traffic in Clitheroe would require additional mitigation. This may lead to a situation where this junction is improved more than once over a period of a few years, with the disruption due to the road works resulting in temporary but potentially severe and repeated periods of congestion.
 - (2) Considering the Waddow View development together with the proposed Standen development (now accepted as committed development), this is acknowledged in the 2014 TA Addendum as requiring a traffic signalised junction. The TA shows that with these two developments, the junction will operate with some queuing and delays for much of the peak periods and will exceed a DoS of 90% from time to time. Having now evaluated and commented on the proposed Standen development, LCC Highways have considered this junction in some detail. It is apparent that the installation of traffic signals here would not be appropriate because of the consequent effects on the network of interacting roads and minor junctions in the vicinity of the main junction under consideration. The peak hour queues that would be a feature of traffic signals, would result in queuing on roads at nearby junctions which in turn would promote 'rat-running' along residential and minor roads.
27. The improvements to the mini-roundabout proposed by the Waddow View developer will deliver only marginal mitigation improvements to the junction in the assessment year, 2019, and the residual RFC values indicate that the junction will suffer congestion and delays. As a result I recommend that the developer should investigate the operation of the local road network, taking into account the traffic flows from the

Standen development. This should produce proposals for the improvement of the local highway network influenced by the operation of the Shawbridge Street / Waterloo Road junction.

28. A workable solution which will accommodate the Waddow View and Standen developments, and which would reduce local congestion and the possibility of 'rat-running', would involve a wholesale re-design of the Waterloo Road / Shawbridge Street junction. This solution must include consideration of widening of the Mearley Brook bridge, and probably also an improved mini roundabout. Consideration should also be given to the introduction of mini roundabouts at Taylor Street, at Wellgate and at other junctions dependant on the outcome of modelling the local road network. I recommend that the Waddow View developer should be required to contribute to this larger improvement scheme through an appropriate S106 agreement.

Whalley Road / Queensway mini-roundabout

29. One of the junctions from the 2012 TA to be improved was this junction, which requires a widening of the entries onto the roundabout to improve its capacity. There is no discussion or modelling of this junction in the 2014 TA. Without any input from the developer, I recommend that the improvements are still required. The improvements agreed in 2012 were a widening of the entries onto the mini roundabout. A drawing is required for these improvements so that the design can be reviewed.

Access onto Back Commons / Kirkmoor Road

30. This is intended to be a limited access and egress for buses and emergency vehicles only. The developer's proposals for this junction are shown on drawing number J087/bus gate/Fig 4. The detail of the junction layout will need to be amended and refined and the mechanism for restricting the use of this access to buses and emergency vehicles will need to be agreed. I would ask for traffic signing together with appropriate traffic regulation orders to limit the use of this access to buses and emergency vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians only. Rising bollards or other mechanical means to achieve this are not favoured as they introduce a significant future maintenance and operational liability. Although in principle the introduction of such a junction is agreed, the layout and other details are not. However, I am confident that an agreement on the detail of the design is achievable.
31. I should like to note, as part of consideration of this issue, that Back Commons residents believe there are outstanding matters of land ownership which affect the developer's right

to access the development site from Kirkmoor Road. I can advise that the County Council's records indicate that the public highway (managed and maintained by the County Council) extends to a point approximately 7m northwest of the centre line of Swan Meadow. The developer needs to demonstrate that he has a right of access to his site from Kirkmoor Road, which he can confer onto future residents, their visitors and essential services. If the road running from the limit of adoption to the proposed rear site access off Kirkmoor Road is to be offered for use by buses, cyclists, pedestrians and emergency services, it would be in the public interest for it to be constructed to adoptable standard before it was opened to use and maintained at that standard in perpetuity. Whilst I cannot require the developer to offer this section of road for adoption by the highway authority, I can undertake that it would be so adopted if all required improvements were made through an appropriate agreement (Highways Act 1980 Section 38) that would need to include all affected landowners.

Proposed Junction Improvements

32. Waddington Road, at the proposed new entrance to the Waddow View development. The design and construction of this access will be subject to an agreement under the Highways Act 1980 Section 278 and the works will require the approval of Lancashire County Council as the relevant Highway Authority. An approach consistent with Manual for Streets is appropriate at this location. The works proposed by the developer on drawing J087/site access/Fig1, are acceptable, although this will be subject to a design review.
33. Waddington Road and Railway View Road. The change from a priority junction to a mini-roundabout is acceptable in principle based on the ARCADY modelling provided. However, a detailed scheme design will be required which will be the subject of S278 agreement (as above) and will require the approval of Lancashire County Council as highway authority.
34. Waterloo Road and Shawbridge Street. The improvements to this junction proposed by the developer amount to changes to the geometry of the mini roundabout. This would be a short term solution, as other development in Clitheroe, especially the Standen development, will result in the junction capacity being exceeded. LCC does not agree with the developer's proposal to install traffic signals and considers a bigger improvement scheme is required as discussed in paragraph 28 above. Clearly this will require discussion between LCC and the developer with the aim of agreeing a sum that the developer will pay to LCC (through a S106 agreement).

35. Whalley Road and Queensway. Improvements are required to the geometry of the existing mini roundabout. A detailed scheme design will be required which will be the subject of a S278 agreement and will require the approval of Lancashire County Council as highway authority.

Other improvements on the highway

36. Waddington Road. The traffic calming, lining and minor road junction improvements are accepted in principle as shown on drawing number J087/wadd calming/fig2, although these proposals will be subject to a design review. The 20mph speed limit is to be extended past the proposed access into the development for a distance of approximately 50m north of the cemetery access. These improvements are to be paid for by the developer and implemented through a S106 agreement and a S278 agreement as appropriate. Maintenance and improvement works have been carried out by LCC on the highway drainage under the railway bridge, to mitigate the risk of flooding here and reduce the incidence of flooding severe enough to close the road.
37. Castle View and Kirkmoor Road. The principle of the bus only link from the proposed development to Kirkmoor Road is accepted. As discussed at paragraph 30 above, the details and junction geometry shown in drawing number J087/bus gate/Fig 4 need to be reviewed.
38. The bus route from Kirkmoor Road will be via Castle View to Bawdlands, where buses will turn right only. Parking restrictions may need to be introduced to ensure there is sufficient space for the bus to drive along and navigate around junctions, especially at the Bawdlands junction.
39. The principle of improvements to the footways and pedestrian provision linking the site to Clitheroe town centre have been agreed previously.

Pedestrians and Cyclists Access

40. The site is located conveniently for the town centre and the accessibility score reflects this close proximity. However, I have detailed below improvements to routes for cyclists within and around the development site that would enhance accessibility thus reducing the demand for new residents to use cars for local journeys:
1. Design the bus only road to be accessible to cyclists.
 2. Provide 3 metre wide shared use paths to link the site at several locations.
 3. Modify the road closure on Corbridge Court, leading from Chester Avenue, to provide a 3 metre wide cycle

path with smooth surfacing appropriate for cycle use. The cost of this measure is estimated to be £10,000.

4. Consider environmental improvements to Back King Street as this will form an increasingly significant pedestrian route to the town centre. This could include the provision of additional street lighting. The cost of these measures may well be dependent on the available services.
 5. A secure cycle shelter at Clitheroe railway station should be provided. This amenity would have an estimated cost of £10,000.
41. Public Rights of Way footpath No.20 runs within the site and is to be retained in full, supported by the internal layout of footways and carriageway,
 42. In view of the increased pedestrian activity associated with the site, a new pedestrian priority crossing (zebra crossing) should be provided on Waddington Road. An appropriate location has been agreed at a point just west of the railway bridge near to the Railway View junction. As a guide, the introduction of a zebra crossing would cost in the region of £15,000 to £20,000, depending on the necessity for any servicing alteration and other associated highway works. This would be implemented under a S278 agreement, after a period of notice to local road users and frontagers.

Public Transport

43. The Clitheroe bus and rail interchange is conveniently located for this development and falls within a 400m radius from the centre of the site. Good access to public transport services will be an important factor in helping to reduce dependence on the private car, particularly for commuting journeys.
44. The proposed bus service through the site was intended to be provided before the occupation of the 176th dwelling under the 2012 application (345 dwellings). The Inspector commented, however, that the site bus service 'could be introduced much earlier' (paragraph 256 of the Inspectors report). I would recommend that the bus service should be introduced for the 2014 development application (275 dwellings), before the occupation of the 75th dwelling. This will require construction of the estate road through to the Kirkmoor Road access, completion of the bus only link and the off-site improvements to Kirkmoor Road.
45. Funding for the improvement of bus services through S106 was agreed at £110,000 per year for 5 years (statement of common ground dated 8 July 2013). It should be noted that the railway companies will invest in improving rail services

for new developments where they see a commercial market. However, it would be unreasonable to ask the developer here to make provision for rail services as this Waddow View development is not of a sufficient size.

Internal Site Layout

46. This is an outline application with all matters except access reserved, and the indicative masterplan is based on a limited level of detail. The internal road layout should be developed in accordance with LCC's Creating Civilised Streets policy and design guidance and in accordance with the design principles set out in Manual for Streets (editions 1 and 2). The internal site layout shall be designed to comply with a 20mph speed limit and should incorporate appropriate engineering features to secure a more sympathetic and robust means of managing vehicle speeds and enhancing highway safety.
47. In line with the present Lancashire County Council policies to improve highway safety in residential areas, it would be appropriate to introduce a 20mph Speed Limit within the site. The provision of the necessary Traffic Regulation Order would form part of an agreed programme of measures, should the application receive planning consent.
48. The internal site layout should provide for safe and convenient manoeuvring for servicing, delivery and waste collections. A service, delivery, waste collection and routing strategy should be developed and agreed with Lancashire County Council and RVBC to ensure that all deliveries, servicing and waste collection can be undertaken safely without creating conflict with other vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.
49. Prior to the commencement of the bus service, the development should provide two bus stops to DDA standard within the residential layout of the site, as part of the detailed approval.
50. On-site parking provision for individual properties should comply with parking guidelines, which provide for two on-site parking spaces per two or three bedroom dwellings and three on-site parking spaces per four or more bedroom dwellings, or a similar level of parking per dwelling located in a parking court.
51. With any reserved matters application relating to internal road layout, I shall recommend that steps be taken to ensure the roads within the site have an appropriate phasing and adoption agreement or private maintenance agreement so that prospective residents will have clear understanding of what to expect.

Travel Plan

52. A travel plan has not been submitted with this application. Consequently, I would ask that a condition be attached to any consent you may decide to grant, requesting the submission of a travel plan when a reserved matters application is made. Comments were made on the framework travel plan submitted with the 2012 application, and these comments should be used in the preparation of the full travel plan.
53. A contribution of £24,000 is recommended to enable Lancashire County Council Travel Planning team to provide a range of services as described in 2.1.5.16 of the Planning Obligations in Lancashire paper dated September 2008.

Traffic Regulation Orders

54. The following Traffic Regulation Orders would be advisable. The provision of additional TROs may be appropriate as subsequent reserved matters are considered. The provision of the necessary TRO would form part of an agreed programme of measures, should the application receive formal planning consent. The consultation and legal stages should be funded through the S106 agreement and works added into the S278 agreement if there are no insurmountable objections to the legal processes:
- As detailed above, it would be appropriate to introduce a 20mph zone within the site. The design of the internal layout should include engineering features to manage vehicle speeds and enhance highway safety.
 - An extension of the existing 20mph Speed Limit on Waddington Road, from its present transition point to the north of Milton Avenue to a point north of the entrance to Clitheroe Cemetery.
 - A length of prohibition of waiting to both sides of Castle View to allow buses to safely use the junction with Bawdlands.
 - A length of prohibition of waiting at the Kirkmoor Road junction to enable the junction to operated efficiently.
 - Further waiting restrictions at junctions to be improved as part of the mitigation measures which will become apparent once the design of these junctions is agreed and finalised.
 - Introduction of a zebra crossing on Waddington Road to assist with pedestrian movements.

Proposed Off-Site Highway Works

55. The provision of the following off site highway works should be delivered through a Section 278 Agreement (some elements of this list may be dependent on successful

completion of the Traffic Regulation Order processes as explained above):

- A zebra crossing is required on Waddington Road.
- The proposed priority and right turn junction design from Waddington Road into the site.
- The provision of improved footway and cycling provisions linking the site to Clitheroe town centre via Corbridge Court and back King Street. This is to maximise pedestrian access between the proposed development site, the bus and rail interchange and the town centre.
- The proposed mini-roundabout junction design at Railway View Road and Waddington Road.
- Improvements to the Waterloo Road and Shawbridge Street junction. These are not yet agreed with the developer.
- Improvements to the Whalley Road / Queensway mini roundabout.

Other Items for inclusion in a S106 Agreement

56. Travel Plan. A contribution of £24,000 is required to enable Lancashire County Council Travel Planning team to provide a range of services as described in 2.1.5.16 of the Planning Obligations in Lancashire paper dated September 2008.
57. Funding for the improvement of bus services £110,000 per year (index linked) for 5 years.
58. The developer will make a contribution of £10,000 for the provision of a secure cycle storage facility at the Clitheroe Railway Station.
59. A contribution is required in the sum of £6,000 for the S106 component of cost (construction costs to be included in a S278 agreement) for highways related projects including improved cycle and pedestrian linkages to the town centre. This funding would be used also for 'no waiting' restrictions, extension of the 20 mph zone, a 20 mph order for the internal estate roads, and the zebra crossing.

In the event that the Council is minded to grant outline planning permission, LCC Highways recommend the imposition of a number of conditions and informatives. Compliance with some of the recommended conditions will be dependent on an appropriate agreement being reached with the applicants on matters pertaining to funding of consultation and legal procedures relating to Traffic Regulation Orders.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY
COUNCIL (PLANNING

Following an education assessment on 25 September 2014, LCC has advised that a contribution for 41 secondary school places and

CONTRIBUTIONS):

44 primary school places will be required. This results in a request for a contribution of £743,182 (£18,126.38 x 41 places) towards secondary school places and £529,303 (£12,029.62 x 44 places) towards primary school places.

The County Council, however, refers to four pending planning applications that would have an impact on the group of schools that are relevant to this application in Clitheroe. If decisions are made on any of these developments (including the outcome of any appeals) before agreement is sealed on this contribution, the County Council may need to reassess its position taking into account the likely impact of such decisions. This would not affect the requested contribution towards two secondary school places but could result in a claim for up to 83 primary school places. The maximum claim for primary school places could therefore be £998,458 (£12,029.62 x 83 places).

The County Council also stated that there may also be a request for a contribution from their Highways and Sustainable Transport Teams in relation to this application. That matter is covered in the separate consultation response from the County Surveyor as stated above.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY
COUNCIL
(ARCHAEOLOGY):

Has commented that the site was the subject of both a geophysical survey and archaeological field evaluation in 2012 by Archaeological Research Services. The surveys did not encounter any significant archaeological features and no further archaeological investigation of the site is considered necessary.

ENVIRONMENT
AGENCY:

The Environment Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions.

In relation to flood risk, the application site is greater than 1 hectare in size and lies within Flood Zone 1, which is defined as having a low probability of flooding in the National Planning Practice Guide (PPG) to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In accordance with the NPPF, the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).

EA has reviewed the submitted FRA (Ref: 263 – FRA Rev 2.0, dated 2 July 2014) in relation to the risk of flooding on and off-site and they are satisfied that the proposed development would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere, provided that any subsequent development proceeds in accordance with the recommendations outlined in the approved FRA. This should be ensured by an appropriate condition.

A condition to ensure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage is also recommended.

In relation to the aquatic environment, EA has given advice in relation to the watercourse that crosses the site. (The applicant is aware of this advice and it will inform any subsequent reserved matters applications).

In relation to foul drainage EA advises that the development should comply with Paragraph 20 of the "Water supply, wastewater and water quality" category of the PPG. As this site is in an area served by the public sewer, any development on this site would be expected to connect all foul drainage to the existing sewer network.

In relation to pollution control EA advises that, prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking/servicing areas should be passed through an oil interceptor designed and constructed to have a capacity and details compatible with the site being drained.

UNITED UTILITIES:

United Utilities draw attention to a number of matters in order to facilitate sustainable development within the region, as follows.

In accordance with NPPF and the Building Regulations, the site should be drained on a separate system with foul drainage to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. Building Regulation H3 clearly outlines the hierarchy to be investigated by the developer when considering a surface water drainage strategy. The developer is asked to consider the drainage options in the following order of priority:

- a) An adequate soakaway or some other adequate infiltration system or, where that is not reasonably practicable.
- b) A watercourse or, where that is not reasonably practicable.
- c) A sewer.

To reduce the volume of surface water draining from the site United Utilities would promote the use of permeable paving on all driveways and other hard standing areas including footpaths and parking areas.

Overall, United Utilities would have no objection to the proposed development subject to appropriate conditions and advisory notes being included on any planning permission.

ELECTRICITY NORTH WEST:

Do not express any objections to the application but point out that the development could have an impact upon their infrastructure. They therefore advise that the applicant should be informed that, should there be a requirement to divert any apparatus because of the proposed works, the cost of such a diversion would usually be borne by the applicant. ENW also advise that the applicant should

be aware of their requirements for access to inspect, and maintain, adjust, repair, or alter any of their distribution equipment.

SPORT ENGLAND:

Has no comments to make on this application.

ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:

Letters have been received from 338 local households (more than one letter has been received from some households). The letters are on file and available for viewing by Members, but a summary of the objections that they contain is as follows:

1. Planning Policy Issues

- The application site is outside the long established historical and natural boundary of the town. The proposed development is not consolidation or rounding off.
- At the time of the Public Inquiry, the Inspector did not give much weight to the Core Strategy and dealt with the appeal on the basis of NPPF. The Core Strategy is now at a more advanced stage and (as stated by an Inspector in a more recent appeal) now carries substantial weight. Councillors should now therefore be in a position to decide what development is appropriate.
- The previous application was refused because the development represented an urban extension in the open countryside that would change the character of this area of countryside to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area contrary to Local Plan Policies G1, G2 and ENV3 and Core Strategy Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME2 and the provisions of NPPF in respect of visual amenity considerations. These reasons for refusal remain valid.
- The Council presently has a five year housing supply. This application should be determined in relation to the up to date housing supply figures.
- With over 2,000 dwellings built or in the pipeline, this more than satisfies the Core Strategy requirement for the town for the foreseeable future.

2. Highway Safety/Traffic Issues

- The revised traffic flow forecasts seem grossly understated. The Appeal Inspector accepted a figure of 7 journeys per dwelling and this should be applied across the board.

- In assessing trip generations it is inevitable that most residents on the proposed development would drive to employment outside Clitheroe using the A59. There is little evidence locally of any extensive use of public transport or cycling as a means of access to employment sites.
- 275 dwellings on the application site would generate 1,925 journeys per day and the already approved 50 dwellings at Milton Avenue would create 350 journeys giving 2,275 additional journeys per day along Waddington Road.
- The bridge on Waddington Road has a height limit and floods from time to time. The applicants have offered to fund works to mitigate the flooding problem but have not suggested how this could be achieved.
- The footpaths under the railway bridge are very substandard being of inadequate width, particularly for wheelchair users and mobility scooters and additional traffic will only increase the possibility of an accident.
- There is already regular traffic congestion on Waddington Road at peak times and the development will only exacerbate this problem.
- A mini roundabout is proposed at the junction of Waddington Road and Railway View but in considering traffic flows at this junction have the permissions for 460 dwellings or thereabouts at Henthorn and Low Moor being taken into account.
- Two alternative schemes for seeking to mitigate issues at the Shawbridge Street/Waterloo Road mini roundabout are suggested without coming to a conclusion. Both alternatives appear to be tinkering with what will prove to be a severe congestion issue.
- Traffic lights would increase congestion and there is strong concern as to whether an improved mini roundabout would be capable of coping with the additional traffic generated by this application and the various other approved housing developments in Clitheroe.
- The traffic flow at the Shawbridge Street/Waterloo Road roundabout is compromised by other junctions in the locality at Wellgate, Duck Street and Taylor Street plus the access to the Lidl supermarket. Consideration

should therefore be given to additional mini roundabouts at these junctions.

- There has been insufficient traffic flow modelling within the Transport Assessment and restricting the projected flow to the year 2017 is inappropriate and it would be more realistic for this to be extended out to 5, 10 or 15 years.
- Given the reduced number of houses, the proposed bus/emergency vehicle access via Kirkmoor Road is unnecessary. There does not appear to have been any consultations with the Police, Fire and Rescue Service, Ambulance Service or bus companies in relation to this particular proposal.
- There is already a regular bus route on Waddington Road and, given the proximity of the site to the Clitheroe public transport interchange there has to be a question of whether there would be a demand for an additional bus service.
- Due to ownership issues, it is questionable whether the proposal to link the site with the adopted part of Kirkmoor Road is deliverable.
- The proposal involving a vehicle exiting Eastwood bungalow directly on to the proposed road with no visibility whatsoever is positively dangerous.
- A regular bus route along Kirkmoor Road and Castle View would be torturous and inevitably from time to time a bus would find itself unable to get through because of parked vehicles.
- The provision of no waiting near to Bawdlands Bridge would improve safety but there are issues as to whether displaced vehicles would then park given the existing pressures on highway parking in the locality. This would also not mitigate the sub-standard sightlines at Bawdlands Bridge and this junction is not suitable for a regular bus route.

3. Public Health Issues

- Ribble Valley has the highest per capita CO₂ emissions in England. Traffic congestion increases toxic emission. These cause diseases which will be made worse when they occur in the background of already high air pollution.

- NPPF states that Councils should promote healthy communities. Additional houses will cause more traffic causing more congestion that will directly influence the health and safety of pedestrians including hundreds of children who daily walk to school.
 - The loss of walking spaces will have a detrimental effect on the health of the community.
 - Green spaces ameliorate CO₂ levels. This proposal results in the loss of green spaces.
 - The proposal results in the loss of green spaces.
 - The proposal is likely to be further detrimental to safety due to increased risk of injury through road traffic accidents.
4. Detriment to the local landscape.
 5. Detriment to the local ecology and wildlife.
 6. Loss of public footpaths.
 7. This is incremental planning that lacks foresight.
 8. It is the wrong development in the wrong location on the wrong side of the railway line.
 9. The existing infrastructure of the health centre, doctors, dentists and schools are all already struggling to cope with existing demand. The proposed development will exacerbate this problem.

Proposal

The application seeks outline permission for a development of up to 275 new dwellings. All matters except access are reserved for consideration at reserved matters application stage.

An illustrative master plan has been submitted which shows the general layout of the development and the position of the proposed points of access.

The principal vehicular access into the site would be formed by the creation of a new junction onto Waddington Road. This would provide vehicular access to all of the proposed dwellings. A bus and emergency vehicle only access would also be formed onto Kirkmoor Road.

The illustrative internal site layout includes the retention of the public footpath that crosses the site, which is to be improved to provide a safe, overlooked and well lit pathway through the centre of the development. The existing watercourse that crosses the site is also to be retained within an open space area/wildlife green corridor. There would also be a formal public open space on the eastern part of the site.

The density of the development would vary across the site with higher density on the eastern part of the site (closest to the existing high density development within the town centre); medium density in the centre of the site and lower density of those parts of the site adjoined by undeveloped land.

Substantial landscape/screen planting is also shown on the majority of the external boundaries of the site.

It is proposed that 30% of the dwellings would be “affordable”.

Site Location

The application site comprises 9.2 hectares of agricultural land that is outside, but adjoining the western settlement boundary of Clitheroe.

To the north, the site is immediately adjoined by dwellings in Brungerley Avenue, by a field use for the grazing of horses and by the section of Waddington Road onto which the access is to be formed. To the northeast, but not immediately adjoining the site are Milton, Cowper and Chester Avenues, together comprising a high density of residential area.

The northern part of the western boundary is adjoined by land designated as an extension to the existing cemetery. The southern part of the western boundary is adjoined by open countryside.

The western part of the southern boundary is adjoined by open countryside whilst the eastern part of that boundary is adjoined by housing development in Kirkmoor Road, Kirkmoor Close and Corbridge Court.

To the east, the site is adjoined by a proposed housing development site (3/2011/0892/P – refused by allowed on appeal) beyond which is the Chester Avenue public car park.

Relevant History

3/2012/0913/P – Outline application for a development of up to 345 dwellings and a 50 place crèche/nursery with all matters except access to be reserved for consideration at reserved matters application stage. Refused and appeal dismissed.

Relevant Policies

The Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version)

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy.

Key Statement EN2 – Landscape.

Key Statement EN3 – Sustainable Development and Climate Change.

Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity.

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.

Policy DMG3 – Transport and Mobility.

Policy DME1 – Protecting Trees and Woodland.

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.

Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The matters for consideration in the determination of this application relate to the planning history of the site (previous application 3/2012/0913/P), the principle of development, highway safety/traffic issues, infrastructure provision, ecology/tree considerations, effects upon visual amenity, effects upon residential amenity, affordable housing, public open space provision, public footpath and archaeology. For ease of reference these are broken down into appropriate sub-headings for discussion.

Previous Application 3/2012/0913/P

This previous application sought outline permission for a development of up to 345 dwellings and a 50 place crèche/nursery. All matters except access were reserved for consideration at reserved matters application stage.

That application related to the same site as the site as outlined in red on this current application. In the previous application there were two principal points of access. A new junction with a right turn ghost island was to be formed onto Waddington Road in order to give access to 220 of the proposed housing units and the crèche. The second access, that was to serve the remaining 125 dwellings, was to be formed onto Kirkmoor Road. This second access would have connected, via Castle View, to Bawdlands where a signalled junction was proposed. Within the site, a bus shuttle route was indicated with a second of bus only highway linking the northern and southern separate sections of estate roads. This would have had a post gate, to prevent shortcutting by cars, but the link road could also be used by emergency vehicles.

Application 3/2012/0913/P was considered by Planning and Development Committee on 14 February 2013 and was refused for two reasons relating to the matters of visual impact and prematurity. As the Lancashire County Council Highway Authority have not expressed any objections to that previous application, there was no reason for refusal relating to highway safety or other traffic related issues.

An Appeal was submitted against the refusal that was decided at a Public Inquiry. As a result of a review of the planning balance, appeal decisions received around about that time, ministerial advice and new evidence available to the Council, the decision was taken that the Council would not defend the appeal.

The Inquiry nevertheless proceeded in August and September 2013 with the Appellants and third parties putting forward their respective cases. The Appeal was called in by the Secretary of State and the decision letters from the Inspector and the Secretary of State were issued on 23 January 2014. The Appeal was dismissed on the ground that the Inspector and the Secretary of State did not consider Kirkmoor Road to be a suitable access to serve part of the proposed scheme. On all other counts however, the proposal was considered to be acceptable.

At para 303 the Inspector states that “in summary, the presumption in favour of sustainable developed prevails over all matters except for highways. Even then, there is the option to relook at the Waddington Road access to ascertain the level of development on the Appeal site that could be served from this single access, with bus/emergency access retained to connect to Kirkmoor Road”.

Principle of Development

The application site is outside but adjacent to the settlement boundary for Clitheroe and is therefore located within the Open Countryside. As such Policy ENV3 within the saved Districtwide Local Plan (DWLP) is relevant. Development schemes in the open countryside will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape area and should reflect local vernacular style, features and building materials. Proposals to conserve, renew and enhance landscape features will be permitted, providing regard has been given for the characteristic landscape features of the area.

Policy G5 of the DWLP is also applicable to the proposals. The policy is intended to recognise the need to protect the countryside from inappropriate development but in doing so accepts that the countryside is a working area and a source of many Ribble Valley resident's livelihoods. Applying policy G5 to the proposals, the policy states that outside the main settlement and village boundaries (as this site is) planning consent will only be granted for small scale developments which are essential to the local economy, developed for local needs housing (subject to Policy H20 of the DWLP) or are for other small scale uses appropriate to a rural area which conform to the policies of the plan.

Whilst these DWLP policies remain relevant, the 'Core Strategy 2008-2028: A Local Plan for Ribble Valley' continues to progress through the Examination in Public (EiP) and has now progressed through the formal hearing stages. Public consultation has recently taken place on a series of main modifications to the Core Strategy following these hearing sessions. This consultation follows on from the Council's Planning and Development Committee ratifying these modifications (on 8th May 2014). The policies set out in the Core Strategy Submission Version, as proposed to be modified therefore represents the Council's proposed policy position. It is considered that the plan is at an advanced stage in the plan making process and the policies within the Core Strategy must therefore be afforded significant weight in the decision making process.

This view was supported in a recent Appeal decision by the Planning Inspectorate (APP/T2350/A/14/2213808), where the Inspector stated, "*I note that the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028: A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Regulation 22 Submission Draft 2012 is at an advanced stage of examination. Even though it is yet to be adopted and has no statutory force it nevertheless carries substantial weight.*"

When assessing the proposals against the Core Strategy policies at this stage, a central issue for consideration is whether the proposals would cause harm to the Development Strategy. Main Modification 54 of the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014) outlines the proposed modifications to Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations. This policy states that *development should be in accordance with the Core Strategy Development Strategy and should support the spatial vision. Development in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the more sustainable defined settlements (Tier 1 Villages) should consolidate, expand or round off development so that it is closely related to the main built up areas, ensuring this is appropriate to the scale of, and in keeping with the existing settlement.* It is considered that the proposals would therefore comply with policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy.

In assessing the impact on the Development Strategy however, main modification 21 and 25 of the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014) outlines the proposed modifications to Key Statement DS1: Development Strategy. This policy states that *the majority of new housing development will be concentrated within an identified strategic site located to the south*

of Clitheroe towards the A59; and the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley. Policy DS1 goes on to state that in general, the scale of planned housing growth will be managed to reflect existing population size, the availability of, or the opportunity to provide facilities to serve the development and the extent to which development can be accommodated within the local area. As set out under Main Modification 21 and 25 of the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014), the overall number of residential units to be provided in the Clitheroe area over the plan period (2008-2028) is 2320, with the residual requirement at 30 June 2014 of 226 units.

Whilst the site lies just outside of the existing settlement boundary for Clitheroe, it is clear that further development will be required within the Clitheroe area to accommodate the residual residential requirement set out in the Core Strategy. It is accepted that the settlement boundaries for these principal settlements will be subject to a review to ensure clarity and conformity with the Core Strategy. With this in mind it is considered that 275 units would be an acceptable number in light of the residual requirement, making the proposals acceptable in housing numbers terms. Whilst DWLP policy ENV3 and G5 remain as saved policies until such a time that the Core Strategy becomes adopted, it is not considered that the proposals conflict with these policies. The policy direction of DWLP policy ENV3 is reflected in Key Statement EN2: Landscape, stating that *as a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.*

In addition to the Core Strategy, the NPPF also needs to be considered. Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. This site is clearly not isolated and is not remote from other built form. Indeed, the site is close to a variety of services within the Key Service Centre of Clitheroe such that it is a highly sustainable location for development.

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle.

Highway Safety/Traffic Issues

The appeal relating to the previous application was dismissed solely for reasons relating to highway matters. The principally related to the proposal to serve 125 dwellings by an access from Kirkmoor Road and the implications on this on the junction of Castle View with Bawdlands. Other than as a bus/emergency route, that access has been deleted from this current application. The Inspector also commented, however, that “whilst the access to Waddington Road would be acceptable, there are unresolved issues along Waterloo Road”.

The comments of LCC Highways on this current application have been included in full earlier in this report. From this it can be seen that, whilst there still appear to be unresolved issues relating to the treatment of the Waterloo Road/Shawbridge Street junction, it is considered that these matters can be resolved such that permission can be granted subject to appropriate conditions.

Infrastructure Provision

Concerns have been raised by persons objecting to the application about the ability of the schools in Clitheroe to cope with the additional demands generated by this proposed development.

The County Council has requested a financial contribution to address the shortfall in both primary and secondary school places. This is in accordance with the normal practice. The applicants have submitted a draft Section 106 Agreement with the application in which there is an undertaking to pay to Lancashire County Council a contribution towards the provision of school places.

Subject to conditions, the Environment Agency does not express any objections to this application.

United Utilities has not expressed any objections to the application.

In relation to the previous application (that was for a greater number of dwellings) the Appeal Inspector commented on the matter of infrastructure, including schools, doctors, dentists, burials and services. The Inspector commented that the local education authority has a legal responsibility to provide education for children of school age and a contribution is required of the developers to secure this where necessary. Doctors and dentists tend to be demand-lead and in such a pleasant town as Clitheroe this should not prove problematical. The Inspector commented that future hospital accommodation had been raised, highlighting the shortfall in provision at the new hospital compared to the increase in population. The Inspector considered that this may not so surprising because many specialist procedures are now being transferred to centres of excellence, which are often remote from the local hospital. As for burials, the Inspector pointed out that the Council is proposing a cemetery extension to accommodate future interments. The Inspector, therefore, did not see any objections to the previous application in relation to the provision of infrastructure.

For these reasons I can see no issues relating to infrastructure provision that would represent reasons to refuse this current application.

Ecology/Tree Considerations

In respect of the previous application, an Ecological Assessment (EA) and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) were submitted. Subject to appropriate mitigation measures, neither of these Assessments identified any undue harm to the ecology or trees that would represent sustainable reasons for refusal of the application. Other than a comment that there should be more substantial new planting on the site boundaries with the open countryside, the Council's Countryside Officer did not dispute the findings of either of these Assessments. Ecological and arboricultural matters were given thorough consideration at the Public Inquiry. In his decision letter, the Appeal Inspector accepted that some trees and hedge would be lost, but these were not the best specimens. However, the Inspector commented that in addition to the retention of most trees and some hedgerow, much more new landscape would be planted. He therefore did not consider there to be any cogent objection arising from this particular topic.

In relation to fauna, the Inspector commented that there are no records of any protected species living on the site. This includes badgers, deer, otters, bats, water voles and owls. He recognized, however, that in some cases these species may forage over the area and that, as a direct or indirect consequence of the development, such foraging opportunities for some would diminish or possibly even disappear. The Inspector considered this to be a negative point that needed to be taken into account.

The Inspector commented, however, that wildlife corridors would be incorporated into the development and that, during the construction period, soil stripping and earth moving would be outside the bird breeding season. He added that the landscape proposals would include

enhanced planting of indigenous species and that this may arrest any predicted decline. In any event, with areas of open countryside having to be forfeited in order to provide the necessary amount of housing, the ecological contribution of the site would be harmed no more than most. As such, the Inspector considered that the effects would register a small negative factor but not of sufficient weight to materially affect the overall balance.

Similar Ecological Assessments and Arboricultural Impact Assessments, with similar conclusions and recommendations, have been submitted with this current application. As shown on the submitted illustrative layout plan, the proposal (that is for a reduced number of dwellings with increased peripheral planting) would not have any detrimental effects upon trees/ecology of any greater magnitude than those considered to be acceptable by the Appeal Inspector (and also the Secretary of State) in their consideration of the previous application.

Subject to appropriate mitigation measures, secured through conditions, I can therefore see no sustainable reason for refusal of this current application in relation to ecological and arboricultural issues.

The Effects Upon the Character, Appearance and Landscape of the Countryside Area

A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was submitted with the application in which it was accepted that the proposed development would affect the visual amenity of users of the site and from views that are generally at close quarters as seen by:

1. walkers using the footpath that crosses the site and the footpath that runs along its western boundary;
2. the occupiers of existing residential properties;
3. users of the short section of Waddington Road where the new access is to be formed;
4. from the cemetery to the west and the older burial ground on the northern side of Waddington Road.

It was, however, stated in the previous LVIA that through the use of landscaped buffers, an integrated landscaping and tree planting scheme to the development and a sensitive choice of building materials the impacts could be appropriately mitigated. The overall conclusion was that, with mitigation, the landscape and visual impact would be within the range “minor adverse to negligible/minor beneficial” with new landscaping providing an enhanced biodiversity within the locality.

It was also accepted in the previous LVIA that, with regards to the footpath that crosses the site, the development would lead to changed experience for users that this could be associated with the open space areas in the development and which could provide a positive experience in amenity terms.

The view of the site from Clitheroe Castle was also examined in the previous LVIA. The conclusion reached was that the development would form a “closed edge” to built form as development wraps around to meet with existing properties on Waddington Road; and that the impact would be moderate adverse moving in the longer term to minor adverse. Overall, therefore the previous LVIA accepted that the proposal would have adverse effects upon visual

amenity but generally considered that these would be mitigated in the longer term by appropriate landscaping/screening.

The effects of the development on the character appearance and landscape of the countryside were given very careful and thorough consideration in the Public Inquiry.

In this decision letter, the Appeal Inspector concluded in relation to this particular consideration that there could be little doubt that the experience for those using and viewing the area would be devalued. He acknowledged that there would be a loss of open countryside, which, he said, would run counter to the aims and objectives of a strict application of saved Local Plan and emerging Core Strategy Policies. Even so, with no special landscape designation, he considered that this would amount to only a small negative factor and not a determining issue in its own right. He considered that the crucial point was that the boundaries of Clitheroe have got to be relaxed in order to meet the Council's future housing demands, and he considered the appeal site to be one of the least vulnerable locations in landscape and agricultural terms and, he stated that locationally it is the most sustainable site available.

This current application is for a lesser number of dwellings on the same site. A new Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is submitted with the application. This has taken into account points made during the consideration of the previous application and appeal (such as a proposed increase in landscape screen planting on the edges of the development in response to a point made by the Council's Countryside Officer but broadly reaches the same conclusions as the previous LVIA.

As those conclusions were supported by the Appeal Inspector; and as the number of properties has now been reduced, and the amount of natural screening has been increased; I can see no sustainable objections to the current application in respect of its impact on the appearance and landscape of the locality.

Effects Upon Residential Amenity

The illustrative site layout submitted with this outline application shows a landscaping/screen planting belt on the southern and south eastern boundaries of the site adjoining existing residential properties in Kirkmoor Road, Kirkmoor Close and Back Commons; and also on the northern boundary adjoining dwellings in Brungerley Avenue.

Any reserved matters application will be expected to broadly comply with this particular feature of the illustrative site layout. Through such appropriate screen planting and appropriate separation distances between existing and proposed dwellings, these specific effects of the development on the amenities of existing nearby residents will be properly assessed and addressed at reserved matters application stage.

In relation to the previous application, the Appeal Inspector commented that whilst a few existing residents would suffer a significant loss of view; this was not of such magnitude as to justify withholding planning permission. The Inspector commented that buildings and planting would have to be laid out such that there would be no inordinate sense of overbearing or undue loss of light or privacy. The Inspector commented that the loss of view for a limited number of residents did not constitute a minor level of objection to the scheme, and said that it must be remembered that no one has the right to an uninterrupted view.

I consider that the Inspector's comments would equally apply to the development as shown on the illustrative layout submitted with this current application. As such, I can see no sustainable reason for refusal of the application relating to the effects of the development upon the amenities of nearby residents.

Affordable Housing

During the consideration of the previous appeal, a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was formulated for use in the event that the Inspector had been minded to allow the appeal. Amongst other things, this contained an undertaking in respect of the provision of affordable housing. That UU (that was agreed by both parties and by the Planning Inspectorate) has been submitted as a draft Section 106 Agreement with this application, but with all numeric values, percentages etc deleted. The Council's Strategic Housing Officer has provided those figures/values by stating as follows:

1. There should be a total of 83 affordable units with 50% shared ownership and 50% affordable rental.
2. A discounted sale unit would be at a discount of 60% of open market value.
3. The final (83rd) property shall be complete before the 96th market dwelling is occupied.
4. There should also be a minimum of 41 properties that are suitable to accommodate older people, 50% of which can be included within the affordable housing provision.

In the event that this application is approved, the Section 106 Agreement will be drafted to reflect the Council's affordable housing requirements as stated above.

Public Open Space

The submitted illustrative layout shows the retention of both the existing public footpath and the existing watercourse that cross the site within "linear" open spaces plus the provision of an equipped children's play area in a central location within the site, and a further public open space on the eastern part of the site coupled with a financial contribution to mitigate the impact of the dev on local sports facilities. Taken together, these public open spaces represent sufficient open space for this development. In the event that outline permission is to be granted, conditions will be required to ensure the provision of these public open spaces as indicated on the illustrative master plan and also to ensure their future management and maintenance (that would be by the applicants and not by the Council).

The Council is currently in the process of undertaking an assessment of need in respect of the open space and sports facilities in the Borough and whilst this is currently in draft form, the assessment is at an advanced stage of production and will be presented to both the Planning and Development Committee and the Community committee once finalised. In respect of Clitheroe, the assessment identifies specific areas for improvement in respect of the quality of the facilities available for use by residents and attributes a cost to these improvements based on information produced by Sport England. The improvements identified would secure the following:

Clitheroe-

Swimming Pool modernisation scheme at Ribblesdale Pool

Artificial Pitch
(87% shared with Whalley 13%)
Small Sided Artificial Pitch
Clitheroe Rugby Club Pitch improvement
Roefield Sports Hall improvements
Edisford Grass Pitches improvements
Contribution to Play Facility Provision

The contribution of £370 per dwelling towards improvement of facilities which would include the swimming pool and in order to mitigate the impact of the development on sports and open space facilities in Clitheroe and to improve the quality of provision. This would be included in the Section 106 Agreement.

Public Footpaths

In the previous application, all the footpaths crossing and bounding the site were to be kept open on their existing routes, and new footpaths were to be created within the site. In respect of that previous application, the Appeal Inspector accepted that there would “undoubtedly be a diminution of enjoyment with the loss of tranquility and of perceived openness, with the greater sense of enclosure, whether caused by the proximity of built development or the additional activity and landscape features” on balance, he accepted that there would therefore be some loss of benefit but did not consider this to represent a sustainable reason for refusal of the application.

In the master plan submitted with this current application, again, all existing footpaths are to be retained on their existing routes, and new footpaths would be created within the development. The existing Public Right of Way that passes through the site would be maintained within a landscaped “linear” open space. Whilst the experience of persons using the footpath would therefore undoubtedly change, I agree with the conclusion reached by the Appeal Inspector that this would not be so harmful as to represent a sustainable reason for refusal of the application.

Archaeology and Heritage

As a result of surveys and archaeological field investigations carried out in 2012, the County Archeologist has been able to confirm that this application does not have any archaeological implications. No archaeological mitigation measures are therefore required.

Waddow Hall (Grade II listed) is located on the opposite side of the River Ribble approximately 500m away from the application site. In the local list of Lancashire’s Unregistered Historic Designated Landscapes (2013) Waddow Hall is described as a country house with parkland; and in the earlier Historic Designed Landscapes of Lancashire (1998) there is mention of a “vista across River Ribble”.

In the Appeal Inspector’s decision letter, he states that “the appeal proposals would invite no marked visual impact from the lower floors and grounds of Waddow Hall. Whereas there would be some perception from upper floors, the intention of strengthening the tree landscape belt to the north and west of the appeal site would filter these views in time. Nevertheless, with the residential development proposed, the character of the area would change and this would be a negative factor to be weighed in the balance.

Having made that planning balance, the Inspector did not consider there to be any sustainable reason for refusal of the appeal concerning the effects of the proposal on the setting of Widow Hall. Given the distance between the site and the listed building; and the strengthening of the landscape screen planting in the current application, I consider that there would be minimal, if any, detriment to the setting of the listed building; and that any such harm would not outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

Section 106 Agreement Content

A draft Section 106 Agreement was submitted with the application and is in the process of being checked by colleagues in the legal section. As detailed earlier in this report, the Section 106 Agreement will need to cover the following matters:

1. Affordable Housing

- The provision of 83 affordable dwellings 0 50% shared ownership and 50% affordable rental.
- Discounted sole units to be at a discount of 60% of open market value.
- The final (83rd) affordable property to be completed before the 96th marker dwelling is occupied.
- The provision of a minimum of 41 properties to be accommodation suitable for older people – 50% of which could be included within the affordable housing.

2. Education Contributions

- The payment to be County Council, as education authority, of the sum of £529,303 towards the provision of 44 primary school places, and the sum of £743,182 towards the provision of 41 secondary school places.

This is subject to a requirement for possible reassessment once more detailed information regarding bedroom numbers is available and also in the event that any of four specified pending planning applications are determined prior to the contributions stated above having been finalised.

3. Highways/Sustainable Transport Contributions

- Travel Plan. A contribution of £24,000 to enable Lancashire County Council Travel Planning team to provide a range of services as described in 2.1.5.16 of the Planning Obligations in Lancashire paper dated September 2008.
- Funding for the improvement of bus services £110,000 per year (index linked) for 5 years.
- A contribution of £10,000 for the provision of a secure cycle storage facility at the Clitheroe Railway Station.
- A contribution of £6,000 for the S106 component of cost (construction costs to be included in a S278 agreement) for highways related projects including improved cycle and pedestrian linkages to the town centre This funding would be used also for 'no

waiting' restrictions, extension of the 20 mph zone, a 20 mph order for the internal estate roads, and the zebra crossing.

4. Offsite Recreation Facilities

- A contribution of £370 per dwelling.

Conclusion

As explained in the report, the application follows a previous application (3/2012/0913/P) that sought outline permission for a development of up to 345 dwellings and a 50 place crèche/nursery on the same site as the site of this current application. In the previous application, a new junction was to be formed on to Waddington Road in order to give access to 220 of the proposed dwellings and the crèche/nursery; and a second access, that was to serve the remaining 125 dwellings, was to be formed on to Kirkmoor Road.

Permission was refused, and an appeal was submitted that was considered at a Public Inquiry.

In the Public Inquiry all relevant matters were given thorough and careful consideration by the Inspector. In the Inspector's decision letter under the heading 'Overall Balance and Conclusion' the Inspector made a number of comments that, for clarity, I summarise below as a series of bullet points:

- The proposal would not conform to the Local Plan but this is an old plan and in the absence of an up to date replacement, the default position identified in NPPF prevails.
- Thus, as the site constitutes sustainable development there is a presumption in favour of the appeal scheme unless other material circumstances dictate otherwise. The position would stand even if there was a five year supply of readily available housing land.
- The Council did not argue prematurity as, even with the strategic site at Standen, more land would need to be released to meet the Core Strategy figure of 250 dwellings per annum.
- In relation to the rural landscape, the site has no special designation and, whilst there might be some harm, there is acceptance that some countryside around Clitheroe would have to be forfeited. The boundaries of the town will need to be revised and, the modest harm to the countryside landscape, its usage and public and private views do not constitute a cogent reason for dismissing the appeal.
- There are minor to moderate objections in relation to matters such as ecology, flooding under the railway bridge and some broader sustainability aspects. However, taken individually or cumulatively they are not sufficient to outweigh the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Even if combined with the landscape harm, this would not tip the balance in favour of dismissal.
- This is the most sustainable undeveloped site, immediately outside the present town boundary of the largest and most sustainable town in the borough.
- Common sense dictates that this site will almost certainly be developed at some time in the future.

- There are, however, compelling highway objections to the proposal.
- Whilst the access to Waddington Road would be acceptable, there are unresolved issues along Waterloo Road.
- Crucially, however, the combination of geometrically substandard junction of Castle View/Bawdlands Bridge and the heavily parked Castle View and Kirkmoor Road route together with the additional environmental intrusion for local residents living on these roads forge a compelling reason for refusal.
- In summary, the presumption in favour of sustainable development prevails over all matters except for highways.
- Even then, there is the option to relook at the Waddington Road access to ascertain the level of development on the appeal site that could be served from this single access, with a bus/emergency access retained to connect to Kirkmoor Road.
- As it stands, the adverse impacts of allowing the appeal proposals as they are, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
- Accordingly, and having taken into account all of the matters raised, this particular project should be rejected and the appeal should fail.

The Inspector therefore made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that the appeal should be dismissed. The Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector and the appeal was dismissed for the highway safety/traffic related reason recommended by the Inspector.

In accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, this current application has relooked at the Waddington Road access as the sole access to serve the proposed reduced number of dwellings (and with the crèche/nursery having been deleted from the proposal).

As stated previously, the comprehensive comments of Lancashire County Highways are included in this report. From these comments it appears that (subject to agreement on the precise details of the works required to the Waterloo Road/Shawbridge Street junction – that can be achieved through appropriate conditions) the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in relation to all highway considerations.

As this proposal does not result in any greater harm or impact in relation to any other considerations than the effects that the Appeal Inspector considered to be acceptable; and as the Inspector's single objection on highway grounds appears to have been satisfied, it is considered that outline planning permission can be granted in respect of this amended scheme subject to appropriate conditions, but following the completion of an appropriate Section 106 Agreement.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be DEFERRED AND DELEGATED to the Director of Community Services for approval following the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement (in the terms described in the Section 106 Agreement sub-heading of this report) within 2 months from the date of this Committee meeting or delegated to the Director of Community Services in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Planning and

Development Committee should exceptional circumstances exist beyond the period of 3 months and subject to the following condition(s):

1. Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of the building[s], and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced.
2. Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition 1 above, relating to the siting, design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected, and the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority and shall be carried out as approved.
3. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of [three] years from the date of this permission.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later
5. The submission of reserved matters in respect of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the Design and Access Statement and the 'illustrative master plan' (Drawing number 1110.1) submitted with the application.

REASON: To define the scope of the permission.

6. The development hereby permitted in outline relates to the erection of up to 275 residential units. The application for reserved matters shall not exceed 275 residential units.

REASON: To define the scope of the permission.

7. Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall provide details of:
 - i) Sustainable travel options for journeys to and from work for the site operatives, including pedestrian routes, travel by bicycles, journeys by train, car sharing schemes and other opportunities to reduce journeys by motor car.
 - ii) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - iii) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iv) Storage of plant and materials used in the construction of the development;
 - v) The erection and maintenance of security fencing;
 - vi) Wheel washing facilities;
 - vii) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; and
 - viii) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction works.
 - ix) Periods when plant and materials trips should not be made to and from the site (mainly peak hours, but the developer to suggest times when trips of this nature should not be made).
 - x) Routes to be used by vehicles carrying plant and materials to and from the site which shall have been constructed to base course level.
 - xi) Measures to ensure that construction vehicles do not impede adjoining accesses.
 - xii) Plans identifying the existing surface water and foul drainage systems both within the site and outside the site; measures for the protection of those systems; and a

- remediation strategy in respect of any damage that might be caused to any parts of the existing drainage system whether within or outside the application site
- xiii) Details of how existing habitat features, hedgerows/streams shall be retained and protected during the lifetime of the development from the adverse effects of development works by maintaining construction exclusion zones the details of which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of each phase of development.

The approved construction method statement shall be adhered to throughout the entire period of construction works.

REASON: In order to ensure safe working practices on or near the highway in the interests of safety and in the interests of the amenities of nearby residents in accordance with the requirements of Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

- 8. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted in outline a scheme for flood risk mitigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The mitigation measures shall be in accordance with the details contained in the flood risk assessment submitted with the application (reference 263 – FRA Rev 2.0 dated 2 July 2014) and shall be carried out in their entirety and thereafter retained in perpetuity.

REASON: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage/disposal of surface water from the site in order to prevent a mitigate the risks of flooding on and off site and to comply with the requirements Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 9. No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site (based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of grey water recycling and details of the phasing of the provision of its various elements. The surface water drainage scheme shall demonstrate the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details (including the approved phasing) and shall be retained in perpetuity thereafter in a condition commensurate with delivering the approved objectives.

REASON: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage/disposal of surface water from the site in order to prevent a mitigate the risks of flooding on and off site and to comply with the requirements of Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 10. Prior to the commencement of development, a strategy outlining the general system of foul drainage arising from the entire site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This strategy shall include details of any necessary infrastructure including details of the phasing of the provision of its various elements. Thereafter, the detailed scheme for foul drainage for any phase of the development shall be submitted for approval in accordance with the strategy for the entire site that has been approved under this condition.

REASON: To secure proper drainage and to reduce the risk of flooding and pollution and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version) and to comply with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. Any reserved matters applications submitted pursuant to this outline permission shall indicate the provision of a buffer zone extending 8 metres on each side of the watercourse that crosses the site. This buffer zone shall be measured from the top of the bank of the watercourse. No development, including the erection of any structures, buildings, fences, walls or other means of enclosure or formation of hard standings shall be carried out within this area unless precise details of any such developments have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No planting shall take place within this area except with the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To protect the watercourse and the wildlife using the river corridor and to reduce the impact of the development on biodiversity in accordance with Policies DMG1 and DME3 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

12. No development shall begin until a scheme identifying how a minimum of 10% of the energy requirements generated by the development will be achieved by renewable energy production methods, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development and thereafter retained in a condition commensurate with delivering the agreed level of energy generation..

REASON: In order to encourage renewable energy and to comply with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. No tree pruning or removals shall be implemented at the site, with the exception of emergency situations without the prior consent of the Local Planning Authority, which will only be granted when the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that it is necessary. All tree works shall be implemented in accordance with BS3998:2010 Tree Work – Recommendations, and carried out by an approved arboricultural contractor. Note: these restrictions shall not apply to planned systematic hedgerow maintenance works.

REASON: In order to ensure that any trees affected by the development are afforded maximum physical protection from the adverse effects of development in accordance with Policies DMG1 and DME2 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

14. No development shall begin until details of a lighting scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. [The lighting scheme shall include details to demonstrate how artificial illumination of wildlife habitats (trees with bat roost potential and hedgerows used by foraging areas bats) is minimised] and how light spillages can be minimised close to existing residential properties around the site. Lighting columns should reflect the scale and character of the town. The approved lighting scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained in perpetuity in a condition commensurate with delivering the agreed levels of illumination.

REASON: In order to reduce the impact of the development on biodiversity in accordance with Policies DMG1 and DME3 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

15. The dwellings shall achieve a minimum Level of the Code for Sustainable Homes in force on the date of occupation. No dwelling shall be occupied until a final Code Certificate has been issued for it certifying that the appropriate Code Level has been achieved.

REASON: In order to encourage an energy efficient development in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

16. Prior to the commencement of development, precise details of the means of preventing the use of the bus lane within the development by vehicles other than authorised buses and emergency vehicles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained in a condition commensurate with delivering the desired control.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

17. The finished floor levels of all dwellings hereby permitted in outline shall be a minimum of 150mm above ground levels at the site as existing prior to any ground level changes carried out as part of the development.

REASON: In order to mitigate the risks of flooding to properties in accordance with the requirements of Section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

18. Prior to the demolition or any renovation works on the barn in the north eastern corner of the site, appropriate surveys shall be carried out to determine whether the barn is used as a roost for bats and, if so, to provide detailed advice on mitigation and design requirements. The results of the survey and any proposed mitigation measures shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority; and any mitigation measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order to minimise the impact of development on a protected species (bats) and to comply with Policy DME3 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

19. Prior to the commencement of any site works, including the formation of the vehicular accesses, a plan, prepared in accordance with guidance in BS5837:2012, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The plan shall include the following:

- a) Details of trees to be retained;
- b) Details of trees proposed for removal as part of the enablement works;
- c) Details of the locations and type of temporary protective fencing to be erected, in accordance with the advice contained in BS5837 2012;
- d) Details of proposed pruning of trees to be retained as part of the enablement works, whether located on site or on adjacent land;
- e) Details of all development related proposals, including ground level changes and excavations, within 10 metres of the Root Protection Area of any tree to be retained, including those located on adjacent land.

In addition to the plan a schedule of proposed enablement related tree works shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing prior to the commencement of any site works.

Following the implementation of the enablement related tree works the temporary protective fencing detailed in item c) shall be erected to form Construction Exclusion Zones in accordance with BS5837 2012 and the details on the approved plan. Prior to the commencement of any development works the temporary protective fencing shall be inspected and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Exclusion Zones shall remain in place until all construction works have been completed and the removal of the fencing has been agreed, in writing, with the Local Planning Authority.

During the construction works no excavations or changes in ground levels of any type shall take place within the Construction Exclusion Zones. In addition, no construction materials, including spoil, soil, rubble, etc., shall be stored or redistributed within the Construction Exclusion Zones.

REASON: To enable the Local Planning Authority to consider the details of the proposed development in relation to the existing trees.

20. No development shall take place until a check for nesting birds has been undertaken if vegetation removal is to take place between 1st March to 31st August, inclusive. The nesting bird check shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist.

REASON: To safeguard nesting bird species in accordance with the provisions of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

21. No development shall take place until a scheme for the enhancement of the watercourse and retained hedgerows has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme for habitat enhancement shall include details of physical modifications to the watercourse, proposed habitat planting within the channel and details of proposals for hedgerow management. All new habitat planting to comprise locally occurring native plant species.

REASON: To safeguard and enhance the biodiversity value of the watercourse and hedgerows.

22. The development shall not begin until a scheme for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annex 2 of National Planning Policy Framework or any future guidance that replaces it. The scheme shall include:

- i) The numbers, type, size (including number of bedrooms), tenure and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made which shall consist of not less than 30% of housing units/bed spaces;
- ii) The timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing;
- iii) The arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider (or the management of the affordable housing if no RSL is involved); the

arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.

REASON: To ensure the provision of affordable housing in order to comply with Policy DMH3 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version) and the advice contained in Section 6 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes' of the National Planning Policy Framework.

23. No development shall take place until a survey has been undertaken to identify any overland routes used by otters within any areas likely to be affected by construction activities. A scheme for the protection of such routes during construction and in the future shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development and the approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the timescales set out therein.

REASON: In order to ensure that any otters in the locality of the site are appropriately protected from any potential adverse effects of the development.

24. A visibility splay at the junction of the site access onto Waddington Road shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on drawing number J087/Site access/Fig 1. This shall be constructed and maintained at footway/verge level in accordance with a scheme to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995 there shall not at any time in connection with the development hereby permitted be erected or planted or allowed to remain within the visibility splay defined any building, wall, fence, hedge, tree, shrub or other device over the height of 0.6m from the channel level.

REASON: To ensure adequate visibility at the street junction or site access and in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

25. No phase or part of the development shall be commenced until all the highway works to facilitate construction traffic access have been constructed in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To enable construction traffic to enter and leave the premises in a safe manner without causing hazard to other road users, in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

26. The new estate road for the layout or for any phase of the layout shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for the Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level before any other construction work takes place within the site or within that phase.

REASON In order to ensure the provision of satisfactory and safe accesses into the site for construction vehicles in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

27. No phase or part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or opened for trading until all the offsite highway works and works required for improved access as listed

below have been constructed in accordance with a scheme which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority:

- a. Restricted access off Kirkmoor Road for buses, emergency vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists;
- b. New mini-roundabout junction improvement at Waddington Road/Railway View Road;
- c. Capacity improvements to the existing Whalley Road/Queensway Road mini-roundabout junction.

REASON: In order that traffic generated by the development does not exacerbate unsatisfactory highway conditions in advance of completion of the highway works, in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

28. No phase or part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or opened for trading until details of this developer's contribution to and programming of the offsite highway works and works required for improved access at the junction of Waterloo Road and Shawbridge Street have been determined in accordance with a scheme which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

REASON: In order that traffic generated by the development does not exacerbate unsatisfactory highway conditions in advance of completion of the highway works, in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

29. The proposed phasing of the construction and implementation of the development applied for (including numbers to be included in each phase) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any construction work takes place. No phase or part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or opened for trading until all the off-site highway works and means of access related to the phasing of the development of the site have been constructed in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

REASON: In order that the traffic generated by the development does not exacerbate unsatisfactory highway conditions in advance of the completion of the highway scheme/works, in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

30. No phase or part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme for the improvement of cycle and pedestrian facilities (cycle tracks and footpaths) related to the phasing of the development of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order to encourage sustainable transport and to satisfy the Local Planning Authority and the Highway Authority that the details of improvements to cycle and pedestrian facilities are acceptable before work commences on site in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

31. Prior to the commencement of development, a Framework Travel Plan for the whole development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, prior to the commencement of development of any phase or portion of development, a separate Travel Plan (or up-dated information for the Framework Travel Plan) for each phase shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall be implemented, audited and updated within the timescale set out in the approved plan.

REASON: To ensure a multimodal transport provision for the development and to reduce the traffic impact on the local road network, in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

INFORMATIVES

- i. The applicants are advised that the grant 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 would need to be subject of an Order under the appropriate Act.
- ii. The applicants are advised that the grant of planning permission will require the applicant to enter into an appropriate Legal Agreement with the County Council as Highway Authority. The Highway Authority reserved the right to provide the highway work within the highway associated with this proposal. Provision of the highway works includes design, procurement of the works by contract and supervision of the works. The applicant is advised to contact the Developer Support Manager at Lancashire County Council by email to developeras@lancashire.gov.uk.

APPLICATION NO: 3/2014/0742/P (GRID REF: SD 374170 441987)
OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR MATTERS OF ACCESS ONLY FOR THE ERECTION OF UP TO 19 NO. DWELLINGS WITH ACCESS OFF PIMLICO ROAD. LAND OFF PIMLICO ROAD CLITHEROE, BB7 4PZ.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL: Clitheroe Town Council has no objections to the proposal.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE
(COUNTY SURVEYOR): The County Surveyor had raised a number of objections to the proposal which have now been addressed through the receipt of amended/additional information. The County Surveyor therefore has no objection to the proposal subject to technical requirements/conditions.

LCC CONTRIBUTIONS: Based upon the latest assessment, LCC will be seeking a contribution for 3 secondary school places. However, LCC will not be seeking a contribution for primary school places.

Calculated at the current rates, this would result in a claim of:
Secondary places:

(£18,469 x 0.9) x BCIS Indexation (314.50 / 288.40 = 1.090499)

= £18,126.38 per place

£18,126.38 x 3 places = **£54,379**

Members will note that it is likely that the contribution figure will be revised following a recalculation based on a reduction in numbers.

UNITED UTILITIES

No objection subject to technical requirement/conditions.

LCC ARCHAEOLOGY

The proposal raises to archaeological implications.

ELECTRICITY NORTHWEST

No objection to the proposal but have made detailed comments in relation to existing infrastructure on site which are summarised below:

The development is shown to be adjacent to or affect Electricity North West operational land or electricity distribution assets. The applicant should also be advised that, should there be a requirement to divert the apparatus because of the proposed works, the cost of such a diversion would usually be borne by the applicant.

RVBC ENGINEERS

No objection subject to technical requirements in relation to contaminated land.

LCC ECOLOGY

Have raised numerous concerns in respect of the proposal, the comments received are best summarised as Below:

It appears that most of the trees that were present within the site have already been felled and were felled prior to the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and Tree Survey. It is not possible to establish whether any bats/bat roosts and/or nesting birds were adversely affected by the works and/or whether the works results in any offences.

NATURAL ENGLAND

Natural England have no objection to the proposal subject to technical requirements and the imposition of planning conditions, the comments received are summarised below.

Natural England is satisfied that the proposed development being carried out in strict accordance with the details of the application, as submitted, will not damage or destroy features for which the adjacent SSSI sites have been notified. We therefore advise that the SSI does not represent a constraint in determining the application.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS:

17 Letters of representation and a petition with 185 signatures have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The area of land provides an element of sanctuary for

- existing residents from the surrounding industrial uses.
- The increase in traffic will be of detriment to highways safety and the residential amenities of existing occupiers.
- The development will place additional pressure on existing services.
- The development will increase the size of the 'village' to over three and a half times its current size.
- Traffic using the Link Road presently travels at excessive speeds, any additional development in the area is likely to pose increased danger.
- The proposal represents over-development of the site.
- Lack of pedestrian access.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking.
- Noise disturbance resultant from the development and during the course of its lifetime.
- A number of trees had been felled on the land prior to the application being submitted.
- Loss of ecology, habitat and the impacts upon wildlife.
- Proximity to the SSSI.
- The site is inappropriate for development due to existing background noise levels associated with nearby industrial processes.
- The proposal will lead to additional flooding in the area.
- Devaluation of property.
- A summer house has been erected on the site without planning consent.
- Access to bus services within the application is misleading.
- Prematurity in relation to the Development Strategy.
- Risk to the potential occupiers posed by the surrounding industrial uses.
- Air quality and pollution in the area.
- Land ownership

Proposal

The application seeks outline consent (all matters reserved save that of access) for the erection of up to 19 dwellings, Land off Pimlico Road, Clitheroe. The primary and sole vehicular access is provided off Pimlico Road Clitheroe.

Members will note that the application originally sought consent for the erection of 21 dwellings, the applicant has since reduced the number proposed on site following initial officers concerns in respect of this level of development being able to be accommodated adequately on-site.

Subsequently the applicant has submitted a revised indicative site layout that reflects the reduction in numbers. The layout proposes 3 x terrace blocks of 3 dwellings, 1 x terrace block of 4 dwellings, two detached dwellings (one of which fronts Pimlico Road) and a single pair of semi-detached dwellings, it is proposed that the two eastern most dwellings will comprise of 4 x apartments in total.

The proposal is afforded a single point of vehicular access off the Pimlico Link Road to be located further east than the existing access which is proposed to be closed. The development is served by a single internal road with the majority of dwellings directly fronting the road with parking being accommodated in a front of plot arrangement. The internal road affords the dwellings a setback of approximately 22m from the Pimlico Link Road as its lesser extents.

Three of the proposed dwellings are located directly to the rear of numbers 12-30 Pimlico Village, two of which benefit from an offset of 16.6m from the primary elevations of the proposed dwellings and that of the rear boundaries of the aforementioned properties. A single detached dwelling is also located to the rear of the existing properties with an offset of 1.8m from the boundary of numbers 14-18 at its closest point and 11m at its furthest.

Pedestrian access is provided by way of a footpath to the western extents of the site, it is noted that for the proposed footway to link with the existing footway that fronts Pimlico Road a portion of the footway would have to be accommodated on a grass verge outside the scope of the application or the applicants ownership, LCC Highways have confirmed that this area is Highways adopted and therefore a linkage or improved footway could be provided and secured through a S.278 agreement.

Members will note that the application is made in Outline with all matters reserved save that of access, therefore the layout is merely indicative and not for assessment at this stage. For the purposes of clarity and continuity, should be consent be granted and a subsequent reserved matters application be forthcoming, further detailed comments/concerns in respect of the indicative layout are included later in this report.

Site Location

The application site is located at the western extents of the Pimlico Link Road, located to the southern side of the road directly to the east of numbers 12 – 30 Pimlico Village and the Black Horse Inn and is located directly adjacent to the north east extents of the defined Settlement Boundary for Clitheroe

Coplow Quarry (an identified Site of Special Scientific Interest) is located to the south of the site with separation being provided by extensive woodland and a raised area of land. The area bounding Coplow Quarry and land directly to the east of the application site is also identified as a County Biological heritage Site. The site benefits from a number of changes in topography with the site rising considerably to the south.

The application site has no specific designation in relation to ecology, but is considered to be within the Defined Open Countryside given its location outside, albeit adjacent, the settlement boundary.

Relevant History

There is no recent planning history on the site that is directly relevant to the current application.

Relevant Policies

Ribble Valley Core Strategy

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy

Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development
Key Statement EN4 – Biodiversity & Geodiversity
Policy DMG1 – General Considerations.
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations.
Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility
Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection.
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation.
Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside
Policy DMH1 – Affordable Housing Criteria

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

Layout

As previously stated, the application is made in outline with all matters reserved save that of access therefore layout cannot be assessed at this stage, however it is imperative that the Local Planning Authority are assured that the level/amount of development proposed can be adequately accommodated on site.

I have a number of observations in respect of the indicative layout proposed, it is envisaged that these matters would be addressed through negotiation at the Reserved Matters (R.M) stage, these comments have been provided for the purposes of clarity/continuity and in light of the nature of a number of representations received.

In respect of the proposed layout I have the following observations:

- The proposal appears to show excessive areas of hard-surfacing/parking to the plot frontages (Units 05–19), a suitable landscaping scheme should be secured at the R.M stage that mitigates and lessens the extents of surfacing proposed, it is also considered that the areas to the plot frontages should accommodate front garden areas.
- A number of the dwellings (Units 11-19) appear to interface with a significant change in topography on site. It should be demonstrated that these dwellings can be accommodated without significant artificial engineering works/alterations to land levels as the topography of the site may make some areas, assumed to be private amenity space, to be largely unusable impractical.
- It is also noted that a number of the dwellings may require retaining wall structures to the rear, it would have to be demonstrated that such structures would not be visually discordant with the character of area.
- Refuse storage/management for the mid-terrace properties would have to be considered as occupiers do not appear to have direct access to their rear yards from the plot frontage. Refuse storage (if proposed to be accommodated to the front of the properties) should be individual integrated architectural solutions that allow bins to be stored to the frontage for each dwelling out of view, it is considered that these should be designed into the fabric of the building and not treated as a standalone element.

- The area to the south of the existing hedgerow along the northern extents of the site has the potential to accommodate additional native tree species planting that would play a long-term role in relation to any overall landscape strategy and assist in enhancing the biodiversity of the site.
- Unit 04 appears to have limited private defensible amenity space and may potentially require significant boundary treatments to afford the plot with an adequate level of privacy. Consideration would have to be given to any boundary treatments proposed and their visual prominence, both within the development and upon approach.
- Units 02 & 03 appear to directly face onto the rear boundaries of numbers 12-30 Pimlico Village with an offset distance of 16.6m. It is accepted that this distance is in excess of the standard approach taken in respect of overlooking distances to boundaries, Notwithstanding this consideration, it is my opinion that that existing visual receptors are far more sensitive to the visual impact of development, particularly when this impact is considered cumulatively. It is for this reason that I would consider it appropriate for a landscaping buffer to be provided to the rear of numbers 12-30 and it should be demonstrated that any such buffer would contribute to maintaining the residential amenities of existing occupiers.
- The orientation/proximity of unit 01 to neighbouring boundaries/properties may raise issues in respect of over-bearing/privacy. This will be largely dependant on the window locations to habitable rooms and which elements of the dwelling are single/two-storey in scale.
- Given the site context it is my opinion that any reserved matters submission should be accompanied by a robust landscaping proposal consisting of predominantly native species that would play an integral role in complimenting the SSSI and BHS (Biological Heritage Site) to the south.
- In the interests of the visual amenities and character of the area it will have to be robustly demonstrated at the reserved matters stage as to how the overall architectural language, materials and scale of the dwellings will visually reflect the semi-rural/village context of the area.

Residential Amenity

AS the application is made in outline with all matters reserved save that of access, a definitive assessment of the impact upon residential amenities, if any, cannot be determined at this stage. However on the basis of the indicative layout proposed (which may be subject to significant change) I have some limited concerns regarding potential impacts, but it is considered that these would be addressed and mitigated at the Reserved matters Stage.

Landscape & Ecology

LCC Ecology have raised initial objections to the proposal and the level of information submitted in support of the application. The applicants have submitted revised information in relation to survey methodology, the Local Planning Authority's Countryside Officer has confirmed that the revised information is acceptable and has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions being attached, should consent be granted.

Affordable Housing

The application is made in outline (all matters reserved save that of access) for the erection of up to 19 units. A draft Heads of Terms document has been submitted outlining that 30% of these will be affordable. The Council's Housing Strategy Officer is currently engaged in negotiations on Draft Heads of Terms in relation to affordable housing in terms of house type and tenure.

Educational Contributions

Latest projections for the local secondary schools show there to be a shortfall of 103 places in 5 years' time. These projections take into account the current numbers of pupils in the schools, the expected take up of pupils in future years based on the local births, the expected levels of inward and outward migration based upon what is already occurring in the schools and the housing development within the local 5 year Housing Land Supply document, which already have planning permission.

With an expected yield of 3 places from this development the shortfall would increase to 106. Therefore LCC Contributions seek a contribution from the developer in respect of the full pupil yield of this development, i.e. 3 secondary school places. However, LCC will not be seeking a contribution for primary school places.

Calculated at the current rates, this would result in a claim of:

Secondary places:

$(£18,469 \times 0.9) \times \text{BCIS Indexation } (314.50 / 288.40 = 1.090499)$

= £18,126.38 per place

$£18,126.38 \times 3 \text{ places} = £54,379$

NB: If any of the pending applications listed in the attached are approved prior to a decision being made on this development the claim for primary school provision could increase up to maximum of 8 places.

Calculated at the current rates, this would result in a maximum primary claim of:

$(£12,257 \times 0.9) \times \text{BCIS Indexation } (314.50 / 288.4 = 1.090499)$

= £12,029.62 per place

$£12,029.62 \times 8 \text{ places} = £96,237$

Members will note that this figure is likely to be re-calculated based on the reduction in overall numbers proposed. At the time of writing this report the revised calculation is awaited and will be reported verbally.

Off Site Recreational Facilities

Ribble Valley Sports Facilities Needs Assessment document (September 2014) would require a contribution of £1270 per dwelling and therefore a maximum contribution of £24,130.

Principle of Development

In relation to the adopted Settlement Strategy DS1, Clitheroe is defined as a principal settlement which is a location to which (in addition to Longridge and Whalley) the majority of new housing will be directed.

At this point in time, the latest housing monitoring information (June 2014) indicates that there is an outstanding requirement for 226 dwellings in Clitheroe for the remainder of the Core Strategy plan period this takes account of existing completions and commitments.

It is recognised that the residual requirement for Clitheroe could change based on any applications determined since the publishing of the monitoring information in June, however the basis for assessment, in terms of residual need within Clitheroe, must be based on the latest published housing monitoring Information available.

Policy DMG2 of the Core Strategy states that development proposals in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the Tier 1 villages should consolidate, expand or round-off development so that it is closely related to the main built up areas, ensuring this is appropriate to the scale of, and in keeping with, the existing settlement.

The application site is located outside but directly adjacent to the defined settlement boundary for Clitheroe. It has been recognised that the current settlement boundaries can be considered as 'out of date' and that it is anticipated the boundaries are likely to be revised to take account of consents granted since their original adoption and to allow for the allocation of appropriate sites for housing development to meet identified residual needs.

I accept that the proposal would result in an 'expansion' of the settlement outside of current adopted boundaries. However, in principal (notwithstanding other considerations), consider that the site would represent appropriate expansion of the settlement that is well-related to the existing built form/settlement pattern, which would accord with the aims, objectives and main thrust of policy DMG2 and consider that there would be no significant detrimental implications to the adopted development Strategy resultant from the granting of consent.

I additionally recognise that the nature of the site, to some extent, gives a sense of remoteness or isolation from the main urban fabric of Clitheroe. It is my opinion, subject to detailed design matters, that the site could be appropriately developed in a manner that would respond positively to the scale, density and form of development in the immediate context.

Highways Safety

LCC Highways had raised original objections to the proposal due to the adverse effects of the development on highway safety, brought about by the design of the junction of the estate road with Pimlico Link Road. A revised layout has been received that takes into account the original concerns and the County Surveyor has subsequently withdrawn their objection.

The County Surveyor has added that the foot path link to Pimlico Road is welcomed. Please ask the developer to construct this path 3m wide so that it can be used by cyclists as well as pedestrians. The proposed foot path will need to link up to the footway in Pimlico Road by extending the 3m wide foot path over the grass verge in the highway. This work will be included in a S278 agreement. The County Surveyor has suggested that should consent be granted that

conditions be attached in relation to the estate road construction, visibility splays, timing of highways works, construction management, vehicular tracking and construction traffic access.

Other Matters

There are a number of matters relating to the application and points raised by objectors that do not sit comfortably within the main body of this report, these matters are addressed as follows:

Risk Posed to Occupiers resultant from the adjacent industrial uses

A number of representations have raised the issue of risk associated with the adjoining industrial processes/uses and the danger this will pose to potential occupiers of the development.

The application site is bounded to the west by existing residential dwellings with a small number of dwellings located to the north west of the application site, which are located within a closer distance to a number of existing industrial uses, than that of the proposed development, I therefore consider that the risk proposed to potential occupiers is no greater, if any, than that posed to existing occupiers. Notwithstanding this consideration is it imperative to be mindful of any increased risk posed to occupants of the proposed development.

The site is located outside the PADHI (planning advice for developments near hazardous installations) HSE (Health & Safety Executive) consultation zone for Johnson Matthey plc and therefore there it is my opinion that there is no apparent or immediate risk posed to potential future occupiers in relation to this use.

Noise and impact upon residential amenities:

A number of representations have raised the issue of existing background levels of noise associated with nearby industrial uses and the potential detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of future occupiers of the development.

The applicant has submitted a revised acoustic and noise report that concludes that:

Outline planning permission be granted for the above proposed residential development on Pimlico Link Road as the two different sets of measurements indicate that the internal noise levels within the proposed residential properties can be attenuated in order to achieve the required internal noise level at night time in the bedrooms of either 25 or 30 dBA.

It further recommends that should outline planning permission be granted then any such consent should be conditioned such that any reserved matters application should be accompanied with an additional acoustic survey be undertaken to determine the internal noise levels within bedrooms between 23.00 – 07.00 hrs using the rigorous calculation method detailed in Section 6.7.2 of BS 8233: 1999.

The external noise level in the private amenity areas are below the requirements of the WHO therefore with respect to noise the site is suitable for residential development.

An independent noise Assessment undertaken by Vibrock Ltd generally confirms and endorses the findings of the AB Acoustics assessment and further recommends that any reserved matters

scheme should also include details/provision of noise mitigation measures that will have been informed by an acoustic survey based on the detailed design and location of habitable rooms.

Prematurity

A number of representations have been received that object to the proposal on the grounds of prematurity insofar that it pre-empts the Site Allocations DPD and would preclude the Local Authority from undertaking the allocations work and fail to allow for the LPA to appropriately plan and identify suitable locations for new housing development by extending the settlement boundary outside of due process.

Members will note that a number of housing proposals have been granted consent in Clitheroe, a large number of which have been located outside, but in close proximity to, the defined settlement boundary of the town. Whilst it is accepted that further work has to be undertaken on the Site Allocations DPD, each application must be assessed on its own merits at the point of submission.

In relation to prematurity, given the numbers associated with the development, I do not consider that the level or amount of development proposed would raise fundamental strategic issues in respect of the future Site Allocations work to be undertaken. I further consider, in the long-term, that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the implementation or undertaking of further allocations work or be contrary to the interests of the proper planning of the area.

Air Quality

A number of representations have raised the issue of poor air quality, pollution and that the area is therefore not appropriate for residential development. The applications site is not located within an AQMA (Air Quality management Area) and therefore no assessment is required to be submitted with the application. RVBC Environmental Health have confirmed that they are not aware of any significant issues in the immediate vicinity relating to Air Quality/Pollutants.

Conclusion

Therefore, having carefully assessed the proposal as submitted and having regard to all matters raised that I recommend that the application be approved.

RECOMMENDATION: That the application be DEFERRED and DELEGATED to the Director of Community Services for approval following the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement within 2 months from the date of this Committee Meeting or delegated to the Director of Community Services in conjunction with Chairman and Vice Chair of Planning & Development Committee should exceptional circumstances exist beyond the period of two months and subject to the following conditions:

1. Application for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates.
 - (a) The expiration of three years from the date of this permission; or
 - (b) The expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

RESERVED MATTERS

2. The submission of reserved matters shall include details of existing and proposed land levels, including slab levels, shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority can ensure that the development responds appropriately to the topography of the site and in the interests of the appearance of the locality in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Submission Version as proposed to be modified).

3. The submission of reserved matters shall be accompanied by an acoustic survey. For the avoidance of doubt the survey shall determine the internal noise levels within habitable rooms and at the boundaries of any residential dwellings and provide suggested adequate mitigation measures where necessary.

REASON: In the interests of protecting the residential amenity of future occupiers from noise and disturbance in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

4. No development shall take place, including any demolition, until a Construction & Demolition 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. It shall provide for:
 1. The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 2. The loading and unloading of plant and materials
 3. The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 4. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding
 5. Wheel washing facilities
 6. Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction and demolition.
 7. The highway routing of plant and material deliveries to and from the site.
 8. Measures to limit noise disturbance during construction & demolition
 9. A scheme for the recycling/disposing of materials/waste resulting from demolition and construction

REASON: In the interests of protecting residential amenity from noise and disturbance in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

LANDSCAPE/ECOLOGY

5. No site clearance, site preparation or development work shall take place until a construction environment management plan has been submitted and approved in writing by Ribble Valley Borough Council in consultation with specialist advisors. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full. The scheme shall include but not be limited to details of protective fencing for retained habitats and trees (in accordance with guidelines *BS5837:2012 Trees in*

relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations), directional and screened lighting to avoid impacts on wildlife habitat, and pollution prevention measures.

REASON: To protect and conserve the habitats of species of conservation concern in accordance with Policies DMG1 and EN4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted version).

6. No site clearance, site preparation or development work shall take place until a scheme of site/street lighting has been submitted and approved in writing by Ribble Valley Borough Council in consultation with specialist advisors. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full. The scheme shall demonstrate that there will be no artificial illumination (above existing levels) of retained and created habitats such as boundary trees, bat roosts, bat foraging and commuting habitat, or ponds. The principles of relevant guidance should be followed (e.g. the Bat Conservation Trust and Institution of Lighting Engineers guidance *Bats and Lighting in the UK, 2009*).

REASON: To protect, conserve and enhance the habitats of species of conservation concern and reduce the impact of the development in accordance Policies DMG1 and EN4 of the Emerging Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

7. Tree felling, vegetation clearance works, demolition work or other works that may affect nesting birds will be avoided between March and August inclusive, unless the absence of nesting birds has been confirmed by further surveys or inspections and agreed in writing by the Local planning Authority.

REASON: To protect, conserve and enhance the habitats of species of conservation concern and reduce the impact of the development in accordance with G1 and ENV7 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and Policies DMG1 and EN4 of the Emerging Core Strategy (Submission Version as proposed to be modified).

8. 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 have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall identify the actual wall and roof elevations into which the above provisions shall be incorporated. The artificial bird/bat boxes shall be incorporated into the buildings prior to the buildings being first brought into use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of biodiversity and to enhance nesting/roosting opportunities for species of conservation concern and reduce the impact of development in accordance with Policies DMG1 and EN4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted Version).

9. No development shall take place until the mitigation proposals for the protection of bats and birds as contained within EXTENDED PHASE 1 HABITAT STUDY (Simply Ecology Ltd) Dated April 2014, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed measures shall be implemented in full prior to the commencement of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of biodiversity and to enhance nesting/roosting opportunities for species of conservation concern and reduce the impact of development in accordance with Policies DMG1 and EN4 of Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted version).

HIGHWAYS

10. The new estate road shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level before any other construction work takes place within the site.

REASON: To ensure that satisfactory access is provided to the site before the construction of the development hereby permitted commences in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted version).

11. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 there shall not at any time in connection with the development hereby permitted be erected or planted or allowed to remain upon the land hereinafter defined any building, wall, fence, hedge, tree, shrub or other device.

The visibility splay to be the subject of this condition shall be that land in front of a line drawn from a point 2.4m measured along the centre line of the estate road from the continuation of the nearer edge of the carriageway of Pimlico Link Road to points measured 43m in each direction along the nearer edge of the carriageway of Pimlico Link Road, from the centre line of the estate road and shall be constructed and maintained at footway/verge level in accordance with a scheme to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Highway Authority.

REASON: To ensure adequate visibility at the street junction or site access.

12. No part of the development shall be commenced until all the highway works to facilitate construction traffic access have been constructed in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To enable all construction traffic to enter and leave the premises in a safe manner without causing a hazard to other road users in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted version).

13. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or opened for trading until all the off-site highway works have been constructed in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

REASON: In order that the traffic generated by the development does not exacerbate unsatisfactory highway conditions in advance of the completion of the highway scheme/works in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted version).

FLOOD RISK/DRAINAGE

14. Notwithstanding any indication on the approved plans, no development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters for the entire site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and to prevent an undue increase in surface water run-off and to reduce the risk of flooding in accordance with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Adopted version).

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>
3/2014/0152/P	Repair and refurbishment of existing dwelling	Bell Sykes Farm Catlow Road, Slaidburn
3/2014/0753/P	Substitution of plots 12-15 of application 3/2013/0747/P with 5 No houses	Wilkinsons Haulage Yard and adjacent land Whalley Road, Billington
3/2014/0795/P	Detached garage within residential curtilage	Plantation House Chipping Road, Chaigley
3/2014/0805/P	Hanging sign mounted on a single pole. Fascia sign to replace existing one under front window	Chipping Farm Shop Ltd Wilsden, Garstang Road Chipping
3/2014/0836/P	Proposed alterations to existing garden room to create traditional cat slide, lean-to roof and alterations to master bedroom. Opening in gable wall onto concealed viewing deck	The Barn High House Farm Higher Road Longridge
3/2014/0858/P	Extension of two storey rear extension and dormer to side	37 Chaigley Road, Longridge
3/2014/0927/P	Replacement of two front, first floor, circular, timber windows with transom rail one third/two thirds opening with two new circular, timber windows without transom rail, fully opening	Marl Hill Barn Easington Road Cow Ark
3/2014/0966/P	Erection of timber outbuilding for storage in connection with pub/restaurant	Spread Eagle, Mellor Lane Mellor
3/2014/1050/P	Security fence approximately 2,000m long to site entrances, reception building and gatehouses, and alterations to footways within the confines of	British Aerospace Systems, Samlesbury Aerodrome, Balderstone (LDO)

APPLICATIONS REFUSED

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Reasons for Refusal</u>
3/2014/0540/P	Conversion of agricultural barn into two dwellings	Barracks Farm Chipping Road Chaigley	Policies G1, G5, H2, H15, H16, H17, ENV1 and ENV7 of the DWLP and Key Statements/Policies DS1, DS2, EN2, EN5, DMG1, DMG2, DME2, DME3, DME4, DMH3 and DMH4 –

Cont/

Cont...

Unsustainable development due to the isolated location of the site; and detrimental effects upon the appearance and character of the traditional barn, the amenities of existing and the future residents, and species protection/conservation.

3/2014/0607/P	Redevelopment of existing equestrian centre to form horse stables and livery, indoor arena and external riding area, including the demolition of the existing dilapidated building	Trapp Lane Read	Policies G1, ENV3, EN2, DMG1, DME2 and NPPF – Inappropriate scale, design and massing leading to detrimental effects on visual and residential amenity.
3/2014/0805/P	Individual letters mounted under the stone façade (not to be illuminated)	Chipping Farm Shop Ltd, Wilsden Garstang Road Chipping	Key Statement EN2 and Policy DMG1 – Detrimental to visual amenity.

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Location</u>
3/2014/0925/P	Certificate of Lawfulness for an existing use of occupation of the dwelling by persons not satisfying condition 2 of application 3/1991/0313	Croft House Twitter Lane, Waddington

SECTION 106 APPLICATIONS

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Date to Committee</u>	<u>Number of Dwellings</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2012/0785	Clitheroe Hospital Chatburn Road Clitheroe	6/12/12	57	With Applicants Solicitor
3/2014/0981	Land at Chatburn Road Clitheroe	13/2/14 18/12/14	23	With LCC
3/2014/0666	15 Parker Avenue Clitheroe	18/9/14	15	With Applicants Solicitor
3/2014/0597	Land off Waddington Road Clitheroe	16/10/14	275	With Applicants Solicitor
3/2014/0779	Land off Dale View Billington	16/10/14	18	With LCC

<u>Plan No</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Date to Committee</u>	<u>Number of Dwellings</u>	<u>Progress</u>
3/2014/0188	Victoria Mill Watt Street Sabden	13/11/14	40	With Planning
<u>Non Housing</u>				
3/2011/0649P	Calder Vale Park Simonstone	15/3/12		Subject to departure procedures, draft 106 received from Lancashire County Council

APPEALS

<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>
3/2013/0722 U	16/05/14	Englands Head Farm Paythorne	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0394 R	23/07/14	Stoneroyd, Haugh Ave, Simonstone	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0235 R	29/07/14	20 Chapel Hill, Longridge	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0258 R	01/08/14	1 Main Street, Bolton by Bowland	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0298 R	11/08/14	Rose Cottage, Main Street, Grindleton	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0146 R	21/08/14	The Coach House 1 Ashcroft Cottages Clitheroe Road West Bradford	WR		Appeal dismissed 25/11/14
3/2013/1023 U	29/08/14	Land off Kingsmill Avenue, Whalley	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0537 R	29/09/14	Pinfold Cottage, Tosside	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0075 R	24/09/14	Sheepfold Farm, Balderstone	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0550	01/10/14	Bradyll House Franklin Hill Old Langho	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0501 R	07/10/14	Land at Longsight Road, Copster Green	WR		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>
3/2014/0151 Cond	08/10/14	Lower Abbott House Farm, Mellor	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0605 R	09/10/14	Land off Pendle Street East, Sabden	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0462 R	10/10/14	Land adj Glen View, Longridge	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0535 R	10/10/14	Oaklands, Longsight Rd, Clayton le Dale	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0143 R	10/10/14	Land adj 52 Chapel Hill, Longridge	WR		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0692 R	20/10/14	11 The Old Stables, Mitton Road, Whalley	HH		Awaiting decision
3/2014/0419 R	04/11/14	7 Whins Lane, Simonstone	WR		Questionnaire docs sent 10/11/14
3/2013/0442 R	05/11/14	Woodfield Farm, Longsight Road Clayton le Dale	WR		Questionnaire docs sent 11/11/14
3/2014/0804 R	11/11/14	22 Wellgate, Clitheroe	WR		Questionnaire docs sent 26/11/14
3/2014/0711 R	18/11/14	5 Cowper Place, Sawley BB7 4LE	CB		Questionnaire docs sent 24/11/14
3/2014/0705 R	Awaiting validation by PINS	Meadows Farm Worston	AB		
3/2014/0464 R	Awaiting validation by PINS	60 Taylor Street, Clitheroe			
3/2014/0793 R	Awaiting validation by PINS	Talbot Fold Barn Talbot Bridge Bashall Eaves			
3/2014/0592 R	Awaiting validation by PINS	The Moorcock Inn, Slaidburn Road, Waddington			
3/2014/0517	Awaiting validation by PINS	Land to the north of Dilworth Lane Longridge			

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 15 JANUARY 2015
title: OBSERVATIONS TO ANOTHER LOCAL AUTHORITY – OUTLINE
APPLICATION FOR UP TO 150 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED OPEN
SPACE AND LANDSCAPING WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR
ACCESS AT LAND OFF PRESTON ROAD, GRIMSARGH, PRESTON
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal author: SARAH WESTWOOD, SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To request Committee's views in relation to an outline application for up to 150 dwellings on land off Preston Road, Grimsargh that is to be determined by Preston City Council.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives – The matters in this report relate to the objectives of creating a sustainable local economy and ensuring that there is a suitable supply of sites for housing.
- Corporate Priorities – To be a well-managed Council.
- Other Considerations – None.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The planning application in question was received by Preston City Council on 24 November 2014 with a letter sent to Ribble Valley Borough Council dated 9 December 2014 requesting this Council's views on the application.

2.2 The planning application is submitted in outline with matters of access applied for at this stage. All other matters are reserved for future submission.

2.3 By way of a brief summary, the proposal can be described as follows.

- A total site area of 8.05 hectare (net developable area of 4.79 hectare meaning a density of 30 dwellings per hectare net of open space).
- Residential development of up to 150 dwellings (35% affordable housing [53 units]).
- Vehicular and pedestrian access points off Preston Road.
- Public open space and children's play (1.08 hectare).
- Amenity green space (2/08 hectare).
- Potential SUDS area (0.1 hectare).

2.4 The site is set to the south of Preston Road approximately 110m from the boundary between the respective local authorities. The site is greenfield in nature having a roadside frontage of approximately 230m. It then extends in a southerly direction with the properties of Tunbrook Avenue to the west of the site, it wraps around 'The Hermitage', continuing down towards Tun Brook then extending towards 'Woodside Cottage'.

3 ISSUES

3.1 Given the proximity of the site to the borough boundary, there is likely to be some impact on the locality in terms of traffic generation and potential impacts on the demand for services within Longridge. There are county biological heritage sites to the north

(Grimsargh Reservoir) and south (Tun Brook) of the site and a very small area of the site is within Flood Zone 2.

- 3.2 The site is identified as open countryside (Policy EN1) in the publication Preston Local Plan (July 2013) with land to the north of Preston Road that immediately abuts the borough boundary designated as an Area of Separation (Policy EN4). It is for Preston City Council to have regard to the open countryside location of the proposal and determine whether the principle of permitting housing in this location fits with the spatial vision in their Plan, which is at an advanced stage.
- 3.3 It is important for Members of this Council to assess the proposal in relation to the policies in our Core Strategy and whilst the works proposed would bring the built settlement edge of Grimsargh closer to the common boundary division, I do not consider that the principle of the proposal would have a significant impact on this Council's strategic policies.
- 3.4 In relation to development management considerations such as highways, flood risk, ecology and the visual impact of developing this greenfield site, these are matters for the determining authority to consider having regard to their planning policies.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications
 - Resources – No implications identified.
 - Technical, Environmental and Legal - No implications identified.
 - Political – It is important that the Council takes the opportunity to contribute to matters of local concern.
 - Reputation – No implications identified.
 - Equality & Diversity – No implications identified.

5 **RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 Advise Preston City Council that Ribble Valley Borough Council raise no objections but request that detailed consideration be given to the advice of Lancashire County Council Highways and in particular the cumulative impact of previously approved developments.
- 5.2 Note the comments from Ribble River Trust in relation to the adequacy of the ecological approval.

SARAH WESTWOOD
SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Planning application 3/2014/1078/P

For further information please ask for Sarah Westwood, extension 4516.

REF:SW/EL/150115/P&D

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DECISION

Agenda Item No 7

meeting date: 15 JANUARY 2015
 title: REVISED REVENUE BUDGET 2014/15
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
 principal author: TRUDY HOLDERNESS

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To agree a revised revenue budget for 2014/15.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The original estimate for this current financial year was set in March 2014. As members will be aware, there can be numerous variations to the budget that come to our attention as the year progresses, particularly through the budget monitoring process.

2.2 At this time of year we take the opportunity to revise the estimates for the current financial year in order to better assess the level of movement anticipated within our earmarked reserves and balances, and to allow us to better forecast for the coming financial year.

2.3 The 2014/15 budget included provision for price increases of 2.75% and a pay increase of 1%. Overall general inflation for the year is predicted to be slightly less than this. A 2.2% pay award has been agreed covering a two year period which equates to approximately 1% in the current year.

3 REVISED REVENUE BUDGET 2014/15

3.1 The revised budget is £31,640 lower than the original estimate. This is increased to £119,920 lower than the original estimate after allowing for transfers to and from earmarked reserves. A comparison between the restated original and revised budgets for each cost centre is shown below.

Cost Centre	Cost Centre Name	Original Estimate 2014/15 £	Movement in Expenditure £	Movement in Income £	Movement in Support Services £	Revised Estimate 2014/15 £
PLANG	Planning Control & Enforcement	223,570	15,840	-55,020	-76,740	107,650
PLANP	Planning Policy	178,840	0	-4,750	22,530	196,620
CORES	Core Strategy	0	70,250	0	0	70,250
BCSAP	Building Control SAP Fees	-1,550	-60	0	20	-1,590
BLDGC	Building Control	54,300	-4,410	11,850	-10,510	51,230
AONBS	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	13,450	0	0	2,060	15,510
COMMG	Community Groups	22,480	-110	0	2,100	24,470
COUNT	Countryside Management	47,680	0	0	-4,180	43,500
FPATH	Footpaths & Bridleways	5,470	0	0	-1,890	3,580
HIGHH	High Hedges	2,060	0	0	-1,240	820
PENDU	Pendle Hill Users	0	3,450	0	0	3,450

Cost Centre	Cost Centre Name	Original Estimate 2014/15 £	Movement in Expenditure £	Movement in Income £	Movement in Support Services £	Revised Estimate 2014/15 £
CONSV	Conservation Areas	9,450	0	0	80	9,530
PLSUB	Grants and Subscriptions	16,070	0	0	-780	15,290
CINTR	Clitheroe Integrated Transport Scheme	6,470	-140	0	10	6,340
NET COST OF SERVICES		578,290	84,820	-47,920	-68,540	546,650

PLBAL H336	Planning Reserve	0	5,110	-21,690	0	-16,580
PLBAL H358	Core Strategy Reserve	0	0	-70,250	0	-70,250
PLBAL H234	Building Control Reserve Fund	1,770	2,000	0	0	3,770
PLBAL H273	Pendle Hill Users	0	0	-3,450	0	-3,450
NET BALANCES AND RESERVES		1,770	7,110	-95,390	0	-86,510
NET EXPENDITURE		580,060	91,930	-143,310	-68,540	460,140

3.4 The difference between the revised and restated original estimate is an estimated decrease in net spending of £119,920 after allowing for transfers to or from earmarked reserves. The main reasons for this are shown at Annex 1. However, a summary of the main variances is given below:

Description	Variances from original estimate to revised estimate £
PLANG: Planning Control & Enforcement	
Planning consultants fees on planning appeals and associated costs are anticipated to reach £30k in the financial year, which is £21,690 above the current budget provision. This additional cost is to be met from the planning earmarked reserve fund.	21,690
Decrease in the provision for ordnance survey work as the service level agreement is no longer required.	-7,000
Several large planning applications, such as Bowland Meadows, Longridge; Henthorn Rd, Clitheroe; and Land East of Chipping Lane, Longridge has resulted in additional planning fee income	-46,040
CORES: Core Strategy	
Inspection and associated production costs for Ribble Valley's Core Strategy. This expenditure is to be met from an earmarked reserve established for this purpose	70,250
BLDGC: Building Control	
Reduced Income from building regulations fees. This is mainly due to current economic climate and also due to some organisations using private competitors	12,000
Various	
Decrease in support costs mainly from community services due to changes in cost allocations from this service, partly due to temporary planning posts being vacant	-68,540

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 The difference between the revised and restated original estimate is an estimated decrease in net expenditure of £119,920 after allowing for transfers to and from earmarked reserves.

5 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – approval of the revised estimate would see a decrease in net expenditure of £31,640 or £119,920 after allowing for transfers to and from earmarked reserves.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – none identified
- Political – none identified.
- Reputation – sound financial planning safeguard the reputation of the council.
- Equality and Diversity – equality and diversity issues are considered in the provision of all council services.

6 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 6.1 Approve the revised budget for 2014/15.

SENIOR ACCOUNTANT

DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

PD2-15/TH/AC
19 December 2014

For further background information please ask for Trudy Holderness extension 4436.
BACKGROUND PAPERS – None

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
VARIANCES FROM ORIGINAL ESTIMATE TO REVISED ESTIMATE 2014/15**

	MOVEMENT IN EXPENDITURE £	MOVEMENT IN INCOME £	MOVEMENT IN SUPPORT £	TOTAL MOVEMENT £
PLANG: Planning Control & Enforcement				
Planning consultants fees on planning appeals and associated costs are anticipated to reach £30k in the financial year, which is £21,690 above the current budget provision. This additional cost is to be met from the planning earmarked reserve fund.	21,690			
Increase in the provision for statutory notices but this has been partly offset by an increase in planning fee applications	2,570			
Decrease in the provision for agricultural consultants fees as fewer applications are being referred to the County Council.	-1,140			
Decrease in the provision for ordnance survey work as the service level agreement is no longer required.	-7,000			
Additional income received from court costs awarded to the Council following planning appeals		-5,110		
Several large planning application, such as Bowland Meadows, Longridge; Henthorn Rd, Clitheroe; and Land East of Chipping Lane, Longridge has resulted in additional planning fee income		-46,040		
In addition to an increase in planning application fee income there has also been an increase in income from pre-application advice offset by a reduction in decision notice income		-3,870		

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
VARIANCES FROM ORIGINAL ESTIMATE TO REVISED ESTIMATE 2014/15**

	MOVEMENT IN EXPENDITURE £	MOVEMENT IN INCOME £	MOVEMENT IN SUPPORT £	TOTAL MOVEMENT £
Decrease in support costs mainly from community services offset by an increase from chief executives department and legal services due to changes in cost allocations from these services, the decrease is partly due to staff working on the core strategy and temporary planning posts being vacant. The increase is from staff working on planning appeals.			-76,740	
Total Planning Control & Enforcement				-115,640
PLANP: Planning Policy				
Additional income received from Department for Communities and Local Government in respect of the designation of the Bolton by Bowland / Gisburn Forrest neighbourhood plan.		-5,000		
Increase in support costs mainly from community services and legal services due to changes in cost allocations from these services. The increase is mainly from staff working on the core strategy.			22,530	
Total Planning Policy				17,530
CORES: Core Strategy				
Inspection and associated production costs for Ribble Valley's Core Strategy. This expenditure is to be met from an earmarked reserve fund established for this purpose	70,250			
Total Core Strategy				70,250
BLDGC: Building Control				
Reduction in training expenses, professional subscriptions and car allowances partly due to a member of staff taking flexible retirement.	-3,090			

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
VARIANCES FROM ORIGINAL ESTIMATE TO REVISED ESTIMATE 2014/15**

	MOVEMENT IN EXPENDITURE £	MOVEMENT IN INCOME £	MOVEMENT IN SUPPORT £	TOTAL MOVEMENT £
Reduced Income from building regulation fees. This is mainly due to current economic climate and also due to some organisations using private competitors.		12,000		
Reduction in support costs mainly from chief executives department offset by an increase from community services due to changes in cost allocations from these services.			-10,510	
<i>Total Building Control</i>				-1,600
AONBS: Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty				
Increase in support cost from community services due to changes in cost allocation from this service			2,060	
<i>Total Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</i>				2,060
COMMG: Community Groups				
Increase in support cost from chief executives department due to changes in cost allocation from this service			2,100	
<i>Total Community Groups</i>				2,100
COUNT: Countryside Management				
Decrease in support costs mainly from community services due to changes in cost allocations from this service.			-4,180	
<i>Total Countryside Management</i>				-4,180

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
VARIANCES FROM ORIGINAL ESTIMATE TO REVISED ESTIMATE 2014/15**

	MOVEMENT IN EXPENDITURE £	MOVEMENT IN INCOME £	MOVEMENT IN SUPPORT £	TOTAL MOVEMENT £
FPATH: Footpath & Bridleways				
Decrease in support costs mainly from community services due to changes in cost allocations from this service.			-1,890	
Total Footpath & Bridleways				-1,890
HIGHH: High Hedges				
Decrease in support costs mainly from community services due to changes in cost allocations from this service.			-1,240	
Total High Hedges				-1,240
PENDU: Pendle Hill Users				
Landscaping project Pendle Hill area funded from earmarked reserve established for this purpose	3,450			
Total Pendle Hill Users				3,450
Other	-1,910	100	-670	-2,480
Sub-Total	84,820	-47,920	-68,540	-31,640
MOVEMENT IN EARMARKED RESERVES				
PLBAL/H336 - Planning Reserve				
Contribution from reserve to fund planning consultant fees offset by a contribution to the reserve from costs awarded to the Council from appeals	5,110	-21,690		-16,580
PLBAL/H358 - Core Strategy Reserve				
Release from the earmarked reserve to fund the Inspection & associated production costs		-70,250		-70,250

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
VARIANCES FROM ORIGINAL ESTIMATE TO REVISED ESTIMATE 2014/15**

	MOVEMENT IN EXPENDITURE £	MOVEMENT IN INCOME £	MOVEMENT IN SUPPORT £	TOTAL MOVEMENT £
PLBAL/H234 - Building Control Reserve				
Reduction in net expenditure of fee earning account	2,000			2,000
PLBAL/H273 - Pendle Hill User Reserve				
Release from the earmarked reserve to fund a landscaping project		-3,450		-3,450
Total Movement	91,930	-143,310	-68,540	-119,920

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DECISION

Agenda Item No 8

meeting date: 15 JANUARY 2015
title: ORIGINAL REVENUE BUDGET 2015/16
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
principal author: TRUDY HOLDERNESS

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To agree the draft revenue budget for 2015/16, for consideration at Special Policy and Finance Committee.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The three year forecast to Policy and Finance Committee in September showed that significant reductions to our budget of £513k and £900k would be necessary for 2015/16 and 2016/17 based on our indicative grant allocation following a consultation in the summer, and forecast future grant allocation reductions.
- 2.2 Our provisional Settlement Funding Assessment, announced on the 18 December 2014, is £2,240,595 for 2015/16. In comparison our current year's allocation is £2,603,769. This represents therefore a reduction of 14% in our core government funding. No announcement was made regarding 2016/17.
- 2.3 The Government announce movements in our 'Spending Power' which includes income from Council Tax Payers, New Homes Bonus and other grants when quoting our funding allocations. According to the Government we will face a reduction in our Spending Power of 1% in 2015/16.

In the Autumn Statement announced on 3 December 2014 the Chancellor indicated that in the next Parliament Public Sector spending would continue to fall. He stated that the reductions in spending may be at the same rate seen over the last five years. In my budget forecast in September I have assumed a 10% reduction in core funding for 2016/17 and a further 5% in 2017/18. This pessimistic forecast may eventually prove to have been optimistic. Much will depend on the outcome of the General Election and the pace of economic recovery.

- 2.4 The Budget Working Group is meeting regularly to consider the council's budget for next year and have suggested **four options** to address the budget shortfall:
 - Whether the Council Tax should be increased for 2015/16
 - Examination in detail of our underspends and overspends to ensure our base budget is accurate
 - Consider increasing the amount of New Homes Bonus we use to finance the revenue budget
 - Examination of how much business rates growth we can realistically expect to rely upon.
- 2.5 The Budget Working Group will be continue to meet over the coming weeks and will ultimately make recommendations to Special Policy and Finance on 10 February 2015.

3 2015/16 DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET

- 3.1 As far as your budget is concerned, the estimates have been prepared on the current levels of service, and they allow for the settled pay award of 2.2% spread over two years (2014/15 and 2015/16) and price increases of 2%.
- 3.2 Detailed in the following section of the report are the individual budget areas under this committee. Shown are the movements from the 2014/15 Original Estimate, to the proposed Original Estimate for 2015/16. Comments are also provided on the main variances.

4 COMMITTEE SERVICE ESTIMATES

4.1 PLANNING CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT

Service Description							PLANG
<i>Determination of planning applications, pre-application advice and investigation of authorised development.</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Supplies and Services	58,390	1,160	-10	-1,570	0	0	57,970
Third Party Payments	10,250	200	-140	-7,000	0	0	3,310
Support Services	726,770	0	0	0	-114,780	0	611,990
Depreciation and Impairment	6,360	0	0	0	0	0	6,360
Total Expenditure	801,770	1,360	-150	-8,570	-114,780	0	679,630
Customer and Client Receipts	-578,200	-11,560	2,080	106,070	0	0	-481,610
Total Income	-578,200	-11,560	2,080	106,070	0	0	-481,610
NET	223,570	-10,200	1,930	97,500	-114,780	0	198,020
Comments							
<p>Within supplies and services there has been a decrease in the provision for agricultural consultants as past experience has shown that fewer applications are being referred to County Council agricultural consultants.</p> <p>The provision for ordnance survey work within third party payments has been reduced as the service level agreement between ourselves and Ordnance survey is no longer required.</p> <p>The decrease in support costs is mainly from Community services offset by an increase from Chief Executives department and Legal services. This is due to changes in cost allocations from these services and temporary posts with Community Services being vacant.</p> <p>In addition to providing for an inflationary increase on planning fees, decision notices and pre-application advice, the provision for planning fees and decision notices have been reduced due to an anticipated fall in the larger planning application fees experienced in recent years.</p>							

4.2 PLANNING POLICY

Service Description							PLANP
<p><i>To set an overall framework for improving housing delivery, employment and the protection and enhancement of the environment of the area.</i></p>							
Link to Ambitions							
<p>To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.</p>							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Support Services	179,090	0	0	0	33,460	0	212,550
Total Expenditure	179,090	0	0	0	33,460	0	212,550
Customer and Client Receipts	-250	-10	0	260	0	0	0
Total Income	-250	-10	0	260	0	0	0
NET	178,840	-10	0	260	33,460	0	212,550
Comments							
<p>The increase in support costs is mainly from Community services and Chief Executives department due to changes in cost allocations from these services.</p> <p>The provision for sale of publications has been removed as no income is currently being received.</p>							

4.3 BUILDING CONTROL SAP FEES

Service Description							BCSAP
<i>Procedure for estimating energy performance of dwellings</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2.75%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Employee Related	1,480	30	0	-10	0	0	1,500
Supplies and Services	370	10	0	0	0	0	380
Support Services	2,070	0	0	0	-10	0	2,060
Total Expenditure	3,920	40	0	-10	-10	0	3,940
Customer and Client Receipts	-5,470	-110	0	0	0	0	-5,580
Total Income	-5,470	-110	0	0	0	0	-5,580
NET	-1,550	-70	0	-10	-10	0	-1,640
Comments							
There has been a small inflationary increase in both expenditure and income.							

4.4 BUILDING CONTROL

Service Description							BLDGC
<i>Determination of all types of building control applications and related legislation and standards, including dangerous buildings and elements of licensing</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Employee Related	3,610	70	-20	-150	0	0	3,510
Transport Related	16,740	330	-40	-2,340	0	0	14,690
Supplies and Services	19,450	400	-90	-950	0	0	18,810
Support Services	206,800	0	0	0	-8,750	0	198,050
Total Expenditure	246,600	800	-150	-3,440	-8,750	0	235,060
Customer and Client Receipts	-192,300	-3,840	310	14,950	0	0	-180,880
Total Income	-192,300	-3,840	310	14,950	0	0	-180,880
NET	54,300	-3,040	160	11,510	-8,750	0	54,180
Comments							
<p>The provision for professional subscriptions within employee related expenses and the provision for car allowances within transport have been reduced to reflect a change in the staffing of the Building Control section.</p> <p>Within supplies and services there has been a small reduction in software support, consumables, subscriptions and mobile devices to reflect previous spending patterns.</p> <p>The reduction in support costs is mainly from Chief Executives department due to changes in cost allocations from this service.</p> <p>The reduced income from building control fees is anticipated to continue due to the current economic conditions and competition from private companies.</p> <p>Details of the subscriptions paid under this service are shown under Annex 1.</p>							

4.5 AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY

Service Description							AONBS
<i>This relates to the cost of membership of National AONB Organisation and the annual contribution to the Joint Advisory Committee Partnership. Funding contributes to managements work and projects</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Third Party Payments	6,990	140	0	0	0	0	7,130
Support Services	6,460	0	0	0	2,030	0	8,490
Total Expenditure	13,450	140	0	0	2,030	0	15,620
NET	13,450	140	0	0	2,030	0	15,620
Comments							
Support service costs from Community services shows an increase due to changes in cost allocation from this service.							

4.6 COMMUNITY GROUPS

Service Description							COMMG
<i>Support funding for biodiversity, conservation and environmental community projects.</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To help make peoples lives safer and healthier.							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Transfer Payments	6,430	130	0	0	0	0	6,560
Support Services	16,050	0	0	0	-40	0	16,010
Total Expenditure	22,480	130	0	0	-40	0	22,570
NET	22,480	130	0	0	-40	0	22,570
Comments							
There have been no significant changes on this cost centre.							

4.7 COUNTRYSIDE MANAGEMENT

Service Description							COUNT
<i>The Council provides advice on countryside management matters and gives grants for trees, woodlands, hedgerows planting and environmental projects.</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Premises Related	10,530	210	0	0	0	0	10,740
Supplies and Services	8,980	180	0	0	0	0	9,160
Transfer Payments	17,270	350	0	0	0	0	17,620
Support Services	20,800	0	0	0	-4,260	0	16,540
Total Expenditure	57,580	740	0	0	-4,260	0	54,060
Miscellaneous Recharges	-9,900	-200	0	0	0	0	-10,100
Total Income	-9,900	-200	0	0	0	0	-10,100
NET	47,680	540	0	0	-4,260	0	43,960
Comments							
There has been a reduction in support service costs mainly from Community services due to changes in cost allocations from this service.							

4.8 FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS

Service Description							FPATH
<i>The Council provides assistance in footpath and diversion orders</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Premises Related	300	10	0	0	0	0	310
Supplies and Services	1,540	30	0	0	0	0	1,570
Support Services	5,170	0	0	0	60	0	5,230
Total Expenditure	7,010	40	0	0	60	0	7,110
Other Grants and Contributions	-1,540	-30	0	0	0	0	-1,570
Total Income	-1,540	-30	0	0	0	0	-1,570
NET	5,470	10	0	0	60	0	5,540
Comments							
There have been no significant changes on this cost centre.							

4.9 HIGH HEDGES

Service Description							HIGHH
<i>The Council adjudicate on whether a hedge adversely affects a complainant's reasonable enjoyment of their property.</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Support Services	2,060	0	0	0	-1240		820
Total Expenditure	2,060	0	0	0	-1,240	0	820
NET	2,060	0	0	0	-1,240	0	820
Comments							
There has been a reduction in support service costs mainly from Community services due to changes in cost allocations from this service.							

4.10 CONSERVATION AREAS

Service Description							CONSV
<i>The Council has the power to designate areas as Conservation Areas, these are areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.</i>							
Link to Ambitions							
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.							
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Support Services	9,450	0	0	0	80	0	9,530
Total Expenditure	9,450	0	0	0	80	0	9,530
NET	9,450	0	0	0	80	0	9,530
Comments							
There has been no significant changes on this cost centre.							

4.11 GRANTS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS – PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Service Description								PLSUB
<i>Within this budget are various Grants, Contributions and Subscriptions paid by the Council from this committee</i>								
Link to Ambitions								
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.								
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Supplies and Services	15,290	300	0	0	0	0	15,590	
Support Services	780	0	0	0	-780	0	0	
Total Expenditure	16,070	300	0	0	-780	0	15,590	
NET	16,070	300	0	0	-780	0	15,590	
Comments								
There has been a reduction in support service costs from Financial services due to changes in cost allocations from this service. Details of subscriptions paid under this committee are included at Annex1.								

4.12 CLITHEROE TRANSPORT INTERCHANGE

Service Description								CINTR
<i>The council makes a small contribution to the running costs of the County Council's bus and rail interchange in Clitheroe</i>								
Link to Ambitions								
To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area								
Budget Analysis	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Premises Related	70	0	0	30	0	0	100	
Supplies and Services	30	0	0	-30	0	0	0	
Transfer Payments	5,290	110	-10	-140	0	0	5,250	
Support Services	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	
Depreciation and Impairment	1,180	0	0	0	0	0	1,180	
Total Expenditure	6,570	110	-10	-140	10	0	6,540	
Customer and Client Receipts	-100	0	0	0	0	0	-100	
Total Income	-100	0	0	0	0	0	-100	
NET	6,470	110	-10	-140	10	0	6,440	
Comments								
There has been no significant changes on this cost centre.								

5 SUMMARIES

5.1 The draft budget is summarised in two ways. One over the cost of the service (objective) provided by the committee. The other is over the type of expenditure and income (subjective).

a) *Cost of Services Provided (Objective)*

Cost Centre	Service Name	BUDGET ANALYSIS						
		Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
PLANG	Planning Control & Enforcement	223,570	-10,200	1,930	97,500	-114,780	0	198,020
PLANP	Planning Policy	178,840	-10	0	260	33,460	0	212,550
BCSAP	Building Control SAP Fees	-1,550	-70	0	-10	-10	0	-1,640
BLDGC	Building Control	54,300	-3040	160	11,510	-8,750	0	54,180
AONBS	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	13,450	140	0	0	2,030	0	15,620
COMMG	Community Groups	22,480	130	0	0	-40	0	22,570
COUNT	Countryside Management	47,680	540	0	0	-4,260	0	43,960
FPATH	Footpaths & Bridleways	5,470	10	0	0	60	0	5,540
HIGHH	High Hedges	2,060	0	0	0	-1,240	0	820
CONSV	Conservation Areas	9,450	0	0	0	80	0	9,530
PLSUB	Grants and Subscriptions	16,070	300	0	0	-780	0	15,590
CINTR	Clitheroe Integrated Transport Scheme	6,470	110	-10	-140	10	0	6,440
NET COST OF SERVICES		578,290	-12,090	2,080	109,120	-94,220	0	583,180
ITEMS ADDED TO/(TAKEN FROM) BALANCES AND RESERVES								
PLBAL H234	Building Control Reserve Fund	1,770	0	0	1,250	0	0	3,020
NET BALANCES AND RESERVES		1,770	0	0	1,250	0	0	3,020
NET EXPENDITURE		580,060	-12,090	2,080	110,370	-94,220	0	586,200

b) Type of Expenditure/Income (Subjective)

	Original Estimate 2014/15	Inflation at 2%	Inflation above or below 2%	Unavoidable Changes to Service Cost	Support Services	Capital	Original Estimate 2015/16
Employee Costs	5,090	100	-20	-160	0	0	5,010
Premises Costs	10,900	220	0	30	0	0	11,150
Transport Costs	16,740	330	-40	-2,340	0	0	14,690
Supplies and Services	104,050	2080	-100	-2,550	0	0	103,480
Third Party	17,240	340	-140	-7,000	0	0	10,440
Transfer Payments	28,990	590	-10	-140	0	0	29,430
Support Services	1,175,500	0	0	0	-94,220	0	1,081,280
Depreciation & Impairment	7,540	0	0	0	0	0	7,540
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	1,366,050	3660	-310	-12,160	-94,220	0	1,263,020
Other Grants and Reimbursement	-1,640	-30	0	0	0	0	-1,670
Customer and Client Receipts	-776,220	-15,520	2,390	121,280	0	0	-668,070
Miscellaneous Recharges	-9,900	-200	0	0	0	0	-10,100
TOTAL INCOME	-787,760	-15,750	2,390	121,280	0	0	-679,840
NET COST OF SERVICES	578,290	-12,090	2,080	109,120	-94,220	0	583,180
ITEMS ADDED TO/ (TAKEN FROM) BALANCES AND RESERVES							
PLBAL/H234 : Building Control Reserve Fund	1,770	0	0	1,250	0	0	3,020
NET BALANCES AND RESERVES	1,770	0	0	0	0	0	3,020
NET EXPENDITURE	580,060	-12,090	2,080	110,370	-94,220	0	586,200

5.2 Net costs for this committee have increased by £6,140 after allowing for transfers to and from earmarked reserves. The main reasons for this are summarised below:

Description	Additional Costs from 2014/15 to 2015/16 £
PLANG: Planning Control and Enforcement	
Planning fees have been reduced due to an anticipated fall in the larger planning application fees experience in recent years	104,870
BLDGC: Building Control	
Reduced income from building control fees is anticipated to continue	14,950

6 RISK ASSESSMENT

6.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – approval of the original budget for 2015/16 would see an increase in net expenditure of £4,890, compared with the original budget for 2014/15 or £6,140 after allowing for transfers to and from earmarked reserves.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – none identified
- Political – none identified
- Reputation – sound financial planning safeguards the reputation of the Council
- Equality and Diversity – Equality and diversity issues are considered in the provision of all Council services.

7 FEES AND CHARGES

7.1 Fees and charges for this Committee were agreed in October 2014, and have been increased by 2%. Detailed rates will be contained in the Council's fees and charges book and the new rates will be applicable from 1 April 2015.

8 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

8.1 Agree the revenue budget for 2015/16 and to submit this to the Special Policy and Finance Committee subject to any further consideration by the Budget Working Group.

SENIOR ACCOUNTANT

DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

PD1-15/TH/AC
19 December 2014

For further background information please ask for Trudy Holderness.

BACKGROUND PAPERS – None

Planning and Development Committee – Subscriptions

Cost Centre	Body	Budgeted Subscription £	Benefits and Outcomes	Since
PLSUB Planning and Development Committee Grants and Subscriptions	Lancashire County Council Archaeological and Ecological Advice Lancashire County Council archaeological service believes that archaeological and historic remains should not be needlessly destroyed and therefore takes an active role in their management, conservation and recording. The service maintains the Lancashire Historic Environment Record (LHER), a record of known archaeological and historic sites in the County.	9,920	The service can provide an assessment of the archaeological effects of a development and any measures to reduce its impact, thus ensuring that the sites are managed and conserved	1996
BLDGC Building Control Subscriptions	Local Authority Building Control (LABC) LABC is a membership organisation representing all local authority building control departments in England and Wales; it is a not-for-profit organisation to promoting public sector expertise.	1,800	The service provides a link to over 300 local authorities and over 3000 members. As a member the authority can obtain information on current legislation and technical advice to ensure a high quality of building control and access to submit-a-plan portal	2002
	Local Authority Building Control NW LABC NW represents the North West Region which extends from Morecambe Bay in the north to the Cheshire Plain in the South, from the Lancashire coast to the Pennine watershed, and includes the counties of Lancashire and Cheshire	180	Promotes high quality building by awarding annual building excellence awards to the winners of 12 categories	2007