

MM17

For official use		Ref. No.
		Ack'd

Ribble Valley Housing and  
Economic Development -  
Development Plan Document  
(HED DPD)



Response Form

Regulation 22 Main  
Modifications  
consultation

Before using this form to make any comments please ensure that you have read the Housing and Economic Development – Development Plan Document Main Modifications : Housing Allocations document and associated documents and the Response Form Guidance Notes, which can be found on Ribble Valley Borough Council's website - [www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk) and follow the HED DPD link. If after reading the Guidance Notes you should have any queries in completing the form please telephone 01200 425111.

This form has two parts: -

Part A - Personal Details (you need only complete one copy of Part A)

Part B - Your comment(s) (Please complete a separate Part B for each comment you wish to make.) All completed comments forms must be received by the Council no later than 5pm on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2018.

Please return paper copies marked 'HED DPD Main Modifications consultation' to Forward Planning Team, Ribble Valley Borough Council, Council Offices, Church Walk, Clitheroe, BB7 2RA. Alternatively you can email them to: [pmods22@ribblevalley.gov.uk](mailto:pmods22@ribblevalley.gov.uk)

Part A

Q1 Please can you provide the following information which will assist us in contacting you if we need to discuss any of your comments further

Name

Name of Organisation (if you are responding on behalf of an organisation)

Database Reference number (if you have one)

Address

Post Code

Email Address

Phone number

[Redacted]

PWA PLANNING FOR

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Copies of all comments made in Part B of the form will be put in the public domain and are not confidential, apart from any personal information. All personal information within Parts A and B will only be used by the Council in connection with the Local Development Framework and not for any other purpose and will be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The Council will summarise the comments and all representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate.

Part B

Please use a separate form for each individual comment.

Q2

Name / Name of Organisation (if you are responding on behalf of an organisation)

WEST BRIDGE DEVELOPMENTS

Q3

To which Main Modification to the HED DPD does this comment relate?

Modification number

MM1 - MM5

Paragraph No.

MM1 - MM5

Q4

Please indicate if the proposed change resolves any objection you have made at the previous Regulation 19 consultation stage of April - June 2017:

Yes

No

Not applicable

Q5

As a consequence do you consider the HED DPD is:

i) Legally compliant

Yes

No

ii) Sound \*

\* The considerations in relation to the HED DPD being sound are explained in the Guidance Notes

Q6

If you consider the HED DPD is unsound, is this because it is not... (please tick the appropriate box)

Justified

Consistent with national policy

Effective

Positively prepared

Q7

Please give details of why you consider that the HED DPD is not legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible and ensure that your comments only relate to a specific proposed change. You do not need to repeat comments made at the previous consultation stages as these have already been forwarded to the Inspector for consideration as part of the Examination.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the HED DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments. Please continue on a separate sheet if required.

PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING STATEMENT

**Q10** If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. *(Please note that the Inspector will determine who participates.) Please continue on a separate sheet if required.*

PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING STATEMENT

**Q11** If you wish to be kept informed as the HED DPD progresses through to adoption, please indicate which of the following stages you wish to be informed of by ticking the box(es) below.

The publication of the Inspector's report following the Examination

The formal adoption of the HED DPD

**Q12** If you have any other comments to make on the HED DPD that have not been covered elsewhere, please use the box below. *Please continue on a separate sheet if required.*

PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING STATEMENT

**Q13** Date of completion: 07/09/2018

**Q14** Signature

[Redacted signature area]

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this comments form, your comments are very much appreciated.  
If after reading the Guidance Notes you should have any queries in completing this form please telephone 01200 425111

**Q8**

In relation to this proposed change, please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the HED DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q6 above where this relates to soundness. Please restrict your answer to specific proposed changes.

You will need to say why this change will make the HED DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be precise as possible. *Please continue on a separate sheet if required.*

PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING STATEMENT

**Please note:** your comment should cover succinctly all the information, evidence, and supporting information necessary to support/justify the comment and the suggested change.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for Examination in the forthcoming Examination in Public.

**Q9**

**Participation at the Examination is at the discretion of the Inspector but please indicate below if you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination in connection with these representations.**

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I do wish to participate at the oral examination

### **OBJECTION TO ALLOCATIONS MM1 – MM5**

1. PWA Planning is retained to act on behalf of owners of land within the Ribble Valley Council area, and to provide comments to the Proposed Main Modifications: Additional Sites consultation (Regulation 22) of the Housing and Economic Development DPD (HEDDPD), together with the associated documents.
2. It is a requirement of the emerging DPD that it is able to meet in full the housing, employment and other identified needs of the Borough during the plan period. This needs to be achieved through its policies and particularly its land use allocations, including settlement boundaries. **At this stage we believe that the approach taken by the Council is unsound, as it is not at all clear that it will be effective in delivering the right amount of development in the right location.**
3. This in part is recognised within the Council's Regulation 22 document for the HED DPD submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination in Public (EIP) which states that *'within it were housing land allocations in Wilpshire and Mellor, the only settlements at that time requiring allocations'*. The justification for this was provided by the Core Strategy's overall Borough-wide requirement for housing at the time, and specific distribution to individual settlements as set out in Core Strategy Key Statement DS1 which had already been met by the Standen Strategic Site and a variety of planning permissions.
4. However, as previously stated, in the case of residential development, which makes up the largest likely land use allocation, the Council appears to believe that meeting only the minimum housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy is a correct way to plan for the future development of the Borough. This is evidenced by the fact that the Council were only seeking to identify those sites for which planning permission has been granted and which notionally would meet the minimum requirements, if all sites were developed entirely as planned. It is also clear from the fact that the Council is seeking new allocations in only a very small number of settlements.
5. Core Strategy policy sets the housing requirement as a minimum in order to ensure that additional development over and above the minimum is encouraged and is a sensible way to ensure that minimum requirements are exceeded.
6. It is clear from past evidence that approved housing schemes will not always deliver any or all of the housing anticipated in the expected timeframe and that much can change over the lifetime of the plan. Unless all approved housing sites deliver precisely as anticipated, it is clear that the policies of the DPD will fail to deliver the Core Strategy housing requirement.
7. This is now partly identified as being the case given the Council's most recent Housing Land Availability Report (published in July 2018), which now partly takes into account the matters identified in other appeal decision, most recently APP/T2350/W/17/3186969 (appended to this submission) issued on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2018 which confirms that the Council can currently only demonstrate at best a 4.7 year housing land supply. The Council's Housing Land Supply Report seeks to progress on the basis of a 5% buffer, despite the aforementioned appeal decision

confirming that 20% is the appropriate figure. Even by the Council's own figures, using the 20% buffer the Council confirm their supply to be only 4.6 years.

8. In partial recognition of this issue, the additional housing allocations in the consultation document seek to address some of this shortfall. The five new sites purport to provide a total of 210 dwellings, which would provide a 'surplus' of 50 dwellings above the bare minimum needing to be constructed over the next 5 years.
9. It is quite apparent that there is a need to increase the supply of available land to meet future housing requirements and to address the requirements set out in the Core Strategy. However, it is clearly inappropriate to limit this to a handful of sites that have not been adequately tested against other alternatives. By seeking to limit any public responses to only those sites identified in the document and hence by not allowing for full consideration and public comment on other potential sites, it is not clear that the plan can be said to have been ...

*"prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development"*  
(NPPF 2018 Paragraph 16)

10. In order to be found sound the plan also needs to be ...

- (a) **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- (b) **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- (c) **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
- (d) **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework.

(NPPF 2018 Paragraph 35)

11. The current consultation on a handful of proposed housing allocations clearly and fundamentally fails to meet criteria (b); it is not demonstrated that it is the appropriate strategy (individual sites) as these have not been objectively assessed against any reasonable alternatives. The Council acknowledges that the current proposals have resulted from a review of sites which were put forward as part of the earlier Regulation 18 and 19 consultations, but which were rejected as being unrelated to then suggested allocations. To then compile a list of sites based on these rejected objections provides no true objective assessment of all reasonable alternatives. In fact, the need to revisit these rejected objections demonstrates that the Council have got this approach wrong and the continued assertion that representations cannot relate to other sites than those being put forward compounds this situation. If, as seems likely, interested parties put forward alternative sites, the Council will summarily reject these as being inappropriate, yet may then revisit those representations some time later.

12. In order to rectify this matter, the Council needs to invite a new 'call for sites' and to allow suitable alternative sites to be properly assessed, based on clear and objective criteria. To do otherwise renders the plan unsound.

13. On this basis PWA Planning wish to put forward an additional site for further and just consideration. The site in question sits on the periphery of Barrow and adjoins land previously utilised as a garden centre which is currently being redevelopment as part of a major residential scheme. Consequently, the site in question therefore represents a logical progression for development and the applicant has previously engaged with the council as part of a formal pre-application submission (pre-app ref: RV/2016/ENQ/00207). Further details of the site are provided in the associated response form and an aerial image of the site is appended to this statement. The site is considered both deliverable and preferable to those already put forward by the council and as such requires detailed consideration and likely subsequent inclusion in the Authority's allocated housing sites.

**Appendices**

*Site Aerial Image*

*Appeal Ref. APP/T2350/W/17/3186969*

**Regulation 22 of the HEDDPD  
Proposed Main Modifications: Additional Housing Allocations**







---

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 17 April 2018

Site visits made on 17 April 2018 and 18 April 2018

by **Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 22 May 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/17/3186969**

**Land at Higher Road, Longridge**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by VH Land Partnership against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2016/1082, dated 17 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2017.
  - The development proposed is an outline planning application for residential development for up to 123 houses; demolition of an existing house (74 Higher Road) and formation of access to Higher Road.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outline planning application for residential development for up to 123 houses; demolition of an existing house (74 Higher Road) and formation of access to Higher Road at Land at Higher Road, Longridge in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2016/1082, dated 17 November 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

### Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all detailed matters other than means of access reserved for future approval. Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for later consideration and the appeal has been determined on that basis. The masterplan and illustrative material submitted with the planning application in so far as it relates to those matters has been taken into account for indicative purposes.
3. A signed and dated planning obligation by unilateral undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (UU) has been provided as part of this appeal. It includes obligations relating to affordable housing, off site leisure provision, highway and transport works and education. I consider the agreement in relation to the Regulatory tests of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in my decision.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development proposed would be consistent with the objectives of policies relating to the location and supply of housing.

## Reasons

### *Location and supply of housing*

5. The appeal site, except for No 74, is undeveloped land comprising a number of agricultural fields that lie adjacent to the edge of the built up area of Longridge, which includes the linear arrangement of houses adjoining the site that face Higher Road and Dilworth Lane. There is also a residential development immediately adjacent that is under construction which is accessed from Blackburn Road and also adjoins Dilworth Lane. The remaining site boundary adjoins Tan Yard Lane, a track and bridleway accessed from Blackburn Road with open fields and reservoirs immediately beyond. The submitted plans indicate that the development of up to 123 dwellings would include a new access from Higher Road which would utilise the land currently occupied by No 74 that is proposed to be demolished.
6. Key Statement DS1 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008 - 2028 - A Local Plan for Ribble Valley (CS), adopted December 2014, sets out the development strategy. It seeks to guide development to the most appropriate locations through the identification of groupings of settlements in a hierarchy based upon 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. In that context, Longridge is identified as one of three principal settlements which are the highest order settlements within the hierarchy where the majority of new housing development will be located.
7. The housing requirement set out in Key Statement H1 of the CS indicates that land for residential development will be made available to deliver 5,600 dwellings, estimated at an average annual completion target of at least 280 dwellings per year over the plan period. The supporting text to Key Statement DS1 at paragraph 4.11 and Appendix 2 of the CS include tables which identify the number of houses required for each settlement by 2028 to meet the housing requirement. The number to be delivered in Longridge is stated as 1,160 houses during the plan period, with a residual number of 633 houses remaining as at 31 March 2014<sup>1</sup> to meet that figure.
8. In seeking to deliver the above, the CS does not define an up-to-date settlement boundary for Longridge and Key Statement DS1 of the CS indicates that specific allocations will be made through the preparation of a separate allocations DPD. Consequently, the settlement boundaries currently utilised by the policies of the CS are those defined by the proposals map of the preceding Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan. During the Hearing it was confirmed by the parties that it is not a matter of dispute that the site is located outside of the existing settlement boundary of Longridge and therefore, lies within open countryside.
9. Policy DMG2 of the CS, indicates amongst other things, that development in the open countryside will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting. In that regard, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Takes account of completions/permissions granted up to 31 March 2014, plus a reapportionment of 200 houses to other settlements in Ribble Valley to reflect a planning permission granted near to Longridge for 200 units at Whittingham Lane within Preston Borough.

landscape sensitivity of the site and its surroundings is assessed as medium by a landscape visual impact assessment (LVIA) accompanying the application. To my mind that assessment in the LVIA appropriately reflects the higher sensitivity of the open countryside generally, but takes into account that the steeply sloped topography of the land is viewed against the backdrop of existing properties that face Higher Road and Dilworth Lane with the rural character at the edge of the built up area further eroded by development under construction immediately to the south. Although the site lies close to the boundaries of the Longridge Conservation Area and the Bowland Forest Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it has no influence on the special character and interest of those areas due to the presence of intervening built form and landscaping.

10. With regard to the above, the construction of dwellings on the site would result in built development on greenfield land that currently consists of largely open fields in agricultural use. However, it is evident that when taken together with the development under construction immediately to the south that there is some scope to absorb development adjoining the existing settlement boundary and provide a more robust boundary between the built up area and open countryside. In that context, both Key Statement DS1 and Policy DMG2 of the CS, when taken together, permit development proposals in the principal settlements, including Longridge, which accord with the development strategy and consolidate, expand or round-off development so that it is closely related to the main built area. Nonetheless, although the site adjoins the principal settlement of Longridge it lies outside of it and therefore, does not meet the precise wording of either Key Statement DS1 or Policy DMG2 which require development proposals to be in the principal settlements and, therefore, it would result in a consequent loss of open countryside. In that respect, there is also conflict with Policy DMH3 of the CS that relates to dwellings in the open countryside and which seeks to limit residential development to a closed list of exceptions and criteria, which the proposed development would not meet.
11. In reaching the above findings, it is evident that the conflict with the above policies and the Development Strategy relates specifically to the existing designation of land as open countryside. Concerns have been expressed with respect to the oversupply of housing that would result from the development relative to the residual numbers for Longridge in paragraph 4.11 and Appendix 2 of the CS. However, I find no harm in that respect as those numbers are not intended to be interpreted as a ceiling and can be exceeded in circumstances to provide flexibility to meet the local needs set out in the CS and where there is infrastructure capacity to deliver the development. The development is intended to contribute to meeting significant local needs in terms of affordable housing and older persons housing in accordance with the CS. Furthermore, there is no substantive evidence before me that local infrastructure, utilities, services and facilities could not accommodate the development, including when taken cumulatively with development nearby within the administrative area of Preston City Council, subject to planning obligations that are considered in detail later in this decision.
12. I have also taken into account that the emerging Ribble Valley Housing and Economic Development - Development Plan Document (HED DPD) was submitted in July 2017 and did not include the site within its proposed allocations or its settlement boundary for Longridge. However, as the examination in public has yet to take place and there are unresolved objections

to the document including the proposed settlement boundary, the emerging HED DPD is not an influential factor upon the above findings. In addition, the Longridge 2028 Neighbourhood Development Plan - Regulation 16 Submission Draft - January 2018 (NDP) was also provided during the Hearing. However, the emerging NDP does not currently include specific housing policies relating to land beyond the Longridge settlement boundary or policies that add to those that are relevant to the proposal in the CS. In any case, the NDP is at an early stage of preparation and consequently, I can afford little weight to it.

13. When having regard to all of the above, there is conflict with Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the CS and the associated objectives relating to the location of housing and the protection of the countryside. Nevertheless, to conclude on the main issue as a whole it is necessary to also assess the existing housing land supply position in Ribble Valley which I go onto to consider.

#### *Housing land supply in Ribble Valley*

14. In order to boost significantly the supply of housing, paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires local planning authorities to identify and update a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. Footnote 11 of paragraph 47 states that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development, and be achievable to ensure that housing will be delivered on site within five years.
15. During the Hearing, the appellant provided an up-to-date position<sup>2</sup> relative to the Council's Housing Land Availability Schedule - October 2017 (HLAS) which has a base date of 30 September 2017 for the calculation of housing supply and includes the shortfall of delivery during the plan period to date of 649 dwellings. In that respect, the appellant considers that the Council can demonstrate a housing land supply of approximately 4.3 years when including a 20% buffer relative to paragraph 47 of the Framework. The Council position in the HLAS as at September 2017 was a housing land supply of 5.9 years, including the application of a 5% buffer, the existing shortfall of delivery, 10% slippage applied to sites with planning permission that had not started and a windfall allowance.
16. The Council have subsequently provided an April 2018 update to the figures as at 30 September 2017 which reduced the expected yield from large sites within the five year land supply by 240 dwellings, thereby reducing the housing land supply to approximately 5.4 years, when including a 5% buffer, the shortfall of delivery in the plan period, 10% slippage applied to sites with planning permission not started and windfalls. Aside from the level of buffer to be applied in accordance with the Framework, the differences between the parties reflect the level of contribution from large sites with planning permission and proposed allocations in the emerging HED DPD. There is no dispute between the parties with respect to a windfall allowance of 115 dwellings in total and based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to take a different view in that regard.
17. The Council have justified the application of a 5% buffer, rather than a 20% buffer, on the basis that it accords with the approach of a 'housing

---

<sup>2</sup> Hearing document 5

delivery test' set out in a Government White Paper<sup>3</sup> that has been taken forward in the National Planning Policy Framework - draft text for consultation, March 2018, and associated draft updates to Planning Practice Guidance. The approach of the proposed housing delivery test suggests that a 20% buffer would not apply in circumstances where the completions over the last three years of the monitoring period exceed the identified housing requirement as set out in the development plan. In that respect, the housing delivery in Ribble Valley has exceeded the annual requirement set out in Key Statement H1 of the CS for the last three years. However, appeal decisions have been drawn to my attention at Dalton Heights, Seaham<sup>4</sup> and Lower Standen Hey Farm, Clitheroe<sup>5</sup> where Inspectors considered the application of methodologies subject to consultation to be premature.

18. I concur with those Inspector findings as although the methodology set out in the March 2018 consultations relating to the draft Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and associated Housing Delivery Test - Draft Measurement Rule Book indicate the Government's intent, it remains subject to consultation with no certainty that it will be formally adopted and implemented in its current form. In existing circumstances, the improved housing delivery rates in Ribble Valley between 1 April 2014 and 30 September 2017 should not prevail over the longer period of persistent under-delivery of housing that was significantly below the annual requirement during each year between April 2008 and March 2014. The adoption of the CS has had an influence upon the recent increase in housing delivery rates, but the longer period of under-delivery has resulted in a considerable shortfall of housing delivery in Ribble Valley during the first half of the plan period that in total is more than two years of the annualised requirement in Key Statement H1. I, therefore, consider that there is a persistent record of under-delivery of housing in Ribble Valley and a 20% buffer should be applied to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.
19. The application of a 20% buffer, rather than a 5% buffer, to the Council's updated position submitted prior to the Hearing results in a housing land supply of approximately 4.7 years. The remaining differences between the parties relate to the contribution of a list of disputed sites submitted as part of the appeal that I deal with in turn below.
20. *Higher Standen Farm*. The site is under construction by a single developer and the Council's figures of 200 dwellings to be delivered within five years are derived from a delivery rate of 20 dwellings in year 1, with a delivery rate of 45 dwellings per annum in the remaining years. During the Hearing, the Council have indicated that commencements have been recorded in the half year to date, but with no completions so far. Based on the evidence before me, the delivery rate applied by the Council is at the upper end of the range provided by the developer which was 40 - 45 dwellings per annum. In that respect, whilst the delivery of 20 dwellings in the first year may be achievable, the 45 dwellings per annum in the remaining years appears overly optimistic when compared with delivery rates experienced in Ribble Valley on most other sites with a single developer. I, therefore, consider the lower delivery rate of 40 dwellings per annum to be a more reasonable forecast for years 2 - 5.

---

<sup>3</sup> Fixing our Broken Housing Market, February 2017

<sup>4</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/X1355/W/16/3165490 - 29 September 2017

<sup>5</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/17/3174924 - 25 October 2017

Based on the evidence before me, the contribution from this site is more likely to be in the region of around 180 dwellings in the five year period.

21. *Land South West and West of Whalley Road, Barrow.* The site is under construction in two phases and the parties reached an agreement prior to the Hearing that the site would contribute 150 dwellings during the plan period at an annual delivery rate of 30 dwellings per annum, which is lower than the Council forecast in the HLAS. Based upon the evidence before me, I have no reason to take a different view to the parties and consider that the contribution from this site is likely to be around 150 dwellings in the five year period.
22. *Land off Waddington Road, Clitheroe.* The site has outline planning permission and a reserved matters application has been submitted to, but has yet to be determined by the Council. During the Hearing it was confirmed that the Council's figures of 110 dwellings to be delivered within five years are based upon a delivery rate provided by a developer that is no longer proceeding, with anticipated completions in year 2 (2018/19) of 20 dwellings and a delivery rate of 30 dwellings per annum in the remaining years. In the circumstances, I consider that the Council's lead in times for commencement on site and completions are now overly optimistic. The appellant's lead in time of 24 months (from September 2017) for a new developer to receive approval for reserved matters, discharge the requirements of conditions and commence on site, with a delivery rate of 15 dwellings in the third year and 30 dwellings in each of the remaining years appears a more reasonable and realistic outcome. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, the contribution from this site is likely to be around 75 dwellings in the five year period.
23. *East of Clitheroe Road, Whalley - Lawsonsteads.* The site has reserved matters approval, but the Council since October 2017 have subsequently revised down the figures to 105 dwellings to be delivered within five years due to infrastructure constraints associated with Phase 1 that have delayed commencement of development on this site. During the Hearing, it was confirmed by the parties that the original developer is no longer proceeding and whilst a new developer has expressed interest it would likely necessitate a full application that has yet to be submitted to overcome existing drainage issues. In the circumstances, I consider that the Council's lead in times are overly optimistic. The appellant's lead in times of 24 months (from September 2017) for a new developer to obtain its own planning permission, overcome infrastructure constraints and commence on site, with a delivery rate of 15 dwellings in the third year and 30 dwellings each of the remaining years appears a more reasonable and realistic outcome. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, the contribution from this site is likely to be around 75 dwellings in the five year period.
24. *Land east of Chipping Lane, Longridge.* Based upon the evidence before me, the site has outline consent, with reserved matters consent for phase 1 comprising 118 dwellings that has commenced and a full planning permission granted for phase 2. The Council figures of 150 dwellings to be delivered within five years are based upon a delivery rate of 30 dwellings per annum in each year. During the Hearing, the Council indicated that commencements have been recorded in the half year to date, but with no completions so far. In the circumstances, I consider that a delivery rate of 30 dwellings in the first year is overly optimistic and a forecast of 15 dwellings in the first year, with 30 dwellings in each subsequent year would be a more reasonable and realistic

outcome. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, the contribution from this site is likely to be around 135 dwellings in the five year period.

25. *Land north of Dilworth Lane, Longridge.* The site is under construction and the Council's figures of 171 dwellings to be delivered within five years reflect the build out of the remainder of the site during the five year period. During the Hearing, the Council confirmed that 24 completions were recorded in the previous year with a further 10 completions having been recorded since October 2017 with commencements having also taken place. The appellants indicated that their own figures based upon 30 dwellings per annum should be revised down to match the lower delivery rate in the previous year resulting in a total contribution of 120 dwellings during the five years. However, when taking account of the evidence of the build out rates within the site to date and the fluctuations that can occur between each year, I consider that the application of a delivery rate of 30 dwellings per annum would be a more reasonable and realistic figure as an average that would be achievable across the five year period. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, the contribution from this site is likely to be around 150 dwellings in the five year period.
26. *Preston Road, Longridge.* The site has planning permission with the developer expected to start on site in July 2018. The Council's figures reflect no delivery in year 1 (2017/18) with a delivery rate of 30 dwellings in years 2-5, whilst the appellant indicated that due to lead in times delivery should only be expected in years 3-5. I consider that the middle ground between those figures would be realistic in year 2, with a build out rate of 15 dwellings to reflect the lead in times from anticipated commencement late in year 1 to the first completions in year 2, with delivery of 30 dwellings per annum in the remaining years. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, the contribution from this site is likely to be around 105 dwellings in the five year period.
27. *Sites allocated in the emerging HED DPD.* The proposed allocations within the submitted version of the emerging HED DPD are Land at Mellor Lane (HAL1) which contributes 15 dwellings to the Council figures and Land at Wilpshire (HAL2) which contributes 35 dwellings.
28. The allocations remain subject to objections and do not have planning permission, but were subject to a site selection process as part of the preparation of the HED DPD prior to its submission. The Council confirmed during the Hearing that there are no constraints to the delivery of HAL1 and no contrary evidence was provided. In that respect, I am satisfied that given the scale of the site, a developer would be capable of obtaining planning permission, commencing on site and building out HAL1 at the level indicated in the Council figures during the five year period.
29. With respect to HAL2, I observed that there are overhead power lines with a pylon located close to the access to the site, but I am satisfied that it would not preclude delivery given that there are existing dwellings nearby and a road that has already been built close to the pylon. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the Council's nominal capacity for the site incorporates reasonable deductions to reflect any reduction in developable area associated with the constraint of overhead power lines. Consequently, given the scale of the site, there is no substantive evidence before me which indicates that a developer would be incapable of obtaining planning permission, commencing on site and building

out HAL2 at the level indicated within the Council figures during the five year period. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, the contribution from HAL1 and HAL2 is likely to be around 50 dwellings in the five year period as indicated by the Council.

30. When having regard to my above findings with respect to the disputed sites, the Council's housing land supply is reduced by a further 136 dwellings in total during the five year period. As a consequence, I find that on the basis of the evidence before me the deliverable housing land supply demonstrated is approximately 4.5 years, including the application of a 20% buffer, the existing shortfall of delivery, 10% slippage applied to sites with planning permission not started and a windfall allowance, in accordance with the Framework. In that respect, even if the Council's predictions relating to some of the sites prove to be more accurate, it would not significantly alter the housing land supply position and would only marginally reduce the shortfall within the range of 4.5 years and a maximum of 4.7 years of deliverable housing land supply.
31. Having regard to all of the above, I conclude that the development would conflict with Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the CS in terms of their objectives relating to the location and supply of housing. However, the restrictions in those policies are not consistent with national policy objectives in the Framework to boost significantly the supply of housing in circumstances where a five-year supply of housing land has not been demonstrated and therefore, they are not up-to-date. In that respect, to conclude on the compliance of the proposal with the development plan and the Framework as a whole as part of the planning balance, it is necessary to firstly consider any other matters that are relevant to the proposal.

### **Other Matters**

#### *Highway and pedestrian safety*

32. The effect of the proposal on highway and pedestrian safety is not a matter contested by the Council. The Framework advises that development should only be prevented where the residual cumulative impacts are severe. The highway authority is satisfied that the additional traffic arising from the development could be accommodated on Higher Road and the surrounding highway network without a severe impact. This would be subject to certain measures, such as the formation of the new access following the demolition of No 74. It would also require contributions to and delivery of specific highway improvements including traffic calming measures on Higher Road and upgrades to the junctions and pedestrian crossings at Preston Road-Chapel Hill, Preston Road-Kestor Lane and the Longridge Road roundabout, together with public transport upgrades and off site contributions to walk routes and cycling (linked to the emerging NDP) as listed in Schedule 4 of the UU. Based on the evidence before me and my observations of the site and its surroundings at different times of the day, I have no reason to take a different view to those of the highway authority.
33. With regard to the above, the Council and the highway authority have also raised no objection with respect to the proposed access, its layout and agreed visibility splays and sight lines, subject to the new footpath connections and alterations proposed to each side of the access as referred to in Schedule 4 of the UU. Based on the evidence before me and my observations, I have no



reason to take a different view and consider that the proposal would ensure that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people.

34. In reaching the above findings I have taken into account the concerns expressed by interested parties in terms of existing parking arrangements and access for emergency vehicles on Higher Road, particularly at its narrowest point near the Club Row terraces where I observed that on-street parking is at its most prevalent but passing places were still available. In that respect, the development would not increase the demand for on-street parking or increase traffic flows on Higher Road to an extent that existing highway conditions and parking arrangements would be significantly altered or worsened. I am satisfied, therefore, that the development would not have a detrimental impact upon highway safety or preclude access for emergency vehicles, which is capable of being secured within the site as part of the detailed site layout to be submitted as part of the reserved matters.

#### *Living conditions*

35. The masterplan and illustrative material submitted with the planning application demonstrate that adequate separation distances to neighbouring properties facing Higher Road, Dilworth Lane and the on-going development immediately adjacent could be achieved to preserve the living conditions of their occupiers and future occupiers of the development in terms of outlook and privacy. Existing views from the rear elevations and rear gardens of the adjoining properties facing Higher Road and Dilworth Lane would be affected by the development. However, that is generally the case with development on the edge of an existing settlement. A well-designed and appropriately landscaped development would be capable of limiting the perception of the site being suburbanised, whilst providing a suitable outlook for occupiers of neighbouring properties around the site. I am satisfied that the detailed issues in those respects could be appropriately addressed through the reserved matters relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, taking account of the variations in topography.
36. The proposed access road between Nos. 70 and 76 would increase the noise and activity experienced by occupiers of those properties. However, I do not consider that the extent of those effects would result in significant harm or disturbance to their existing living conditions. In reaching that view, I have taken into account that potential mitigation measures could be provided at reserved matters stage or by condition, such as appropriate use of land levels for the access relative to the slab levels of surrounding properties, additional landscaping buffers and acoustic fencing. The construction phase could also be suitably controlled to prevent unacceptable impacts in terms of noise and disturbance through the agreement of a Construction Method Statement.
37. Interested parties have also expressed concerns with respect to the impact on property values. However, it is a well-established principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests such as the value of land and property. The issue of restrictive covenants relating to the site has also been raised. However, I see no reason why the grant of planning permission would supersede any private legal rights relating to land ownership or a leaseholding. Consequently, those matters fall outside of my jurisdiction and have not had any material bearing on my assessment of the planning issues in this appeal.

*Ecology, trees and open space*

38. The Ecological Appraisal submitted with the application found no substantive evidence of any protected species within the site or the surrounding area that would be adversely affected by the development. Based upon the evidence before me, I have no reason to take a different view. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the compensatory planting, habitat enhancement and precautionary measures identified relating to amphibians, bats, badgers, nesting birds, brown hares, invertebrates and reptiles would be suitable and could be secured through conditions, and the detailed site layout and landscaping submissions as part of the reserved matters. I, therefore, find that the development would not have an adverse impact upon ecology and biodiversity.
39. The Tree Report submitted with the application indicates that the masterplan and illustrative details that accompanied the application could require the removal of one high quality tree, two moderate quality trees, one low quality tree and three low quality groups within the site. Additionally, it indicates that five trees and one group located within the site are considered unsuitable for retention for reasons unrelated to the development. However, the layout and landscaping proposals are illustrative and the specific details remain subject to a reserved matters submission. In that regard, I am satisfied that the detailed submissions could suitably incorporate existing high and moderate quality trees within the site, together with the trees and hedgerows along the site boundary and those located on neighbouring land with crown overhangs or root protection areas within the site. Tree protection measures in those respects can be secured by condition. In addition, the landscaping within the site would be capable of including extensive new tree and hedge planting to adequately compensate for any loss of lower quality trees within the site.
40. The detailed provision of public open space within the site, including useable spaces, natural play spaces, pedestrian footpath links and cycle routes, can be secured as part of the reserved matters and conditions in accordance with the illustrative details within the masterplan accompanying the application, including potential links to the Longridge Loop as set out in the emerging NDP. The public open space provision in that respect would have wider recreational benefits to the Longridge area given that the site has no public access at present, even though the primary purpose would be to meet policy requirements.

*Drainage and flood risk*

41. The development would not be at unacceptable risk of flooding or increase the risk of flooding to surrounding properties, subject to the suitability of the detailed site layout as part of the reserved matters, together with foul and surface water drainage measures, including sustainable drainage systems (SuDs). Those drainage details are capable of being secured by conditions.

*Planning obligation and infrastructure*

42. There is a signed and completed UU. As previously mentioned, it requires the appellant to deliver affordable housing (30% affordable housing provision and 15% of the overall number of dwellings on site for occupation by those over 55 years of age, with half in the affordable provision) as set out in Schedule 1. It would also make the following contributions towards improving local

infrastructure that would serve the development: an off site leisure contribution to be paid relative to the reserved matters in accordance with occupancy ratios set out in Schedule 1, education contributions calculated in accordance with primary and secondary places as set out in Schedule 3 and Appendix 1 of the UU, highways and transport works and contributions specified in Schedule 4.

43. Having regard to the above and based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the proposed contributions are necessary, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development in accordance with CIL Regulation 122 and paragraph 204 of the Framework, given the precise financial contributions are dependent upon calculations relative to the details that come forward as part of the reserved matters. I have, therefore, attached weight to them in my decision. In reaching such a view, I have taken into account that there are minor typographical issues within the UU agreement relating to the off site works proposed on Higher Road in Schedule 4(2) and 4(7). However, I am satisfied that such matters would not prevent the implementation of the planning obligation given that those off site highway works and walking routes are also supported by specific details in associated plans that are before me.
44. It is not contested by the Council that the development would have a harmful effect upon existing infrastructure, subject to the planning obligations in the UU. In that respect, I also observed that the development would be within walking distance of a wide range of local services and facilities within Longridge. Furthermore, there is no substantive evidence before me which indicates that the available services, facilities and utilities would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate demand arising from the development beyond those that require planning obligations as set out in the UU.

### **Planning Balance**

45. The Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The proposal is not in accordance with Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the CS in so far as they are relevant to the location and supply of housing and the protection of the countryside. Whilst the Council decision notice also refers to conflict with Key Statement DS2 of the CS it is a broad repetition of paragraphs 11 and 14 of the Framework and the planning balance necessary where conflict with the development plan is identified. Proposed development which conflicts with the development plan should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. In that respect as the Council cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing supply, the relevant policies for the location and supply of housing are out-of-date through the operation of paragraph 49 and 215 of the Framework. Paragraph 14 of the Framework is, therefore, engaged.
46. Paragraph 14 of the Framework states that for decision making this means where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.
47. There are economic and social benefits arising from the provision of up to 122 additional homes including the potential for delivery of affordable housing and accommodation for over 55s to meet local needs in an accessible location,

which are important considerations that carry significant weight. There would also be associated economic benefits in terms of job creation during construction and support for local services and facilities after occupation, which carry significant weight based on the scale of the development proposed. Furthermore, considerable weight is given to the contribution which the appeal proposal would make to significantly boosting the supply of housing, where the supply of housing in Ribble Valley is constrained due to an inability to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, with a 0.5 year shortfall having been identified. In that respect, the proposal would contribute to a clear need for more market, affordable and older persons housing to be delivered in Ribble Valley. Based upon my findings, the scale of the development would not fully address the shortfall to an extent that a deliverable five year supply of housing land would be demonstrated. Nonetheless, the contribution to meeting housing need is significant and is afforded considerable weight.

48. The development would result in a loss of open countryside. However, given that the site is already mostly enclosed by development on three sides with varied topography, I have found no significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, landscape character and visual amenity, including views from neighbouring properties and a nearby bridleway, subject to the details of the reserved matters. There would also be no unacceptable impact in terms of highway safety, the living environment for future residents, the living conditions of existing residents, ecology and trees, and drainage that could not be resolved by the imposition of suitable conditions.
49. Having regard to the above, the adverse impacts of allowing this appeal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole. In that respect, there are also no specific policies in the Framework which indicate that the development should be restricted. The proposal constitutes sustainable development when assessed against the Framework as a whole. Consequently, I find that there are material considerations which indicate that the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan and planning permission, therefore, should be granted.

### **Conditions**

50. I have had regard to the planning conditions that have been suggested by the Council. Where necessary I have reordered the conditions, amended the wording to ensure consistency with paragraph 206 of the Framework and consolidated the conditions where possible.
51. Conditions 1 - 5 relate to the submission of reserved matters, timescales, phasing, provide certainty of the outline permission granted and require compliance with approved details, design principles and parameters which are necessary. In that respect, conditions 6 and 7 necessarily restrict the height of any dwellings to not exceed two storeys in height and require full details of proposed ground levels and building finished floor levels in any subsequent reserved matters. Those conditions are required in the interest of the character and appearance of the area, to ensure that the development responds appropriately to the topography of the land and to preserve the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
52. Conditions 8 and 9 necessarily require the submission of full details of proposed surface water attenuation ponds and other water bodies on the site, and works

for disposal of foul water and sewage, as part of the reserved matters. Condition 10 requires full details of boundary treatments to be erected within the site and is necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of future occupiers and occupiers of neighbouring properties and to assess wildlife movement as part of the reserved matters. Condition 11 requires full details of proposed play areas and play equipment as part of the reserved matters which is necessary to ensure acceptable and adequate forms of useable public open space.

53. Condition 12 relates to the submission and approval of a detailed scheme for the construction of the pedestrian and vehicular site accesses, together with a retaining structure adjacent to the site access. The pre-commencement condition is required in the interest of highway and pedestrian safety and it is necessary that the development is carried out in strict accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of a dwelling.
54. Conditions 13 and 14 are pre-commencement conditions that are necessary to secure full details of precautionary ecology measures mentioned previously relative to the full details of any subsequent reserved matters approval. Condition 15 is a pre-commencement condition for each phase that secures a Construction Method Statement which I consider is necessary to preserve the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of noise and disturbance.

### **Conclusion**

55. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

*Gareth Wildgoose*

INSPECTOR

## SCHEDULE

### CONDITIONS

- 1) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced on any phase (as referred to in Condition 3) until full details of the layout, scale and appearance of the buildings and landscaping within that phase (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.  
  
In relation to landscaping, the details for each phase shall include: the types and numbers of trees and shrubs to be planted, their distribution on site, those areas to be seeded, turfed, paved or hard landscaped, including details of any changes of level or landform, full specifications of all boundary treatments and a scheme of maintenance, including long term design objectives. The submitted landscape details shall take full account of the mitigation measures as contained within the submitted Ecological Appraisal (Report Ref: 3089 V1).
- 2) Application(s) for approval of all of the outstanding reserved matters related to the consent hereby approved 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 latter 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.
- 3) The submission of reserved matters relating to layout shall be accompanied by a phasing scheme, including the parcels which shall be the subject of separate reserved matters applications (where applicable), for the approval in writing by the local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt the submitted information shall include anticipated commencement dates and annual delivery rates of housing for each phase or parcel of development.
- 4) The details in respect of the submission of any reserved matters shall be in accordance with the design principles and parameters as set out in the following documentation:
  - RF15-293-IN03-02: Green Infrastructure and Character document (February 2017)
  - Masterplan SK10 (February 2017)
  - Indicative Site Sections (February 2017)
  - Movement Framework (February 2017)
- 5) No more than 123 dwellings shall be developed within the application site edged red on the submitted Red Line Boundary Plan (VHLP/7782/2194/01 Rev: A).
- 6) Notwithstanding the submitted details, the height of any of the dwellings proposed in any subsequent reserved matters application(s) shall not exceed two storeys in height.

- 7) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be accompanied by full details of existing and proposed ground levels and proposed building finished floor levels (all relative to ground levels adjoining the site) including the levels of the proposed roads.

For the avoidance of doubt, the submitted information shall include existing and proposed sections through the site including details of the height, scale and location of proposed housing in relation to adjacent existing development/built form (where applicable). The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

- 8) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be accompanied by full details of the proposed surface water attenuation ponds and all other water bodies on the site. Before any details are submitted to the local planning authority, an assessment of site conditions shall be carried out having regard to Defra's non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (or any subsequent version), and the results of the assessment shall have been provided to the local planning authority. The submitted details shall as a minimum:

- a) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the methods to be employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures to be taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- b) include a timetable for its implementation; and,
- c) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

For the avoidance of doubt, the submitted information shall also include existing and proposed sections through each pond including relevant existing and proposed land levels and details of all associated landscaping and boundary treatments, together with means of access for maintenance and easements where applicable. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, and subsequently maintained in strict accordance with the approved details.

- 9) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be accompanied by full details relating to works for the disposal of foul water and sewage. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, and subsequently maintained in strict accordance with the approved details.
- 10) Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be accompanied by elevational and locational details including the height and appearance of all boundary treatments, fencing, walling, retaining wall structures and gates to be erected within the development.

For the avoidance of doubt, the submitted details shall include the precise nature and location for the provision of measures to maintain and enhance wildlife movement within and around the site by virtue of the inclusion of suitable sized gaps/corridors at ground level. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

- 11) Applications for the approval of reserved matters, where relevant, shall be accompanied by full details of all proposed play areas and associated play equipment.

For the avoidance of doubt, the submitted details shall include the specification and nature of all proposed surfacing, informal/formal play equipment and details of existing and proposed land levels and all associated landscaping and boundary treatments where applicable, including timescales for delivery. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

- 12) Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development, including any site preparation, demolition, scrub/hedgerow clearance or tree works/removal shall commence or be undertaken on site until a scheme for the construction of the pedestrian and vehicular site accesses, together with a retaining structure adjacent to the site access, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling.

For the avoidance of doubt, the submitted details shall also include the precise nature and design of all pedestrian/cycleway accesses into and out of the site including details of their interface with existing pedestrian/cycle routes or networks.

- 13) Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development, including any site preparation, demolition, scrub/hedgerow clearance or tree works/removal shall commence or be undertaken on site until details of the provisions to be made for building dependent species of conservation concern, artificial bird nesting boxes and artificial bat roosting sites have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

For the avoidance of doubt, the details shall be submitted on a dwelling/building dependent bird/bat species 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 during the construction of those individual dwellings identified on the submitted plan and be made available for use before each such dwelling is occupied, and thereafter retained. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

- 14) Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development, including any site preparation, demolition, scrub/hedgerow clearance or tree works/removal shall commence or be undertaken on site until details of a package of proposed mitigation measures, as outlined in Section 6 of the approved Ecological Appraisal (Report Ref: 3089 V1) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

For the avoidance of doubt the mitigation shall include, but be limited to the provision for bat and bird boxes, the improvement of existing hedgerow, creation of refugia/hibernacula/habitat features and bee and wasp nest boxes. The submitted details shall include the timing and phasing for the



creation/installation of mitigation features and a scheme for future management and maintenance where applicable. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

15) No development shall take place within a phase (pursuant to condition 3 of this consent) until a Construction Method Statement for the relevant phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt the submitted statement shall provide details of:

- a) The location of parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- b) The location for the loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) The location of storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- d) The locations of security hoarding
- e) The location and nature of wheel washing facilities to prevent mud and stones/debris being carried onto the Highway (For the avoidance of doubt, such facilities shall remain in place for the duration of the construction phase of the development) and the timings/frequencies of mechanical sweeping of the adjacent roads/highway
- f) Periods when plant and materials trips should not be made to and from the site (mainly peak hours but the developer to identify times when trips of this nature should not be made)
- g) Days and hours of operation for all construction works.
- h) Details of good practice and management measures to be employed during the development, including the identification of suitable of suitable highway routes for plant and material deliveries to and from the site, and measures to ensure that construction and delivery vehicles do not impede access to and from the site.

The approved statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period of the development.

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Peter Vernon (Did not attend site visit)	VH Land Partnerships
Gary Hoerty	Gary Hoerty Associates Ltd
Kieran Howarth (Did not attend site visit)	Gary Hoerty Associates Ltd

### **FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

Colin Hirst (Did not attend site visit)	Ribble Valley Borough Council
Rachel Horton	Ribble Valley Borough Council
Stephen Kilmartin	Ribble Valley Borough Council

### **INTERESTED PARTIES:**

Kenneth Cooper	Local Resident
Brian Holden	Local Resident
Anthony Ingham (Did not attend site visit)	Local Resident
John Murphy	Local Resident

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING**

- 1 Planning Obligation by Unilateral Undertaking dated 16 April 2018
- 2 Updated 5 year housing land position provided by the appellant
- 3 Written statement from Mr Cooper
- 4 Written statement from Mr Murphy
- 5 Written statement from Mr Holden
- 6 Written statement from Mr Ingham
- 7 Longridge 2028 - Neighbourhood Development Plan - Regulation 16 Submission Draft, January 2018
- 8 Appeal decision - APP/T2350/W/17/3174924
- 9 Letter from Indigo Planning to Council dated 13 April 2018 - Draft Allocation (HAL2) in submission version of the Housing and Economic Development - Development Plan Document

**DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING (BY AGREEMENT)**

- 1 Indicative Site Sections (February 2017) upon which the Council made its decision
- 2 Movement Framework (February 2017) upon which the Council made its decision
- 3 E-mail update received from the Council on 20 April 2018 relating to the dates for the Examination in Public of the HED DPD

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PH.D. PROGRAM IN CHEMISTRY

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

1155 CHEMISTRY BUILDING

5808 S. UNIVERSITY AVE.

CHICAGO, IL 60637

TEL: 773-936-3200

FAX: 773-936-3200

WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

ADMISSIONS@CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637

CHICAGO, IL 60637