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Appendix 1  Appeal Decision - New Road, Wrenbury, Nantwich, Cheshire (APP/R0660/A/11/2152783).
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2011

by Claire Sherratt  DipURP MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 September 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/A/11/2152793
New Road, Wrenbury, Nantwich, Cheshire CW5 8HF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by McInerney Homes against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
- The application Ref 11/0041N, dated 5 January 2011, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2011.
- The development proposed is 14 two-storey affordable dwellings.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 14 two-storey affordable dwellings at New Road, Wrenbury, Nantwich, Cheshire in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref Ref 11/0041N, dated 5 January 2011, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule of Conditions attached.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by McInerney Homes against Cheshire East Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the site is suitable for affordable housing in principle.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is outside the settlement boundary of Wrenbury, in open countryside, where new housing would normally be resisted. Policy RES.8 of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011 (LP) relates to the provision of affordable housing in rural areas, outside settlement boundaries, to meet specific and identified local needs and where a number of other criteria are met. These include that the site is in a sustainable location, immediately adjacent to an existing settlement boundary and the scale, layout and design of the scheme is appropriate to the character of the settlement.

5. There is no dispute between the main parties that there is a need for affordable housing in Wrenbury. A Unilateral Undertaking accompanies the appeal submission, dated 18 August 2011, that would ensure that the development comprises 14 affordable houses, transferred to a Registered Provider, to be used for rental units, rent to buy or shared ownership and occupied by those with a proven need for accommodation based on a cascading scale. Although some interested parties have disputed the extent of local need for affordable housing, the various surveys relied upon are the most up to date and best
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evidence of need for affordable housing currently available. Based on this
evidence, and notwithstanding any redevelopment at Sandfield Court, I am
satisfied that a need for affordable housing in Wrenbury exists.

6. The appeal site is separated from the settlement boundary to the north east of
the site by an intervening piece of land currently used as a paddock. The
settlement boundary extends broadly southwards to incorporate a linear
pattern of properties along the east side of New Road. The appeal site is
immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary where the boundary of the
site abuts New Road opposite these existing properties. It is therefore
immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary along New Road. It will not
extend the village beyond the existing line of properties. The intervening
paddock does not divorce the site from the village to such an extent that it
would appear isolated.

7. The appeal site is within easy walking distance of a reasonable range of
facilities in the village. I recognise that there is no footpath along New Road.
However, it is a relatively short stretch of road and in a location where vehicles
are reducing speed in a built up area. Inter-visibility between pedestrians and
traffic is good. The scale, layout and design of the scheme are not areas of
dispute between the main parties. Some of the dwellings would have frontages
facing towards New Road, providing an active frontage and reflecting the linear
pattern of development opposite. I find no conflict with LP Policy RES.8.

8. The proposal involves the development of a greenfield site. However the
Council is concerned that if approved, the appeal proposal would prejudice the
development of a brownfield site that may be suitable for development.
Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) 'Housing' encourages the development of
brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites. An application has been
made for the development of a brownfield site on land at the Former Goods
Yard off Station Road which has been vacant for some time. However, this
brownfield site is also outside the village settlement boundary and is not
allocated as an exception site in the Local Plan. I have not been referred to
any other document that has been subject to consultation that identifies the
Station Road site as an identified and sequentially preferable site for affordable
housing following an appraisal of potential sites. The application has not yet
been determined. Indeed it had not been validated at the time the Committee
refused the application at New Road. The planning merits of the site have not
therefore been considered and it is unclear whether it is a suitable and
deliverable site. It can not be relied upon as contributing to the local housing
needs identified at this time.

9. In relation to affordable housing in rural communities, PPS3 encourages the
use of a Rural Exception Site Policy to enable small sites to be used, specifically
for affordable housing in small rural communities that would not normally be
used for housing because, for example, they are subject to policies of restraint.
These are the circumstances applicable to this appeal and I find no conflict
between national policies and LP Policy RES.8.

10. LP policies seek to protect the best agricultural land, classified as grade 1, 2 or
3a. The appeal site has been classified as grade 4 bordering grade 3. As such
the development of the site would not result in the loss of best agricultural
land. The traffic generated by the development would not be so significant as
to impact unduly on highway safety on the surrounding network of roads. I am
mindful that the highway authority has raised no objections to the
development. Satisfactory living conditions would be secured for both existing and proposed occupiers of the site. The use of suitable materials and landscaping would ensure that the development would preserve the setting of the nearby conservation area.

11. I have taken account of the views of local residents and other interested parties in reaching this decision. I have also had regard to the Consultation Draft National Planning Policy Framework that was issued recently. However, as the consultation process may result in changes, it only carries limited weight at this stage. Overall, the appeal development does not conflict with relevant development plan policies.

12. A number of conditions were suggested by the Council should I allow the appeal. I agree that conditions would be required to ensure that the development integrates satisfactorily with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and conservation area. Details of materials to be used, landscaping, boundary treatments and removal of permitted development rights for extensions and ancillary buildings would all ensure a satisfactory scheme that integrates with the surrounding area. To protect wildlife, wildlife mitigation measures should be included in the scheme together with restrictions on the removal of part of the frontage hedge (to provide an access to the site) during the nesting season and the provision of artificial nests. In the interests of highway safety the construction details of the access and all roads within the site shall be agreed and the provision of parking, turning and servicing facilities is necessary prior to the first occupation of the site. Drainage details should also be approved to ensure that foul and surface water is satisfactorily disposed of.

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Claire Sherratt
INSPECTOR
Schedule of Conditions

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: WREN/LOC/01 (Site Location Plan), MINW/013 (Topographical Survey), WRENbury/5K09 (Planning Layout), WRENbury/SLAB/01 (Proposed Slab levels), WRENbury/284P/01 (2 Bed 4 person), WRENbury/284PAspect/01, WRENbury/385P/01 (3 Bed 5 Person), WRENbury/BLOCK/01 (Block Elevations), WRENbury/STREET/01 (Proposed Streetscenes).

3) No development shall commence until details or samples of all external materials and finishes to be used in the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place except in complete accordance with the approved details.

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no extensions or ancillary buildings shall be erected (other than as shown on the plans approved as part of this planning permission) unless a further planning permission has first been granted following an application to the Local Planning Authority.

5) No development shall commence until full constructional details of the proposed highway access and all roads to be provided within the application site have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval. No development shall be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority has first agreed to any variation in writing.

6) No development shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping for the site indicating inter alia the positions of all existing trees and hedgerows within and around the site, indications of any to be retained together with measures for their protection during the course of development, also the number, species, heights on planting and positions of all additional trees, shrubs and bushes to be planted. The scheme shall also include a management method statement for the completed landscaping. No development shall be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority has first agreed to any variation in writing.

7) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the landscaping scheme die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.
8) No development shall commence until a scheme of boundary treatment for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include native hedges and post and rail fencing to field boundaries and brick walls to courtyard areas. The approved scheme of boundary treatment shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

9) No development shall commence until details of a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water from the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the scheme of foul and/or surface water disposal has been implemented in accordance with the approved details.

10) No development shall take place except in complete accordance with the recommendations and wildlife mitigation measures set out in the report by TEP dated November 2010 submitted with the planning application.

11) Prior to any commencement of hedgerow removal works between 1st March and 31st August in any year, a detailed survey shall be carried out to check for nesting birds. Where nests are found in any hedgerow, tree or scrub to be, a 4m exclusion zone shall be left around the nest until breeding is complete. Completion of nesting shall be confirmed by a suitably qualified person and a report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

12) Prior to the commencement of development detailed proposals for the incorporation of features into the scheme suitable for use by breeding birds shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The features shall be permanently installed in accordance with approved details prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted.

13) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the parking, turning and servicing facilities shown on the approved drawings shall be constructed and made available for use. These areas shall be reserved exclusively for the parking and turning of vehicles and shall not be obstructed in any way.
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2011

by Claire Sherratt  DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 September 2011

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/A/11/2152793
New Road, Wrenbury, Nantwich, Cheshire CW5 8HF
- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
- The application is made by McInerney Homes for a full award of costs against Cheshire East Council.
- The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for 14 two storey affordable dwellings.

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is allowed in the terms set out below.

Reasons

2. The relevant Committee refused permission contrary to the advice of its own professional Officers. Circular 03/2009 confirms that if Officer’s professional or technical advice is not followed, authorities will need to show reasonable planning grounds for taking a contrary decision and produce relevant evidence on appeal to support the decision in all respects. If they fail to do so, costs may be awarded against the authority.

3. The crux of the application for an award of costs is that the Council failed to produce evidence to substantiate its reason for refusal in relation to the reliance placed and in terms of the proximity of the site with the settlement boundary.

4. In refusing the application, the Council placed reliance on the availability of a brownfield site, referred to as the Station Yard site, as a preferable alternative site. However, this is not a site allocated for development in the Local Plan. Nor is it identified in any other specific to the village that has identified preferred sites following a consultation exercise. An outline application to develop the Station Yard site had not been validated when the Committee reached its decision. Indeed that remained the case at the time that the statements were exchanged by the parties and final comments made. As such the planning merits of the case and its suitability for affordable housing had not been considered. Like the appeal site, it is outside the settlement boundary, in open countryside, and will therefore need to be assessed accordingly as a rural exception site, having regard to relevant development plan policies and any other material considerations.

5. In the absence of planning permission being secured for the development of the Station Yard site, the Council placed undue reliance on the likelihood of the
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unallocated site coming forward and contributing to or fulfilling the identified need for affordable housing, prior to any application being determined.

6. The Council argue that the appeal site is not immediately adjacent to an existing settlement boundary and therefore fails to comply with LP Policy RES.8 in this respect. However, the site is clearly immediately adjacent to the stretch of New Road that denotes the line of the settlement boundary of Wrenbury.

7. The Council failed to show reasonable planning grounds and produce relevant evidence on appeal to support the decision. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in Circular 03/2009, has been demonstrated and that a full award of costs is justified.

**Costs Order**

8. In exercise of the powers under section 250(5) of the Local Government Act 1972 and Schedule 6 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, and all other enabling powers in that behalf, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Cheshire East Council shall pay to McInerney Homes, the costs of the appeal proceedings, such costs to be assessed in the Senior Courts Costs Office if not agreed. The proceedings concerned an appeal more particularly described in the heading of this decision.

_Claire Sherratt_
INSPECTOR
APPENDICIES

Dear Mr Hirst,

Core Strategy Consultation – Regulation 25 Report - August 2010
Draft for Consultation

I refer to the above matter.

As you know, we are instructed by the Trustees of the Standen Estate to submit representations on the Core Strategy at this and subsequent stages of the submission process.

The Standen Estate is a significant land owner in Ribble Valley and therefore has a direct and clear interest in the emerging planning policy documents which form part of the Local Development Framework for the area.

These representations follow work undertaken by us in concert with Taylor Young on masterplanning aspects and Royal Haskoning (Denis Wilson Partnership) on traffic impact and sustainable transport considerations.

The thrust of these representations is that our client’s land should be allocated in the Core Strategy as a Strategic Site as defined in PPS 12.

In the context of the consultation into the Draft Core Strategy options we have not confined our work to our client’s land but also have assessed (in principle) the relative merits of the other options indicated as possibilities in your August 2010 document.

As a consequence of the work we have undertaken with Taylor Young I am pleased to be able to provide you with an early sight of the evolving masterplanning exercise. This has been commissioned in the context of the Core Strategy exercise and taking into account what PPS 12 (paragraphs 4.6 – 4.7; 4.8 – 4.12 and 4.45) states about strategic site allocations and infrastructure. Attached to this letter are Taylor Young plans/images under the following references:
B001 Wider Context
B002 Existing Land Use
B004 Existing Landscape Features and Built Form
B005 Context, Movement, Linkage and Constraints
B011 Vision Sketch
B012 Proposed Lane Uses
B013 Masterplan
B014 Masterplan Development Outputs

It is worth stressing for those unfamiliar with the LDF Core Strategy process that the masterplan is only indicative at this stage to show the structure of the location in broad terms. It is not a detailed layout. Such detail would form the subject of later work which would evolve as a consequence of consultation over a period of time. Even then it would have to form the subject of planning application(s) for consideration by the Council as Local Planning Authority with all the rigours that involves. The masterplan, at this point, is a preliminary one to assist the Council in envisaging a scenario. It is not fixed and its evolution would continue. Our clients are responding to the Council’s consultation document and looks forward to feedback on their ideas.

In addition to the masterplan background papers produced for us by Royal Haskoning (Denis Wilson Partnership) on traffic impact and sustainable transport considerations will follow so you can read their comments.

The Trustees of the Standen Estate own land to the south east of Clitheroe which is edged green on the attached plan SAA1670.5, which was previously attached to our letter to you of 22 January 2010. As previously advised, they wish to promote the site for a mixed use development as a logical extension of Clitheroe.

The Trustees also own a further 1.78 ha of land, edged red on the same drawing, to the west of the main area of land, which is also suitable for residential development (this land has been identified in the current SHLAA as a short term prospect).

The Trustees welcome the opportunity which the current consultation document provides to demonstrate that the identified site is entirely suited to accommodate a significant proportion of the residential and employment needs for the Borough for the period to 2025. All references in the following comments are to the paragraph numbers in the consultation document.

1. 1.2.2 – It is noted that the Local Development Framework (LDF) and the Core Strategy (CS) within it should be the spatial representation of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The SCS identifies (on page 8) that “the provision of more affordable housing is one of the highest priorities for the Borough Council” and further (on page 9) that “the provision of appropriate employment land so that businesses can start up and grow within the area is essential.” The Trustees land at Clitheroe, outlined in green, extends to 51.3 ha, is in one ownership, is well related to the main settlement and is located adjacent to the A59. Consequently, the site can meet at least two of the major priorities set out in the SCS without materially prejudicing the “exceptional environment” of the Borough.
2. 1.2.7 — the Council’s decision to continue the LDF process broadly along the lines of the Regional Strategy, in terms of housing numbers, is welcomed. Consequently, sufficient deliverable sites (i.e. those which are available, suitable and achievable) must be identified to deliver housing in the first five years and then further sites for the next 5 and 10 years. The Trustees land could easily accommodate a major part of the first five to ten years housing needs by itself or, more realistically, a significant proportion of the 15 years supply plus an element of employment land.

3. 2.1.5 — Clitheroe remains the administrative centre of the Borough and lies at its heart, while Longridge is located at the western extremity of the Borough. It tends naturally to be related to and serve employment in the immediately neighbouring City and industrial areas of Preston.

4. 2.1.9 — “Many people who live in the area are employed outside the Borough.” The provision of additional land for business in a sustainable location within the Borough is therefore central to reversing this trend.

5. 2.1.11 — the objective of providing for the development needs of the Borough whilst maintaining the special environmental characteristics of the area is supported.

6. 2.1.12 — the identification of the A59 as the main route across the Borough is noted, as are the links to the M6 and M65.

7. 2.3.13 — the adopted Council document ‘Ribble Valley Settlement Hierarchy’ (2008) recognises that Clitheroe is at the top of the local settlement hierarchy. It is recognised as the most significant settlement in the Borough, with the best provision of services and facilities.

8. 3.1.1. and 3.1.2. — the restatement of the need for the Core Strategy vision to reflect that of the Sustainable Community Strategy is noted.

9. 3.2.1. — the requirement for new development to meet the needs of the area for growth, whilst preserving the special characteristics of the area for future generations is noted and supported.

10. 3.2.5. — the provision of high quality housing developments, to serve the varied needs of the Ribble Valley community is a key aim of the Core Strategy. It is therefore vital that major new developments which will deliver this aim are brought forward in sustainable locations in a planned and controlled manner. The Trustees land at Clitheroe clearly has a major role to play in this regard.

11. 3.3.5. — the "limited number of employment opportunities available in the borough" should be addressed by bringing forward, appropriately located employment and mixed use developments. Again, the Trustees land at Clitheroe has a major role to play in this regard.

12. 3.3.8. — the role of Clitheroe as a tourist destination should be enhanced by appropriate development and around the town, at a scale and in a location which does not impact detrimentally upon the historic core of the town. Any development which would lead to significant increases in vehicular traffic through the historic core (as defined by the Conservation Area) should be avoided, if alternative locations for development are available which do not involve any increases in vehicular traffic in and around the Conservation Area. The Trustees Land, to the south east of Clitheroe, would be served
from the A59 and would not significantly increase traffic flowing through the town centre, unlike any
developments to the west of the railway line, which can only be served by the roads through the
Conservation Area.

13. 3.3.10 — The Trustees land is within easy walking and cycling distance of the town centre and could
readily be linked to existing and enhanced footways, cycle routes and bus services. Therefore, the
need to reduce reliance on private vehicles would be promoted by the development of the Trustees
land.

14. Part 4 — Development Strategy – the Trustees support Option 1, particularly insofar as it would allow
the release of their identified site south east of Clitheroe. As noted above, the land in the Trustees
ownership extends to over 53 ha, has no identified constraints and is well located adjacent to the A59
to the east and the urban area to the north and west. Improvements to the existing A59 junction with
Pendle Road (which can be achieved on the land within the Trustees ownership) would facilitate a
mixed use development of the site, which could also be accessed, to a more limited extent, from
Whalley Road/Littlemoor to the west.

Royal Haskoning advise that current journey to work statistics clearly show that 52% of people who
live in Clitheroe but drive to work (either in the town or elsewhere), leave the town and travel on the
A59. Whilst every effort should be made to ensure a more sustainable pattern centred on Clitheroe
this is an important advantage the Trustees site has over other options.

The Trustees land is well located for residents of the new development who have to drive to work
elsewhere in the Ribble Valley. In addition, and significant in its own right, the location is good for
those travelling to the location to access the suggested new business land - to easily access their new
work place without creating adverse traffic impacts on the built up area of Clitheroe and the Town
Centre in particular. This is as much a qualitative issue as a traffic flow point, bearing in mind the
attractive historic core and its Importance as such to local people and tourists.

Given the size of the site and its undoubted capacity for significant housing and business development,
there is a very strong case for allocating the Trustees land as a Strategic Site allocation for the Core
Strategy period to 2025. Self evidently the development of this site would significantly reduce the
need for major development elsewhere in Clitheroe and the rest of the Borough.

The attached preliminary masterplan documents demonstrate that the site is capable of
accommodating the suggested significant level of development whilst preserving important aspects of
the landscape and other qualities of the area. The masterplan is submitted with these representations
and shows how the land can facilitate a natural rounding off of Clitheroe. It is a large enough area to
accommodate around 1,300 homes over the plan period which can be phased. In addition there is
also enough land to facilitate a business site by an upgraded junction between A59 and Pendle Road. It
would also provide space for a primary school for the locality (should one be considered necessary by
the Education Authority). The layout could readily enable pedestrian and cycle connections to existing
routes and provide enhanced new ones. The location is large enough for buses to be routed through
it once the road connections are in whilst existing bus stops are relatively close. Space exists to retain
attractive vegetation features and enhance it with additional high quality landscaping. There is an
opportunity here to create something special of a higher quality than existing residential areas.
15. Part 5 – Environment – the Trustees land is located outside the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its development would not affect any local sites of biodiversity interests. Sustainable development principles could be incorporated into future outline and detailed proposals for the site and the required elements identified in the third paragraph of the key statement of Sustainable Development would form a part of any planning applications.

16. Part 6 – Housing – the Trustees land could provide the major part of the Borough's housing needs for the Core Strategy period to 2025. The fact that the site is in a single ownership and is readily deliverable means that the requirements for a sustainable and mixed community, with the required level of affordable housing, could readily be met in what is the major settlement in the Borough immediately adjacent to its main artery, the A59.

17. Part 7 – Economy – the Trustees welcome the confirmation in the Key Statement on Business and Employment Development, that "opportunities to identify land as part of appropriate mixed use schemes within any strategic land release will be considered favourably." As noted above, the land to the south east of Clitheroe is seen as a mixed use opportunity, with the possibility of employment land being provided at the northern end of the site, as shown on the illustrative masterplan.

Because of its accessibility to the A59 and the strategic size and position of Clitheroe within the Borough, this location is seen as having potential for businesses.

Furthermore, the provision of such a mixed use development to the south and east of Clitheroe would help in maintaining or boosting the local retail economy and assisting the tourism credentials of the town by avoiding unnecessary and significant additional vehicular traffic in the town centre and beyond.

18. Part 8 – Delivery Mechanisms and Infrastructure – the Trustees understand that planning obligations will be negotiated where appropriate. This will take account of the local community (current and expanded).

Being of a single ownership and of a significant size, the Trustees' land option presents the most realistic potential opportunity to contribute towards the systematic delivery of infrastructure improvements necessary to integrate a sensitively managed expansion of the town.

Infrastructure provision is fraught with funding, ownership and phasing issues, all of which can become significantly complicated with multiple ownerships. In the Trustees land option there is a masterplanned area, which can have identified, phased and funded infrastructure provision.

19. One example of great relevance is the existing Junction of Pendle Road and the A59. We understand that the local authority would like to see that junction upgraded to a roundabout and that in turn would improve the junction to an all moves operation, whereas at the moment it is not possible to turn right to Pendle Road from the southbound A59. Again the land owned by the Trustees and available for development provides adequate land and would be of a scale which could provide significant funding to promote that junction upgrade.
20. The Trustees land was not known about as being available when the SHLAA exercise was conducted. It is consistent with the proposed broad location for development shown as Option 1C in the consultation document. If, as paragraph OP1.3 states, the percentage distribution of required housing was calculated using SHLAA figures in terms of the potential capacity of the sites and where they were located, it appears that the percentage of housing which can be accommodated by Clitheroe should be increased to allow for the contribution which the Trustees land can make. In any event, the calculations would benefit from a clearer explanation and justification.

21. Paragraph OP1.7 – the text does not include any reference to the extremely poor highways infrastructure both within the Option 1A area and also leading to it through the town centre from other parts of Clitheroe. It is not clear how the road system could be improved without major investment and significant detrimental impacts on the local environment. Furthermore, we understand that the land ownership in the area is fragmented. Therefore the assembly and delivery of any large scale housing, comprehensive development would be problematic, slow and uncertain.

The Trustees land in Clitheroe (the Option 1C location) on the other hand is in single ownership and therefore deliverable without land assembly problems. It is directly accessible to the main local highway network without compromising the town centre, and has the capacity and landscape form to absorb development without harming Clitheroe or its environs.

Other strategic options – both options 2 and 3 involve more development in settlements which are smaller than Clitheroe, lower in the adopted Settlement Hierarchy (2008) and which saved policy G2 of the local plan identifies as taking a much smaller scale of development. They appear to present irreconcilable challenges with the scale of the settlements involved which have obvious local landscape and infrastructure constraints. They would seem to threaten the very fabric which makes the settlements attractive. The development involved would change their overall character.

22. The strategic expansion of Longridge, Whalley and presently unspecified village growth areas is inappropriate. We appreciate that the Core Strategy is putting forward alternative options for the purposes of discussion, but the options appear to be crude just to offer an alternative thesis to Clitheroe rather than them being serious propositions. We offer the following specific comments:

1. Longridge – The identified area of land on north east side of settlement (area 1D) is (with the exception of that between Dilworth Lane and Lower Lane) in a prominent location. It does not occupy an area which constitutes a natural extension of the settlement or which respects the grain of the landscape in the area. It could have a major urbanizing impact on the north east side of Longridge.

2. Whalley – Whalley is severely constrained by topography and landscape features of quality. Significant development on the areas of land involved (areas 1E and 1F) would materially detract from its large village characteristics.

The Trustees land in Clitheroe on the other hand is in single ownership and has the capacity and landscape form to absorb development without harming Clitheroe or its environs.
Fundamentally, the 'scatter gun' approach does not equate to a sustainable approach if it leads to the omission the exceptional strategic opportunity we promote. Such a scenario would not be capable of delivering the infrastructure required in the way our client's land can including the A59 junction upgrade and a genuinely mixed use location.

We have viewed the locations in the other settlements and respectfully question their suitability to take the level of expansion envisaged. They appear to be mismatches.

The Trustees are very willing to continue to discuss the progression of the site through the Core Strategy and Local Development Framework process but are concerned that other parties are promoting strategic scale sites through planning applications ahead of that process. Clearly, if members decide that such schemes can be approved ahead of key decisions on the Core Strategy the Trustees position will be reviewed. In this context our client is intending to object to the current application by Gladman Developments Ltd (LPA ref: 3/2010/0719) and may become involved with others.

For the avoidance of doubt our client does not object to the application before you by Briery Homes (LPA ref: 3/2010/0550) on land off Whalley Road as it is not such a site.

We therefore look forward to your feedback on the specific issues raised in these representations and to your ideas on how you would wish to engage with the Trustees and their representatives in the coming months.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

cc

Enc
10 August 2011

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION
Forward Planning
Regeneration and Housing
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

Dear Sir

Ribble Valley Local Development Framework
Alternative Core Strategy Development Strategy Options

I refer to the above matter.

We are instructed by the and have previously submitted representations to the earlier version of the Core Strategy (letter dated 15th October 2010 is attached).

The is a significant land owner in Ribble Valley and therefore has a direct and clear interest in the emerging Local Development Framework documents.

The central thrust of the representations in October 2010 was that a proportion of their land holdings to the south and east of Clitheroe should be identified as a Strategic Site. We are therefore pleased to note that Alternative Option D of the current document is this land which is identified as a single strategic site capable of accommodating approximately half of the Borough’s required housing and economic development for the plan period.

As previously highlighted, the land in this area is capable of delivering the required level of housing and employment development within the timeframe of the Core Strategy and can do this without any of the detrimental impacts which other options (and current major residential planning applications and appeals) could result in.

Furthermore, the proposed development of this strategic site, because of its scale, would have the critical mass to deliver necessary social and other infrastructure including affordable housing in an entirely systematic and sustainable manner. Such a level of provision can not be achieved by disjointed, ad hoc development of smaller sites, either through the Core Strategy process or through random planning applications and appeals.
The recent publication of the Draft National Planning Policy Framework (dNPPF) has reinforced the need to plan for the development of Ribble Valley in a sustainable manner, particularly as the draft framework now includes a requirement to identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable housing sites which will provide five years worth of housing, plus an additional allowance of 20% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.

It is apparent that local communities in Ribble Valley, which are currently faced with major development proposals, would prefer development to be located predominantly within a suitably located, comprehensively planned, sustainable strategic site, rather than in smaller settlements which could struggle to provide the necessary infrastructure. These views from the community have been clearly expressed in written representations and objections to planning applications in Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge and have also been echoed by Council members at recent meetings of the Planning and Development Committee.

In terms of the eight options which are now presented for public consultation, the Trustees of the Standen Estate have the following comments:

**Option 1**

Whilst this option would still provide for a reasonable level of growth for Clitheroe, within which some of the area could be developed, it would also involve relatively large scale development at Whalley and the Borough’s villages. The levels of growth envisaged within this option could result in a level of development which is disproportionately large for those settlements, resulting in a change to their characters which would not accord with the adopted settlement hierarchy for the borough. Furthermore, although 45% of development would take place in Clitheroe under this option, the lack of a strategic site’s focus could lead to a large number of smaller sites coming forward, without the necessary related infrastructure and adequate affordable housing provision.

**Option 2**

This option would seek to accommodate a lower percentage of growth in Clitheroe and a higher level of growth in Longridge and the villages. It is not clear if Longridge can adequately accommodate the proposed level of growth, which could be increased by further development to the west of the settlement, within the administrative area of Preston City Council.

**Option 3**

This option concentrates 60% of development on what were called “Village Growth Areas” in the previous consultation document and are now referred to as “Ribble Valley Growth Areas”. Whilst a modest level of growth may be needed to maintain viable villages, concentrating 60% of the borough’s growth in the villages for the next 20 years, without any compelling evidence that this is sustainable, is entirely inappropriate. It is clearly contrary to the principles of sustainable development set out in the dNPPF.

**Options A & B**

These two options spread development across the Borough and essentially differ only in the amount of development which is to be directed to the “other settlements”. The lack of a strategic site as a focus for development will mean that a significant proportion of development will take place on relatively small sites, with a consequential lack of adequate infrastructure, affordable housing and other benefits which would flow from a larger scale development.
Option C
This option leaves the choice of appropriate sites almost entirely to the planning application/appeal process, guided only by presently non-existent development management policies and population statistics. It is difficult to believe that the Secretary of State through his Planning Inspectorate would find such a development “strategy” to be sound, as it gives little or no certainty to the planning process and is a recipe for chaos and underachievement in terms of community requirements and enhancement.

Option D
The [Redacted] clearly support this option as it provides the necessary certainty lacking in Option C and the focused, deliverable and sustainable development lacking in Options 1-3 and A, B, C and E.

As detailed in our 15th October 2010 letter, the [Redacted] in Clitheroe is in single ownership and has the capacity and landscape form to absorb and accommodate the anticipated level of development without harming Clitheroe or its environs. Crucially, Option D has easy access to the A59 and could thus accommodate development without materially impacting on traffic levels in the town.

Option E
Focusing two thirds of the Borough’s required housing and economic development upon Barrow appears to be entirely unrealistic and unsustainable. Direct access to the A59 is not achievable from the land to the west of Whalley Road and thus massively increased levels of traffic movements would be experienced at the junction of Whalley Road and the A671 to the north of the village and through Whalley, to the south.

Locating almost 2,000 dwellings in Barrow over the next 20 years, plus two thirds of the economic development floorspace, would swamp the existing settlements and cannot be sustainable development by any recognised definition of that term including that contained in the dNPF. Inevitably, car journeys from Barrow to Clitheroe and Whalley would be increased significantly if Option E is progressed, to the detriment of both settlements.

In summary, the [Redacted] support the choice of Option D as the preferred option to be carried forward to the publication stage and beyond. We remain willing to work with the Borough Council to secure the delivery of a sustainable development on their land in Clitheroe.

Yours faithfully

Enc
15 October 2010

Mr C Hirst
Forward Planning & Regeneration Manager
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 2RA

Dear Mr Hirst

Core Strategy Consultation - Regulation 25 Report - August 2010
Draft for Consultation

I refer to the above matter.

As you know, we are instructed to submit representations on the Core Strategy at this and subsequent stages of the submission process.

The Standen Estate is a significant land owner in Ribble Valley and therefore has a direct and clear interest in the emerging planning policy documents which form part of the Local Development Framework for the area.

These representations follow work undertaken by us in concert with our masterplanning and traffic impact and sustainable transport considerations.

The thrust of these representations is that our client's land should be allocated in the Core Strategy as a Strategic Site as defined in PPS 12.

In the context of the consultation into the Draft Core Strategy options we have not confined our work to our client's land but also have assessed (in principle) the relative merits of the other options indicated as possibilities in your August 2010 document.

As a consequence of the work we have undertaken I am pleased to be able to provide you with an early sight of the evolving masterplanning exercise. This has been commissioned in the context of the Core Strategy exercise and taking into account what PPS 12 (paragraphs 4.6 - 4.7; 4.8 - 4.12 and 4.45) states about strategic site allocations and infrastructure. Attached to this letter are Taylor Young plans/images under the following references:
B001 Wider Context
B002 Existing Land Use
B004 Existing Landscape Features and Built Form
B005 Context, Movement, Linkage and Constraints
B011 Vision Sketch
B012 Proposed Lane Uses
B013 Masterplan
B014 Masterplan Development Outputs

It is worth stressing for those unfamiliar with the LDF Core Strategy process that the masterplan is only indicative at this stage to show the structure of the location in broad terms. It is not a detailed layout. Such detail would form the subject of later work which would evolve as a consequence of consultation over a period of time. Even then it would have to form the subject of planning application(s) for consideration by the Council as Local Planning Authority with all the rigours that involves. The masterplan, at this point, is a preliminary one to assist the Council in envisaging a scenario. It is not fixed and its evolution would continue. Our clients are responding to the Council’s consultation document and looks forward to feedback on their ideas.

In addition to the masterplan background papers produced for us by Royal Haskoning (Denis Wilson Partnership) on traffic impact and sustainable transport considerations will follow so you can read their comments.

They also own a further 1.78 ha of land, edged red on the same drawing, to the west of the main area of land, which is also suitable for residential development (this land has been identified in the current SHLAA as a short term prospect).

The Trustees welcome the opportunity which the current consultation document provides to demonstrate that the identified site is entirely suited to accommodate a significant proportion of the residential and employment needs for the Borough for the period to 2025. All references in the following comments are to the paragraph numbers in the consultation document.

1. 1.2.2 – it is noted that the Local Development Framework (LDF) and the Core Strategy (CS) within it should be the spatial representation of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The SCS identifies (on page 8) that “the provision of more affordable housing is one of the highest priorities for the Borough Council” and further (on page 9) that “the provision of appropriate employment land so that businesses can start up and grow within the area is essential.” The Trustees land at Clitheroe, outlined in green, extends to 51.3 ha, is in one ownership, is well related to the main settlement and is located adjacent to the A59. Consequently, the site can meet at least two of the major priorities set out in the SCS without materially prejudicing the “exceptional environment” of the Borough.

2. 1.2.7 – the Council’s decision to continue the LDF process broadly along the lines of the Regional Strategy, in terms of housing numbers, is welcomed. Consequently, sufficient deliverable sites
(i.e. those which are available, suitable and achievable) must be identified to deliver housing in the first five years and then further sites for the next 5 and 10 years. The Trustees Land could easily accommodate a major part of the first five to ten years housing needs by itself or, more realistically, a significant proportion of the 15 years supply plus an element of employment land.

3. 2.1.5 – Clitheroe remains the administrative centre of the Borough and lies at its heart, while Longridge is located at the western extremity of the Borough. It tends naturally to be related to and serve employment in the immediately neighbouring City and Industrial areas of Preston.

4. 2.1.9 – "Many people who live in the area are employed outside the Borough." The provision of additional land for business in a sustainable location within the Borough is therefore central to reversing this trend.

5. 2.1.11 – the objective of providing for the development needs of the Borough whilst maintaining the special environmental characteristics of the area is supported.

6. 2.1.12 – the identification of the A59 as the main route across the Borough is noted, as are the links to the M6 and M65.

7. 2.3.13 – the adopted Council document 'Ribble Valley Settlement Hierarchy' (2008) recognises that Clitheroe is at the top of the local settlement hierarchy, it is recognised as the most significant settlement in the Borough, with the best provision of services and facilities.

8. 3.1.1, and 3.1.2 – the restatement of the need for the Core Strategy vision to reflect that of the Sustainable Community Strategy is noted.

9. 3.2.1 – the requirement for new development to meet the needs of the area for growth, whilst preserving the special characteristics of the area for future generations is noted and supported.

10. 3.2.5 – the provision of high quality housing developments, to serve the varied needs of the Ribble Valley community is a clear aim of the Core Strategy. It is therefore vital that major new developments which will deliver this aim are brought forward in sustainable locations in a planned and controlled manner. The Trustees Land at Clitheroe clearly has a major role to play in this regard.

11. 3.3.5 – the "limited number of employment opportunities available in the borough" should be addressed by bringing forward, appropriately located employment and mixed use developments. Again, the Trustees land at Clitheroe has a major role to play in this regard.

12. 3.3.8 – the role of Clitheroe as a tourist destination should be enhanced by appropriate development in and around the town, at a scale and in a location which does not impact detrimentally upon the historic core of the town. Any development which would lead to significant increases in vehicular traffic through the historic core (as defined by the Conservation Area) should be avoided, if alternative locations for development are available which do not involve any increases in vehicular traffic in and around the Conservation Area. The Trustees Land, to the south east of Clitheroe, would be served from the A59 and would not significantly increase traffic flowing through the town centre, unlike any developments to the west of the railway line, which can only be served by the roads through the Conservation Area.
13. 3.3.10 - Land is within easy walking and cycling distance of the town centre and could readily be linked to existing and enhanced footways, cycle routes and bus services. Therefore, the need to reduce reliance on private vehicles would be promoted by the development of the Trustees land.

14. Part 4 - Development Strategy - Support Option 1, particularly insofar as it would allow the release of their identified site south east of Clitheroe. As noted above, the land in the Trustees ownership extends to over 53 ha, has no identified constraints and is well located adjacent to the A59 to the east and the urban area to the north and west. Improvements to the existing A59 junction with Pendle Road (which can be achieved on the land within the Trustees ownership) would facilitate a mixed use development of the site, which could also be accessed, to a more limited extent, from Whalley Road/Littlemore to the west.

Advises that current journey to work statistics clearly show that 52% of people who live in Clitheroe but drive to work (either in the town or elsewhere), leave the town and travel on the A59. Whilst every effort should be made to ensure a more sustainable pattern centred on Clitheroe this is an important advantage the Trustees site has over other options.

Land is well located for residents of the new development who have to drive to work elsewhere in the Ribble Valley. In addition, and significant in its own right, the location is good for those travelling to the location to access the suggested new business land - to easily access their new workplace without creating adverse traffic impacts on the built up area of Clitheroe and the Town Centre in particular. This is as much a qualitative issue as a traffic flow point, bearing in mind the attractive historic core and its importance as such to local people and tourists.

Given the size of the site and its undoubted capacity for significant housing and business development, there is a very strong case for allocating the Trustees land as a Strategic Site allocation for the Core Strategy period to 2025. Self evidently the development of this site would significantly reduce the need for major development elsewhere in Clitheroe and the rest of the Borough.

The attached preliminary masterplan documents demonstrate that the site is capable of accommodating the suggested significant level of development whilst preserving important aspects of the landscape and other qualities of the area. The masterplan is submitted with these representations and shows how the land can facilitate a natural rounding off of Clitheroe. It is a large enough area to accommodate around 1,300 homes over the plan period which can be phased. In addition there is also enough land to facilitate a business site by an upgraded junction between A59 and Pendle Road. It would also provide space for a primary school for the locality (should one be considered necessary by the Education Authority). The layout could readily enable pedestrian and cycle connections to existing routes and provide enhanced new ones. The location is large enough for buses to be routed through it once the road connections are in whilst existing bus stops are relatively close. Space exists to retain attractive vegetation features and enhance it with additional high quality landscaping. There is an opportunity here to create something special of a higher quality than existing residential areas.
15. Part 5 - Environment - [redacted] land is located outside the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its development would not affect any local sites of biodiversity interests. Sustainable development principles could be incorporated into future outline and detailed proposals for the site and the required elements identified in the third paragraph of the key statement of Sustainable Development would form a part of any planning applications.

16. Part 6 - Housing - [redacted] land could provide the major part of the Borough's housing needs for the Core Strategy period to 2025. The fact that the site is in a single ownership and is readily deliverable means that the requirements for a sustainable and mixed community, with the required level of affordable housing, could readily be met in what is the major settlement in the Borough immediately adjacent to its main artery, the A59.

17. Part 7 - Economy - [redacted] welcome the confirmation in the Key Statement on Business and Employment Development, that "opportunities to identify land as part of appropriate mixed-use schemes within any strategic land release will be considered favourably." As noted above, the land to the south east of Clitheroe is seen as a mixed use opportunity, with the possibility of employment land being provided at the northern end of the site, as shown on the Illustrative masterplan.

Because of its accessibility to the A59 and the strategic size and position of Clitheroe within the Borough, this location is seen as having potential for businesses.

Furthermore, the provision of such a mixed use development to the south and east of Clitheroe would help in maintaining or boosting the local retail economy and assisting the tourism credentials of the town by avoiding unnecessary and significant additional vehicular traffic in the town centre and beyond.

18. Part 8 - Delivery Mechanisms and Infrastructure - [redacted] understand that planning obligations will be negotiated where appropriate. This will take account of the local community (current and expanded).

Being of a single ownership and of a significant size, [redacted] land option presents the most realistic potential opportunity to contribute towards the systematic delivery of infrastructure improvements necessary to integrate a sensitively managed expansion of the town.

Infrastructure provision is fraught with funding, ownership and phasing issues, all of which can become significantly complicated with multiple ownerships. Instead the land option there is a masterplanned area, which can have identified, phased and funded infrastructure provision.

19. One example of great relevance is the existing junction of Pendle Road and the A59. We understand that the local authority would like to see that junction upgraded to a roundabout and that in turn would improve the junction to an all moves operation, whereas at the moment it is not possible to turn right to Pendle Road from the southbound A59. Again the land owned by the Trustees and available for development provides adequate land and would be of a scale which could provide significant funding to promote that junction upgrade.

20. [redacted] land was not known about as being available when the SHLAA exercise was conducted. It is consistent with the proposed broad location for development shown as Option
1C in the consultation document. If, as paragraph OP1.3 states, the percentage distribution of required housing was calculated using SHLAA figures in terms of the potential capacity of the sites and where they were located, it appears that the percentage of housing which can be accommodated by Clitheroe should be increased to allow for the contribution which the Trustees land can make. In any event, the calculations would benefit from a clearer explanation and justification.

21. Paragraph OP1.7 - the text does not include any reference to the extremely poor highways infrastructure both within the Option IA area and also leading to it through the town centre from other parts of Clitheroe. It is not clear how the road system could be improved without major investment and significant detrimental impacts on the local environment. Furthermore, we understand that the land ownership in the area is fragmented. Therefore the assembly and delivery of any large scale housing, comprehensive development would be problematic, slow and uncertain.

Land in Clitheroe (the Option 1C location) on the other hand is in single ownership and therefore deliverable without land assembly problems. It is directly accessible to the main local highway network without compromising the town centre, and has the capacity and landscape form to absorb development without harming Clitheroe or its environs.

Other strategic options - both options 2 and 3 involve more development in settlements which are smaller than Clitheroe, lower in the adopted Settlement Hierarchy (2008) and which saved policy G2 of the local plan identifies as taking a much smaller scale of development. They appear to present irreconcilable challenges with the scale of the settlements involved which have obvious local landscape and infrastructure constraints. They would seem to threaten the very fabric which makes the settlements attractive. The development involved would change their overall character.

22. The strategic expansion of Longridge, Whalley and presently unspecified village growth areas is inappropriate. We appreciate that the Core Strategy is putting forward alternative options for the purposes of discussion, but the options appear to be crude just to offer an alternative thesis to Clitheroe rather than them being serious propositions. We offer the following specific comments:

1. Longridge - The identified area of land on north-east side of settlement (area 1D) is (with the exception of that between Dilworth Lane and Lower Lane) in a prominent location. It does not occupy an area which constitutes a natural extension of the settlement or which respects the grain of the landscape in the area. It could have a major urbanizing impact on the north-east side of Longridge.

2. Whalley - Whalley is severely constrained by topography and landscape features of quality. Significant development on the areas of land involved (areas 1E and 1F) would materially detract from its large village characteristics.

Land in Clitheroe on the other hand is in single ownership and has the capacity and landscape form to absorb development without harming Clitheroe or its environs.

Fundamentally, the 'scatter gun' approach does not equate to a sustainable approach if it leads to the omission the exceptional strategic opportunity we promote. Such a scenario would not be
capable of delivering the infrastructure required in the way our client's land can including the A59 junction upgrade and a genuinely mixed use location.

We have viewed the locations in the other settlements and respectfully question their suitability to take the level of expansion envisaged. They appear to be mismatches.

We are very willing to continue to discuss the progression of the site through the Core Strategy and Local Development Framework process but are concerned that other parties are promoting strategic scale sites through planning applications ahead of that process. Clearly, if members decide that such schemes can be approved ahead of key decisions on the Core Strategy position will be reviewed. In this context our client is intending to object to the current application by Gladman Developments Ltd (LPA ref: 3/2010/0719) and may become involved with others.

For the avoidance of doubt our client does not object to the application before you by Briery Homes (LPA ref: 3/2010/0550) on land off Whalley Road as it is not such a site.

We therefore look forward to your feedback on the specific issues raised in these representations and to your ideas on how you would wish to engage with[z] and their representatives in the coming months.

Yours sincerely
10 August 2011

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION
Forward Planning
Regeneration and Housing
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
BB7 2RA

Dear Sir

Ribble Valley Local Development Framework
Alternative Core Strategy Development Strategy Options

I refer to the above matter.

We are instructed by the Trustees of the Standen Estate and have previously submitted representations to the earlier version of the Core Strategy (letter dated 15th October 2010 is attached).

The Standen Estate is a significant land owner in Ribble Valley and therefore has a direct and clear interest in the emerging Local Development Framework documents.

The central thrust of the Standen Estate’s representations in October 2010 was that a proportion of their land holdings to the south and east of Clitheroe should be identified as a Strategic Site. We are therefore pleased to note that Alternative Option D of the current document is this land which is identified as a single strategic site capable of accommodating approximately half of the Borough’s required housing and economic development for the plan period.

As previously highlighted, the Standen Estate’s land in this area is capable of delivering the required level of housing and employment development within the timeframe of the Core Strategy and can do this without any of the detrimental impacts which other options (and current major residential planning applications and appeals) could result in.

Furthermore, the proposed development of this strategic site, because of its scale, would have the critical mass to deliver necessary social and other infrastructure including affordable housing in an entirely systematic and sustainable manner. Such a level of provision can not be achieved by disjointed, ad hoc development of smaller sites, either
through the Core Strategy process or through random planning applications and appeals.

The recent publication of the Draft National Planning Policy Framework (dNPPF) has reinforced the need to plan for the development of Ribble Valley in a sustainable manner, particularly as the draft framework now includes a requirement to identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable housing sites which will provide five years worth of housing, plus an additional allowance of 20% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.

It is apparent that local communities in Ribble Valley, which are currently faced with major development proposals, would prefer development to be located predominantly within a suitably located, comprehensively planned, sustainable strategic site, rather than in smaller settlements which could struggle to provide the necessary infrastructure. These views from the community have been clearly expressed in written representations and objections to planning applications in Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge and have also been echoed by Council members at recent meetings of the Planning and Development Committee.

In terms of the eight options which are now presented for public consultation, the Trustees of the Standen Estate have the following comments:

Option 1

Whilst this option would still provide for a reasonable level of growth for Clitheroe, within which some of the Standen Estate land could be developed, it would also involve relatively large scale development at Whalley and the Borough’s villages. The levels of growth envisaged within this option could result in a level of development which is disproportionately large for those settlements, resulting in a change to their characters which would not accord with the adopted settlement hierarchy for the borough. Furthermore, although 45% of development would take place in Clitheroe under this option, the lack of a strategic site’s focus could lead to a large number of smaller sites coming forward, without the necessary related infrastructure and adequate affordable housing provision.

Option 2

This option would seek to accommodate a lower percentage of growth in Clitheroe and a higher level of growth in Longridge and the villages. It is not clear if Longridge can adequately accommodate the proposed level of growth, which could be increased by further development to the west of the settlement, within the administrative area of Preston City Council.

Option 3

This option concentrates 60% of development on what were called “Village Growth Areas” in the previous consultation document and are now referred to as “Ribble Valley Growth Areas”. Whilst a modest level of growth may be needed to maintain viable villages, concentrating 60% of the borough’s growth in the villages for the next 20 years, without any compelling evidence that this is sustainable, is entirely inappropriate. It is clearly contrary to the principles of sustainable development set out in the dNPPF.
Options A & B

These two options spread development across the Borough and essentially differ only in the amount of development which is to be directed to the “other settlements”. The lack of a strategic site as a focus for development will mean that a significant proportion of developments will take place on relatively small sites, with a consequential lack of adequate infrastructure, affordable housing and other benefits which would flow from a larger scale development.

Option C

This option leaves the choice of appropriate sites almost entirely to the planning application/appeal process, guided only by presently non-existent development management policies and population statistics. It is difficult to believe that the Secretary of State through his Planning Inspectorate would find such a development “strategy” to be sound, as it gives little or no certainty to the planning process and is a recipe for chaos and underachievement in terms of community requirements and enhancement.

Option D

The Trustees clearly support this option as it provides the necessary certainty lacking in Option C and the focused, deliverable and sustainable development lacking in Options 1-3 and A, B, C and E.

As detailed in our 15th October 2010 letter, the Trustees’ land in Clitheroe is in single ownership and has the capacity and landscape form to absorb and accommodate the anticipated level of development without harming Clitheroe or its environs. Crucially, Option D has easy access to the A59 and could thus accommodate development without materially impacting on traffic levels in the town.

Option E

Focusing two thirds of the Borough’s required housing and economic development upon Barrow appears to be entirely unrealistic and unsustainable. Direct access to the A59 is not achievable from the land to the west of Whalley Road and thus massively increased levels of traffic movements would be experienced at the junction of Whalley Road and the A671 to the north of the village and through Whalley, to the south.

Locating almost 2,000 dwellings in Barrow over the next 20 years, plus two thirds of the economic development floorspace, would swamp the existing settlement and cannot be sustainable development by any recognised definition of that term including that contained in the dNPPF. Inevitably, car journeys from Barrow to Clitheroe and Whalley would be increased significantly if Option E is progressed, to the detriment of both settlements.

In summary, the Trustees of the Standen Estate wish to support the choice of Option D as the preferred option to be carried forward to the publication stage and beyond. The Trustees remain willing to work with the Borough Council to secure the delivery of a sustainable development on their land in Clitheroe.

Yours faithfully
15 October 2010

Mr C Hirst
Forward Planning & Regeneration Manager
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Council Offices
Church Walk
Clitheroe
Lancashire
BB7 2RA

Dear Mr Hirst

Core Strategy Consultation – Regulation 25 Report – August 2010
Draft for Consultation

I refer to the above matter.

As you know, we are instructed by the Trustees of the Standen Estate to submit representations on the Core Strategy at this and subsequent stages of the submission process.

The Standen Estate is a significant land owner in Ribble Valley and therefore has a direct and clear interest in the emerging planning policy documents which form part of the Local Development Framework for the area.

These representations follow work undertaken by us in concert with Taylor Young on masterplanning aspects and Royal Haskoning (Denis Wilson Partnership) on traffic impact and sustainable transport considerations.

The thrust of these representations is that our client’s land should be allocated in the Core Strategy as a Strategic Site as defined in PPS 12.

In the context of the consultation into the Draft Core Strategy options we have not confined our work to our client’s land but also have assessed (in principle) the relative merits of the other options indicated as possibilities in your August 2010 document.

As a consequence of the work we have undertaken with Taylor Young I am pleased to be able to provide you with an early sight of the evolving masterplanning exercise. This has been commissioned in the context of the Core Strategy exercise and taking into account what PPS 12 (paragraphs 4.6 - 4.7; 4.8 - 4.12 and 4.45) states about strategic site
allocations and infrastructure. Attached to this letter are Taylor Young plans/images under the following references:
It is worth stressing that the LDF Core Strategy process that the masterplan is only indicative at this stage to show the structure of the location in broad terms. It is not a detailed layout. Such detail would form the subject of later work which would evolve as a consequence of consultation over a period of time. Even then it would have to form the subject of planning application(s) for consideration by the Council as Local Planning Authority with all the rigours that involves. The masterplan, at this point, is a preliminary one to assist the Council in envisaging a scenario. It is not fixed and its evolution will continue. Our clients are responding to the Council’s consultation document and looks forward to feedback on their ideas.

In addition to the masterplan background papers produced for us by Royal Haskoning (Denis Wilson Partnership) on traffic impact and sustainable transport considerations will follow so you can read their comments.

The Trustees of the Standen Estate own land to the south east of Clitheroe which is edged green on the attached plan SAA.1670.5, which was previously attached to our letter to you of 22 January 2010. As previously advised, they wish to promote the site for a mixed use development as a logical extension of Clitheroe.

The Trustees also own a further 1.78 ha of land, edged red on the same drawing, to the west of the main area of land, which is also suitable for residential development (this land has been identified in the current SHLAA as a short term prospect).

The Trustees welcome the opportunity which the current consultation document provides to demonstrate that the identified site is entirely suited to accommodate a significant proportion of the residential and employment needs for the Borough for the period to 2025. All references in the following comments are to the paragraph numbers in the consultation document.

1. 1.2.2 – it is noted that the Local Development Framework (LDF) and the Core Strategy (CS) within it should be the spatial representation of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The SCS identifies (on page 8) that “the provision of more affordable housing is one of the highest priorities for the Borough Council” and further (on page 9) that “the provision of appropriate employment land so that businesses can start up and grow within the area is essential.” The Trustees land at Clitheroe, outlined in green, extends to 51.3 ha, is in one ownership, is well related to the main settlement and is located adjacent to the A59. Consequently, the site
can meet at least two of the major priorities set out in the SCS without materially prejudicing the "exceptional environment" of the Borough.

2. 1.2.7 - the Council's decision to continue the LDF process broadly along the lines of the Regional Strategy, in terms of housing numbers, is welcomed. Consequently, sufficient deliverable sites (i.e. those which are available, suitable and achievable) must be identified to deliver housing in the first five years and then further sites for the next 5 and 10 years. The Trustees land could easily accommodate a major part of the first five to ten years housing needs by itself or, more realistically, a significant proportion of the 15 years supply plus an element of employment land.

3. 2.1.5 - Clitheroe remains the administrative centre of the Borough and lies at its heart, while Longridge is located at the western extremity of the Borough. It tends naturally to be related to and serve employment in the immediately neighbouring City and industrial areas of Preston.

4. 2.1.9 - "Many people who live in the area are employed outside the Borough." The provision of additional land for business in a sustainable location within the Borough is therefore central to reversing this trend.

5. 2.1.11 - the objective of providing for the development needs of the Borough whilst maintaining the special environmental characteristics of the area is supported.

6. 2.1.12 - the identification of the A59 as the main route across the Borough is noted, as are the links to the M6 and M65.

7. 2.3.13 - the adopted Council document 'Ribble Valley Settlement Hierarchy' (2008) recognises that Clitheroe is at the top of the local settlement hierarchy. It is recognised as the most significant settlement in the Borough, with the best provision of services and facilities.

8. 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 - the restatement of the need for the Core Strategy vision to reflect that of the Sustainable Community Strategy is noted.

9. 3.2.1 - the requirement for new development to meet the needs of the area for growth, whilst preserving the special characteristics of the area for future generations is noted and supported.

10. 3.2.5 - the provision of high quality housing developments, to serve the varied needs of the Ribble Valley community is a clear aim of the Core Strategy. It is therefore vital that major new developments which will deliver this aim are brought forward in sustainable locations in a planned and controlled manner. The Trustees land of Clitheroe clearly has a major role to play in this regard.

11. 3.3.5 - the "limited number of employment opportunities available in the borough" should be addressed by bringing forward, appropriately located employment and
mixed use developments. Again, the Trustees land at Clitheroe has a major role to play in this regard.

12. 3.3.8 - the role of Clitheroe as a tourist destination should be enhanced by appropriate development in and around the town, at a scale and in a location which does not impact detrimentally upon the historic core of the town. Any development which would lead to significant increases in vehicular traffic through the historic core (as defined by the Conservation Area) should be avoided, if alternative locations for development are available which do not involve any increases in vehicular traffic in and around the Conservation Area. The Trustees Land, to the south east of Clitheroe, would be served from the A59 and would not significantly increase traffic flowing through the town centre, unlike any developments to the west of the railway line, which can only be served by the roads through the Conservation Area.

13. 3.3.10 - The Trustees land is within easy walking and cycling distance of the town centre and could readily be linked to existing and enhanced footways, cycle routes and bus services. Therefore, the need to reduce reliance on private vehicles would be promoted by the development of the Trustees land.

14. Part 4 - Development Strategy - the Trustees support Option 1, particularly insofar as it would allow the release of their identified site south east of Clitheroe. As noted above, the land in the Trustees ownership extends to over 53 ha, has no identified constraints and is well located adjacent to the A59 to the east and the urban area to the north and west. Improvements to the existing A59 junction with Pendle Road (which can be achieved on the land within the Trustees ownership) would facilitate a mixed use development of the site, which could also be accessed, to a more limited extent, from Whalley Road/Little Moor to the west.

Royal Haskoning advise that current journey to work statistics clearly show that 52% of people who live in Clitheroe but drive to work (either in the town or elsewhere), leave the town and travel on the A59. Whilst every effort should be made to ensure a more sustainable pattern centred on Clitheroe this is an important advantage the Trustees site has over other options.

The Trustees land is well located for residents of the new development who have to drive to work elsewhere in the Ribble Valley. In addition, and significant in its own right, the location is good for those travelling to the location to access the suggested new business land - to easily access their new work place without creating adverse traffic impacts on the built up area of Clitheroe and the Town Centre in particular. This is as much a qualitative issue as a traffic flow point, bearing in mind the attractive historic core and its importance as such to local people and tourists.

Given the size of the site and its undoubted capacity for significant housing and business development, there is a very strong case for allocating the Trustees land as a Strategic Site allocation for the Core Strategy period to 2025. Self evidently the
development of this site would significantly reduce the need for major development elsewhere in Clitheroe and the rest of the Borough.

The attached preliminary masterplan documents demonstrate that the site is capable of accommodating the suggested significant level of development whilst preserving important aspects of the landscape and other qualities of the area. The masterplan is submitted with these representations and shows how the land can facilitate a natural rounding off of Clitheroe. It is a large enough area to accommodate around 1,300 homes over the plan period which can be phased. In addition there is also enough land to facilitate a business site by an upgraded junction between A59 and Pendle Road. It would also provide space for a primary school for the locality (should one be considered necessary by the Education Authority). The layout could readily enable pedestrian and cycle connections to existing routes and provide enhanced new ones. The location is large enough for buses to be routed through it once the road connections are in whilst existing bus stops are relatively close. Space exists to retain attractive vegetation features and enhance it with additional high quality landscaping. There is an opportunity here to create something special of a higher quality than existing residential areas.

15. Part 5 – Environment – the Trustees land is located outside the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its development would not affect any local sites of biodiversity interests. Sustainable development principles could be incorporated into future outline and detailed proposals for the site and the required elements identified in the third paragraph of the key statement of Sustainable Development would form a part of any planning applications.

16. Part 6 – Housing – the Trustees land could provide the major part of the Borough’s housing needs for the Core Strategy period to 2025. The fact that the site is in a single ownership and is readily deliverable means that the requirements for a sustainable and mixed community, with the required level of affordable housing, could readily be met in what is the major settlement in the Borough immediately adjacent to its main artery, the A59.

17. Part 7 – Economy – the Trustees welcome the confirmation in the Key Statement on Business and Employment Development, that “opportunities to identify land as part of appropriate mixed-use schemes within any strategic land release will be considered favourably.” As noted above, the land to the south east of Clitheroe is seen as a mixed use opportunity, with the possibility of employment land being provided at the northern end of the site, as shown on the illustrative masterplan.

Because of its accessibility to the A59 and the strategic size and position of Clitheroe within the Borough, this location is seen as having potential for businesses.

Furthermore, the provision of such a mixed use development to the south and east of Clitheroe would help in maintaining or boosting the local retail economy and
assisting the tourism credentials of the town by avoiding unnecessary and significant additional vehicular traffic in the town centre and beyond.

18. Part 8 - Delivery Mechanisms and Infrastructure – the Trustees understand that planning obligations will be negotiated where appropriate. This will take account of the local community (current and expanded).

Being of a single ownership and of a significant size, the Trustees’ land option presents the most realistic potential opportunity to contribute towards the systematic delivery of infrastructure improvements necessary to integrate a sensitively managed expansion of the town.

Infrastructure provision is fraught with funding, ownership and phasing issues, all of which can become significantly complicated with multiple ownerships. In the Trustees land option there is a masterplanned area, which can have identified, phased and funded infrastructure provision.

19. One example of great relevance is the existing junction of Pendle Road and the A59. We understand that the local authority would like to see that junction upgraded to a roundabout and that in turn would improve the junction to all moves operation, whereas at the moment it is not possible to turn right to Pendle Road from the southbound A59. Again the land owned by the Trustees and available for development provides adequate land and would be of a scale which could provide significant funding to promote that junction upgrade.

20. The Trustees land was not known about as being available when the SHLAA exercise was conducted. It is consistent with the proposed broad location for development shown as Option 1C in the consultation document. If, as paragraph OP1.3 states, the percentage distribution of required housing was calculated using SHLAA figures in terms of the potential capacity of the sites and where they were located, it appears that the percentage of housing which can be accommodated by Clitheroe should be increased to allow for the contribution which the Trustees land can make. In any event, the calculations would benefit from a clearer explanation and justification.

21. Paragraph OP1.7 - the text does not include any reference to the extremely poor highways infrastructure both within the Option 1A area and also leading to it through the town centre from other parts of Clitheroe. It is not clear how the road system could be improved without major investment and significant detrimental impacts on the local environment. Furthermore, we understand that the land ownership in the area is fragmented. Therefore the assembly and delivery of any large scale housing, comprehensive development would be problematic, slow and uncertain.

The Trustees land in Clitheroe (the Option 1C location) on the other hand is in single ownership and therefore deliverable without land assembly problems. It is directly accessible to the main local highway network without compromising the town
centre, and has the capacity and landscape form to absorb development without harming Clitheroe or its environs.

Other strategic options - both options 2 and 3 involve more development in settlements which are smaller than Clitheroe, lower in the adopted Settlement Hierarchy (2008) and which saved policy G2 of the local plan identifies as taking a much smaller scale of development. They appear to present irreconcilable challenges with the scale of the settlements involved which have obvious local landscape and infrastructure constraints. They would seem to threaten the very fabric which makes the settlements attractive. The development involved would change their overall character.

22. The strategic expansion of Longridge, Whalley and presently unspecified village growth areas is inappropriate. We appreciate that the Core Strategy is putting forward alternative options for the purposes of discussion, but the options appear to be crude just to offer an alternative thesis to Clitheroe rather than them being serious propositions. We offer the following specific comments:

1. Longridge - The identified area of land on north east side of settlement (area 1D) is (with the exception of that between Dilworth Lane and Lower Lane) in a prominent location. It does not occupy an area which constitutes a 'natural' extension of the settlement or which respects the grain of the landscape in the area. It could have a major urbanizing impact on the north east side of Longridge.

2. Whalley - Whalley is severely constrained by topography and landscape features of quality. Significant development on the areas of land involved (areas 1E and 1F) would materially detract from its large village characteristics.

The Trustees land in Clitheroe on the other hand is in single ownership and has the capacity and landscape form to absorb development without harming Clitheroe or its environs.

Fundamentally, the 'scatter gun' approach does not equate to a sustainable approach if it leads to the omission the exceptional strategic opportunity we promote. Such a scenario would not be capable of delivering the infrastructure required in the way our client's land can including the A59 junction upgrade and a genuinely mixed use location.

We have viewed the locations in the other settlements and respectfully question their suitability to take the level of expansion envisaged. They appear to be mismatches.

The Trustees are very willing to continue to discuss the progression of the site through the Core Strategy and Local Development Framework process but are concerned that other parties are promoting strategic scale sites through planning applications ahead of that process. Clearly, if members decide that such schemes
can be approved ahead of key decisions on the Core Strategy the Trustees position will be reviewed. In this context our client is intending to object to the current application by Gladman Developments Ltd (LPA ref: 3/2010/0719) and may become involved with others.

For the avoidance of doubt our client does not object to the application before you by Briery Homes (LPA ref: 3/2010/0550) on land off Whalley Road as it is not such a site.

We therefore look forward to your feedback on the specific issues raised in these representations and to your ideas on how you would wish to engage with the Trustees and their representatives in the coming months.

Yours sincerely

cc

Enc

Email:
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This ecological summary document has been produced by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd on behalf of Gladman Developments Ltd and provides information on the biodiversity value of a site at Standen (Site D) added to Ribble Valley Council's Core Strategy options in August 2011.

1.2 Site D is located to the south east of Clitheroe and is bounded to the north by Pendle Road and open fields, to the east by the A59 and Four Lane Ends and Open fields, to the south by deciduous woodland and to the west by residential development and a school.

2.0 METHODS

Identification of Potential Ecological Receptors

2.1 Public footpaths were walked across both sites and habitats recorded in accordance with the extended Phase 1 habitat survey methodology (JNCC 2010). Due to limitations with regards to site access aerial photographs and the OS 1:25,000 base were also used to broadly identify habitats and potential ecological receptors of importance within the sites.

2.2 In addition to the broad identification of habitats a desk based search was carried out to identify statutory and non-statutory sites of nature conservation importance. A search for statutory protected sites such as Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar was carried out for areas within 5km and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) for areas within 2km of each site boundary using the Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside website (www.magic.gov.uk) and Natural England’s Nature on the Map. The Lancashire Biological Records Centre was consulted for information on the location of non-statutory sites and species of nature conservation importance within 1km of each site.

3.0 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ECOLOGICAL RECEPTORS AND CONSTRAINTS (FIGURE 1 AND 2)

Habitats

3.1 The site is dominated by intensively managed improved pasture with limited nature conservation value. Species present within the improved fields included perennial rye grass Lolium perenne, white clover Trifolium repens and timothy Phleum pratense. Grassland in the southern half of the site supported species indicative of less intensive management including ladysmock Cardamine pratense.

3.2 Hedgerows formed field boundaries of varying quality and diversity, those that were accessible were dominated by hawthorn Crataegus monogyna and were well managed. Many of the hedgerows supported mature trees including pedunculate oak Quercus robur and ash Fraxinus excelsior.
3.3 Several mature pedunculate oak trees were located within the south eastern portion of the site in association with the Roman Road.
3.4 No ponds are located within the site. Three ponds are shown on the 1:25,000 OS base to be located within 250m of the site boundary, one of these lies across a main road, one lies immediately adjacent to the site and one lies within 100m within woodland to the south.

3.5 A stream runs through the western section of the site surrounded by scrub and trees. The accessible section of this stream held very little water and was not flowing. This joins the Pendleton Brook on the southern boundary of the site.

Photo 3 – Stream Running Through Western Section of the Site Into Pendleton Brook

Statutory and Non Statutory Sites and Species

3.6 No statutory sites of international importance are located within 5km of the site. No statutory sites of national importance are located within the site or adjacent to it. The nearest site is Salthill and Bellmanbank Quarry, which lies 1.6km to the north and Coplow Quarry which lies 2km to the north. Both of these sites are designated for their geological importance and as a consequence are not considered further in this report.

3.7 No non-statutory sites of interest to nature conservation are located within or immediately adjacent to the site.

3.8 No protected species records have been supplied from the biological records centre for the site or immediate surrounds. A record for red squirrel is located over 1km to the south of the A59.

Potential Constraints
3.9 The hedgerows provide potential commuting and foraging habitat for use by local wildlife including bats and birds and are a UKBAP priority habitat supporting greater than 80% native species. Hedgerows should ideally be excluded from back garden boundaries and buffered to enhance their value.

3.10 The trees within the hedgerows and fields increase the diversity of the site and provide some potential for use by roosting bats. PPS9 recognises that aged or 'veteran' trees are of particular value for biodiversity and states that their loss should be avoided.

3.11 The stream running through the western section of the site did not have any running water associated with it at the time of survey, occasional areas of standing water were recorded. Never the less this feature provides a strong corridor of movement through the site for local wildlife and should be retained and enhanced through creation of a buffer zone on both sides.

3.12 The woodland lying on the southern boundary of the site and the associated ponds should be provided with a buffer to enhance their value by creation of a graded and scalloped edge.

3.13 The ponds located to the south of the site boundary have the potential to support great crested newts, if this species was found to be present within these ponds, the southern area of the site, closest to these ponds should be used to provide mitigation for loss of terrestrial habitat within the site.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This document has been prepared by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd on behalf of Gladman Developments Ltd to provide an overview of arboricultural features associated with a site added to Ribble Valley Council's Core Strategy options in August 2011, and how any arboricultural constraints may impact on the deliverability of the sites should any development occur.

1.2 Following a walk over of the site in question to broadly assess the tree cover present this document therefore provide comments relating to the quality and value of the various arboricultural elements and the principal constraints present from an arboricultural perspective.

1.3 Site D, situated immediately to the northern side of Standen Hall Estate, is located to the south east of Clitheroe. The northern limit is defined by Pendle Road and the residential boundary of Clitheroe. The eastern extent is defined by Four Lane Ends and part of the Estate boundary. Beyond the site to the east is the A59. The southern boundary to the site is defined in part by the heavily wooded slopes of Pendle Brook and the woodland cover of Standen Hall. The western edge is adjoining existing residential areas of Clitheroe and includes for a part school playing fields. The designated Pendle Hill AONB is situated approximately 1.15km beyond the site to the east.

1.4 Following consultation with the Local Planning Authority it has been established and confirmed that there are no Tree Preservation Orders in place on trees within or bordering the development site.
2.0 METHODOLOGY

Identification of Arboricultural Features

2.1 A broad overview of the tree cover housed within the site was undertaken by walking the public footpaths and by viewing the material as far as possible from other public vantage points such as local roads surrounding the sites in question.

2.2 Observations were made as to the general species composition, physical quality / condition, overall arboricultural value and the contribution the trees make to the local area / setting. The assessment was undertaken using the broad principals as set out the guidance contained within British Standard 5837 (2005) Trees in Relation to Construction – Recommendations, although a true assessment in accordance with this standard was not possible due to access limitations. Use of aerial photographs was also made to ascertain the relative broad positions of the extent of tree resource within the site.

2.3 The assessment of tree cover was completed from ground level only and was purely visual, from the vantage points abovementioned. No aerial inspections of tree were undertaken. Investigations as to the internal condition of any trees have also not been undertaken.

2.4 No individual tree details have been taken other than broad descriptions often applying generic terms of reference common to trees typical of this type of landscape, and including collective heights / species / ages. Detailed inspections of trees are beyond the scope of this particular assessment at this stage.

2.5 The summary provides details as to those components of the tree stock considered particularly sensitive by virtue of their greater overall quality and subsequent higher level of importance in terms of landscape value and amenity contribution.

2.6 In addition to observations made during the site walkover, consultation with Ribble Valley Council has been made to establish the presence of any legislation or statutory protection / constraints that may affect any trees within the site such as Tree Preservation Orders or Conservation Area Designations. At the time of writing a response not been received and therefore information relating to such constraints that may be present will be inserted upon receipt.
3.0 SUMMARY OF ARBORICULTURAL COMPOSITION AND CONSTRAINTS

3.1 The following section sets out both sites and details the various arboricultural elements within each under separate headings, although in all cases observations were limited due to available vantage points.

Site D

3.2 The tree cover within site D has been divided into three broad areas, A, B and C based on tree types and general characteristics.

Area A

3.3 This part of the site contained two relatively small field compartments separated by established hedgerows within which were housed a number of mature trees predominantly common ash Fraxinus excelsior up to heights of 15-18m and a single free standing example. Many of the examples displayed open grown habits with spreading crowns by virtue of being free standing thus having had opportunity to develop such crown formations. Despite being the most significant arboricultural features of this part of the site, most appeared to have experienced damage resulting from high winds which had impaired their physical conditions and showed typically characteristic effects of such damage which included broken branches, failed branch / limb sections and accumulations of crown dead wood. Along the external boundary of area A (east side adjoining Pendle Road) there were several road side specimens within the hedgerow of similar species and physical quality.

3.4 Overall, the current physical condition of many of the specimens; and taking into account their maturity, would possibly see the value of the trees downgraded to either category B or even C, in accordance with British Standard 6837 (2005), however a more detailed assessment of individual trees would be required to establish the true retention potential of trees within this area.

Photograph 1: Road side mature trees along Pendle Road (northern boundary)

Photograph 2: View northwards across Area A to central hedge line showing typical trees

3.5 Many examples supported ivy growth on their lower stems and visible were a number of branch socket cavities that had developed as a result of past branch / limb removals / failures. Alongside the physical defects resulting from historic storm damage and the presence of ivy, it would be concluded that many of the trees housed features that may have potential to support roosting bats.
3.6 Evidence of pruning works and active arboricultural management was generally absent throughout the area, albeit rudimentary branch removals for clearance of access and remedial work in response to storm damage.

Area B

3.7 Tree cover generally within this area appeared more limited in overall quantity being confined for the most part to a scattered distribution of remaining mature hedgerow trees contained within the field boundaries of the larger field compartments. Old field boundaries were demarked by remnant trees forming small lines of trees once marking the enclosures.

Vantage points available to assess this area were restricted to the two public rights of way and therefore observations were only possible from a distance. Specific details of trees within this area have therefore not been provided. There were a number of trees of other species surrounding the margins of the school fields.

3.8 A prominent tree presence in this area, although off-site was the mature and heavily wooded northern margin of Standen Hall Estate which directly abutted part of the site's southern boundary. This mature woodland was predominantly broadleaved in composition dominated by English oak Quercus robur, common beech Fagus sylvatica and common lime Tilia x europaea. The woodland was very prominent within the local area as a skyline feature and a backdrop to the site. In accordance with British Standard 5837 (2005), the woodland would be considered as retention category A (high quality).

3.9 Noted during the assessment was an area of new tree planting that had been formally fenced, adjacent to the estate wall for an approximate distance of 10-15m from the wall line.

Photograph 3: View from the south towards tree lined slopes of Pendle Brook

Area C

3.10 This part of the site contained the highest number of trees across its extent compared to the other two sub areas, being distributed either within the established field boundary hedgerows or along the watercourse extending from Pendle Brook, as well as a number of free standing examples. In addition a number of prominent mature trees demarked the line of the former Roman Road. Most examples were large and mature, often reaching heights of up to 18m with open grown habit, characteristic of their respective species.
3.11 There was also occasional clustering of trees in groups in which crowns had interlocked. The most dominant species were English oak Quercus robur and common ash. The character provided by trees within area C created a "parkland" style landscape due to the presence of open grown and large mature oak and ash. There were also occasional sycamore Acer pseudoplatanus present as well as a small number of common alder Alnus glutinosa associated particularly with the brook course.

3.12 As with the wooded cover within Standen Hall Estate, there was similarly dense mature belt of woodland present along the banks of Pendle Brook which formed a prominent treed corridor as a backdrop along the western most part of the southern boundary; although this tree cover was also outside of the site boundary. Species composition and age was noted as being similar to that of the estate woodlands.

3.13 Overall quality and physical condition of trees was diverse although there were a high number of specimens that would be considered of category A and B grade in accordance with British Standard 5837 (2005).

3.14 Within hedgerows that surrounded the field compartments of the western most part of the area there were numerous trees that displayed storm damaged material such as broken branches / limbs, snapped and failed sections and cavity developments. Therefore trees in this area were also considered as housing features that may have potential to support roosting bats.

**Potential Constraints**

3.15 The highest quality trees should be retained and incorporated in to any emerging layouts which will assist with the any proposed landscaping schemes by providing a mature landscape. Site D contained a large number of quality trees.

3.16 The layout of any development parcels should be designed around the natural features of the site thereby maintaining the key hedgerows and the mature trees contained within them and any existing belts of trees. The positioning of development parcels and roads should avoid the main tree components within the site. From an arboricultural perspective, any built infrastructure components and access points should attempt to be respectful of the higher quality specimens and sympathetically designed to avoid conflicting with too many of those specimens as possible.

3.17 Any proposed development will need to be considered following guidance contained within British Standard 5837 (2005) – Trees In Relation to Construction, and where practicable, attempt to retain as many surveyed category A and B specimens and groups of trees as possible.

3.18 Trees within the site, especially those of most significance visually within the sub areas A and C particularly would be highly desirable to retain. Should loss of trees from the site in question occur it would have a detrimental impact on the local landscape character and is therefore not recommended. Should it not be possible to retain certain key trees as retentions may potentially conflict with proposed layouts, further consideration should be given to any such losses in favour of development and the wider implications this may have in terms of visual landscape and amenity before final decisions are taken.
3.19 A significant constraint to consider for design and development proposals would be to provide a sufficient amount of stand-off from the woodland off site along the southern boundary, namely W1 and W2. The woodlands are on the southern side of any potential development and therefore would cast shadow on to any possible housing that may be sighted within close proximity. It would be therefore strongly recommended that a stand-off distance at least equal to the height of the trees be provided i.e. 18-20m minimum. This would in design terms reduce the potential for conflicts that routinely arise relating to issues of light loss between proposed development (especially residential development) and retained trees.

3.20 Any Master Plan would need to be arboriculturally sound in terms of reducing any potential conflicts that may arise between the residential elements and the retained tree cover by setting any residential parcels at adequate distances from trees. The existing mature trees should be retained within areas designated for their environmental/recreational value representing a minimal change from the historic growth environment.

3.21 At detailed design stages it will be necessary to ensure that the prescribed root protection areas for all retained trees can be adequately protected by the erection of the requisite tree protection barrier whilst allowing sufficient access/ construction zone for the implementation of any layouts.

3.22 Existing trees of good quality should be carefully incorporated so that they form an appropriate relationship with new surroundings. This will greatly enhance any new development proposals by providing an immediate appearance of maturity. If however, existing trees are poorly sited and suffer from an inappropriate juxtaposition to newly developed structures, then they may cause new occupants anxiety and unacceptable nuisance to the extent that even legal protection will often not ensure their long term retention. To avoid such problems and to ensure equilibrium between existing trees and new development, the physiological requirements of trees must be carefully considered within a planning layout. Once the right balance is found, this will ensure that they area true asset to the site and go on to provide a broad range of material contributions to amenities for their perceived life expectancy. Trees may be negatively affected by the construction period by both direct and indirect actions which are often borne out of ignorance as to their physiological requirements. Careful site planning and management along with the implementation of robust physical protection measures is necessary to ensure the retention of important trees.

3.23 It will be essential to safeguard a pre-determined volume of soil around the base of retained trees or groups of trees to ensure that the ongoing biological functioning of the root system along with its interaction with the soil is not impaired. This requires that prior to the commencement of development activity on site (including the demolition works) that a robust protective barriers be erected.
4.0 FURTHER SURVEY WORK

4.1 It is strongly recommended that to establish a true and accurate representation of the arboricultural resource within the site suitable to inform emerging site layouts and designs, that a full and comprehensive tree survey and assessment in accordance with *British Standard 5837 (2005) – Trees in Relation to Construction – Recommendations* is undertaken. The tree survey should focus on any trees present within the site that may potentially be affected by future development and included those on or close to the boundaries that may be indirectly affected by any proposals through their influence of the site.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

1.1 This Heritage Appraisal has been prepared by Paul Chadwick of CgMs Consulting on behalf of Hourigan Connolly and their client.

1.2 CgMs Consulting is one of the UK's leading heritage consultancies and a Registered Organisation in the Institute for Archaeologists peer-reviewed registration scheme. We have advised on numerous proposed development sites in Chester, Cheshire, Greater Manchester and Lancashire, as well as across the rest of England and Wales, and so are thoroughly familiar with archaeological resources within the region and the planning policy context for the protection and management of heritage assets.

1.3 An initial heritage appraisal of the site and its wider context has been undertaken in order to establish the presence/absence, location and character of designated and undesignated heritage assets on and in the vicinity of the site. Data from a number of sources have been examined, including the Lancashire Historic Environment Record (HER), English Heritage Gateway and various online sources. In turn, this appraisal and discussions with the planning authority's archaeological advisor, Mr Doug Moir, has enabled informed comment on the heritage opportunities and constraints on the site and, in conjunction with FPCR landscape architects and masterplanners, have contributed to FPCR's masterplan proposals which seek to accommodate the issues identified.

1.4 Site D (Standen) is located to the south-east of Clitheroe and is bounded to the north by Pendle Road and open countryside, to the east by Four Lane Ends, open fields and the A59, to the south by the wooded course of Pendle Brook and woodland at Standen Hall, and to the west by residential areas and a school.
2.0 PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

2.1 In March 2010, the government published Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment, providing guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets.

2.1.1 PPS5 is supported by guidance in a document called 'Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide' (HEPPG), also issued in March 2010.

2.1.2 PPS5 sets out the Government's objectives in paragraph 7 as being (in summary) to:

- Deliver sustainable development
- Conserve England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance
- Contribute to our knowledge and understanding of our past (this applies in particular to excavation of archaeological sites and to demolition of buildings).

2.1.3 Paragraph 7 of PPS5 recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. The same paragraph also ensures that decisions are based on the significance of the heritage asset - significance now being a key factor in the assessment of impacts on the historic environment.

2.1.4 Development management is addressed in Policies HE6 to HE12 of PPS5, beginning with the information requirements for applications for consent affecting heritage assets in Policy HE6. Paragraph HE6.1 indicates that in describing the significance of a heritage asset, the level of detail supplied by an applicant should be subject to two considerations:

i it should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset, and

ii it should be no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact on the significance of the heritage asset.
2.1.5 *Heritage Assets* are defined in Annexe 2 of PPS5 as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the PPS) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.

Annex 2 defines *Archaeological Interest* as: an interest in carrying out an expert investigation at some point in the future into the evidence a heritage asset may hold of past human activity. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them. These heritage assets are part of a record of the past that begins with traces of early human and continues to be created and destroyed.

A *Designated Heritage Asset* comprises a: World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.

*Significance* is defined as: The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.

2.1.6 In short, government policy provides a framework which:

- Has a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets
- Protects the settings of designated heritage assets
- Takes into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets
- Requires applicants to provide proportionate information on heritage assets affected by their proposals, including the potential for as yet to be discovered archaeological assets, and an assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of those heritage assets
- Accepts that where the loss of whole or part of a heritage asset's significance is justified, provision must be made for the recording of assets and publication of the resulting evidence.
3.0 HERITAGE ASSETS: OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

3.1 There are no designated assets within Site D. However, the Grade 2+ listed Standen Hall borders the site to the south and several undesignated archaeological assets occur on the site and nearby.

3.2 In relation to the listed Standen Hall and its setting, a belt of deciduous woodland around the Hall is potentially sufficient to reduce any impact from development north of the Hall to an acceptable level. Additionally, the Hall faces south-east down an avenue of trees, and therefore its main frontage faces away from the area of proposed development. In short, subject to maintaining a landscape buffer between built development and the boundary of Standen Hall, it appears unlikely that the significance that the setting of Standen Hall contributes to the overall significance of the listed asset will be reduced.

3.3 In relation to archaeology, the site is crossed by a major Roman road (an undesignated heritage asset) and within the southern site boundary there is a cluster of Roman finds made by metal detectorists over recent years. Together, this evidence suggests that there might be a small Roman road-side settlement within Site D. This possibility is enhanced by the discovery many years ago of a skeleton adjacent to the Roman Road a short distance off-site to the south.

3.4 In accordance with planning policy set out in PP55, any development proposal on Site D should demonstrate the extent and significance of heritage assets on the site; a programme of geophysical survey and trial trenching will therefore be required to establish this. However, on the basis of current information, the alignment of the Roman road should be incorporated in a linear green corridor and, at the southern edge of the site, an ill-defined area of Roman settlement requires pre-application evaluation work in order to demonstrate that development will not adversely impact the significance of this asset.
4.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Government planning policy in relation to heritage is set out in PPS 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment'. The PPS sets out the Government's objectives in paragraph 7 as being (in summary) to deliver sustainable development and to conserve England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

4.2 In accordance with PPS 5, this Heritage Appraisal considers the evidence for designated and undesignated heritage on Site D and in its vicinity, and considers whether these assets influence the suitability or capacity of the site to accommodate residential development.

4.3 There are no designated assets within Site D. However, the Grade 2* listed Standen Hall borders the site to the south and several undesignated archaeological assets occur on the site itself.

4.4 These assets are not insurmountable obstacles to the allocation and future development of Site D. However, their presence does require detailed consideration and accommodation.

4.5 Having assessed the significance of these assets on the basis of currently available information, it is considered that a landscape buffer between built development and the boundary of Standen Hall, and the incorporation of the alignment of the Roman road in a linear green corridor (allied with pre-application evaluation work along and bordering the Roman road to clarify the extent of any road-side Roman settlement) will accommodate heritage issues on Site D.

4.6 An illustrative masterplan has been prepared by FPCR to demonstrate how the currently identified heritage assets might be accommodated. In my opinion, this masterplan successfully addresses the Roman road and setting of Standen Hall, leaving the issue of geophysical survey and trial trenching to be addressed during the preparation of a future planning application.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report details the findings of a Utilities & Drainage Appraisal carried out at the request of Gladman Developments Ltd with regard to utility and drainage supplies & potential requirements for future development.

1.2 The site under consideration is located off Pendle Road, Clitheroe. It is currently accessed from Pendle Road to the north and Little Moor to the west. An unnamed road runs along the eastern boundary of the site. A site location plan is attached at Appendix A.

1.3 The site is approximately 34 hectares in area and is currently Greenfield land.

1.4 The assessments made in the report are based on an enquiry for 1040 residential dwellings and 3.8 hectares of employment property. In addition there is a requirement for one 210 pupil primary school on the site.
**APPENDIX 2**

**PROPERTY TYPE ALLOCATION GUIDELINE**

**allocation of property types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Allocation Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONE BEDROOM PROPERTY</strong></td>
<td>• Single people or couples requiring only one bedroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWO BEDROOM PROPERTY</strong></td>
<td>• Couples (with medical requirement for 2 bedrooms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Households with up to 2 children of different sexes under the age of 8 years or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with 2 children of the same sex with the elder child under 13 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THREE BEDROOM PROPERTY</strong></td>
<td>• Households with 2 or more same sex children one of whom is over the age of 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Households with 2 or more children of different sexes one of whom is over the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age of 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Households with 3 adults who would not normally be expected to share a bedroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this Utilities & Drainage Appraisal is to assist FLP to take account of the utilities and drainage infrastructure in considering the study site as an option for growth in Clitheroe as part of the Ribble Valley Local Development Framework.

2.1 METHOD OF STUDY

2.1.1 Information has been gathered from land searches requested through Linesearch, and Searchflow together with assessment of information provided by the host asset owners and consultation with Statutory Undertakers and Authorities.

2.2 AIM

2.2.1 The principal aim of a Utilities & Drainage Appraisal is to establish the following:

- Review the existing utility and drainage networks to determine their location and potential to serve this potential growth area.
- Identify any need for off site utility network reinforcements to support future development or any engineering difficulties associated with delivering services to the same.
- Identify any need for drainage improvement works to support future development or any engineering difficulties associated with delivering drainage to the same.

2.3 CONTENT

2.3.1 This report will deal with gas, potable water, electric and telecommunications, foul and surface water drainage.

2.4 OUTPUTS

2.4.1 The outputs from this report will:

- Provide an understanding of the existing utilities and drainage infrastructure surrounding the site and the effect that any proposed new growth will have on existing infrastructure.
- Provide a summary of the issues that need to be considered regarding new utility connections and drainage for the proposed new growth area.
3. EXISTING UTILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE

3.1 EXISTING SITE INFRASTRUCTURE DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Option D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Land Use</td>
<td>Mixed use comprising 1040 residential properties, employment property on 3.8Ha and 1 new 210 pupil school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS National Grid Reference</td>
<td>SD 749 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Site</td>
<td>34 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Authority</td>
<td>Ribble Valley Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Host Asset Owner</td>
<td>Electricity North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Host Asset Owner</td>
<td>United Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Host Asset Owner</td>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface and Foul Water Drainage Statutory Authority</td>
<td>United Utilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Development Baseline Information – refer to Appendix A for a Site Location Plan.

Existing electric, gas, potable water and telecommunications, foul and surface water drainage plans have been considered and are attached in Appendix B, C, D, E & F.

3.2 ELECTRIC

3.2.1 The host asset owner in this area is Electricity North West and they maintain the electricity network in the vicinity of the site.

3.2.2 The electricity records have been requested from Electricity North West. As soon as these are received they will be forwarded together with commentary on whether any diversions would be required and any engineering difficulties associated with the works.

3.3 GAS

3.3.1 The host asset owner in this area is National Grid and they maintain the gas network in the vicinity of the site.

3.3.2 The gas records supplied by National Grid indicate there are no existing mains within the site boundary so there are no diversions required.
3.3.3 The domestic properties to the North and North West of the site are supplied by an existing low pressure gas network.

3.4 WATER

3.4.1 United Utilities is the host water provider for this region and is responsible for maintaining any existing infrastructure in the area.

3.4.2 Records indicate there are distribution water mains within the boundary of the development site.

3.4.3 There is a 2" distribution water main running NW to NE from Gills Croft feeding Four Lane Ends Cottages.

3.4.4 There will be restrictions on building and construction activity within the vicinity of this main so it will either need to be diverted or an allowance made for them within the design and layout of the new proposed development. See appendix D for full United Utilities conditions regarding water distribution apparatus.

3.5 TELECOMMUNICATIONS

3.5.1 There does not appear to be any existing BT plant within the site boundary but further investigation is required to confirm this and establish whether any diversions are required.

3.5.2 BT Openreach has existing underground plant running along Pendle Road; this will not be affected by the proposed new development.

3.6 SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

3.6.1 The site is drained naturally in its Greenfield state, with overland flows entering a number of watercourses located on the site and Pendleton Brook running along the site boundary.

3.6.2 Where the site abuts Pendle Road along the northern boundary there is a drain. This drain is likely to take flows from Pendle Road. Within the site itself there are two springs that rise in the centre of the irregularly shaped, northern boundary. These then flow via two drains that conjoin to form a tributary to Pendleton Brook.
3.6.3 Pendleton Brook flows along a section of the southern site boundary and is a tributary to the River Ribble. Pendleton Brook is controlled by a number of weirs along its route and in the vicinity of the option site.

3.6.4 The option site falls for the most part within a Zone 1 Flood Zone (as defined by the Environment Agency's (EA) Flood Map). However the Flood Map also shows that there are Zone 2 and Zone 3 flood areas along the southern boundary of the site, along Pendleton Brook. Refer to Appendix G for a copy of the relevant Flood Map information.

3.7 FOUL WATER DRAINAGE

3.7.1 Existing adopted, combined foul and surface water drainage exists in Little Moor to the west of the option site. This is a 300mm diameter sewer which flows in a westerly direction to join a 375mm diameter sewer in Little Moor View.

3.7.2 Existing foul and surface water sewer maps are presented at Appendix F.
4. NEW SUPPLIES & INFRASTRUCTURE

4.1 LOAD ASSUMPTIONS

4.1.1 All proposals are based on providing supplies for up to 1500 domestic properties. The scheme now consists of 1040 domestic properties, 3.6 hectares of employment land and one single entry primary school. The combined loads for either proposal are deemed to be similar enough that the information provided at this stage of the design will still be relevant, although overall capacities may be marginally different.

4.1.2 Proposals provided are offered given consideration of the existing networks at the current time. Any significant increase in the number of proposed units or the inclusion of other buildings would require further investigation.

4.1.3 The electric loads for this development have been assumed at this stage and are based on all houses being electrically heated with no additional generation from renewable sources.

4.1.4 Estimated electric loadings as follows;

- 1500 Homes 2100kVA Assumes Max 1.4kVA per property ADMD (after diversity maximum demand)
- 1040 Homes + School 2250kVA Assumes Max 1.4kVA per property ADMD plus 300kVA for school, estimated 500kVA employment

4.1.5 Water & gas loads assume standard loadings for domestic properties.

4.2 ELECTRIC

4.2.1 A feasibility study detailing the implications the proposed scheme would have on the existing electricity network has been requested from Electricity North West. This study will establish whether there is current capacity in the existing network to support such a development at this time, together with advising if there will need to be any network reinforcement required, budget cost and timescales for any work, to provide the site with the required capacity.

4.2.2 An initial indication from Electricity North West (ENW) is that the HV network in the Ribble Valley is currently very tight and there is currently limited spare capacity. Once a report regarding the HV network has been completed ENW will be able to
provide the anticipated costs and timescales for any required works. This is expected to be received by 23rd Dec 2011.

4.2.3 The developer will be required to install a new on site secondary sub stations with new HV & LV cabling and service connections to cover the load requirements of the proposed development. The number required will be dependent on final load and the site layout but is likely to be at least 3 for this scale of development.

4.2.4 The final substation positions will be dependant on the final site layout and agreement with ENW at the formal design stage.

4.2.5 Each substation will require an area of land (4.0m x 4.0m) within the site, preferably within 50m of the existing HV network needs to be considered. The site must be in public open space with 24 hour access.

4.3 GAS

4.3.1 A pre development enquiry for the proposed development was requested from National Grid. They have confirmed given the current network configuration the proposed development could be fed from a medium pressure main 232m from the site boundary. The proposed point of connection would be off an existing medium pressure gas main in Whalley Rd. Given the proposed loads there is no requirement for up stream reinforcement.

4.3.2 A new boundary pressure reduction governor would be required on site and a low pressure service main would be laid with service connections to each domestic property on site. Procurement, installation and connection of the new infrastructure is not anticipated to attract any abnormal costs and will be in line with standard development connection costs for a project of this scale at this time.

4.4 WATER

4.4.1 A pre development enquiry to assess the existing network and its ability to supply the proposed new development has been requested from United Utilities.

4.4.2 This has yet to be received however; they have confirmed the initial assessment of the network has resulted in the application being classified as complex and further off site network investigation is required. They have advised a response will be provided by 23/12/2011.
4.5 TELECOMMUNICATIONS

4.5.1 It is likely given the proximity of the site to the existing BT network surrounding the site, there would be no issue in extending this to serve the requirements of the new development.

4.5.2 Cable broadband connections are not currently available within the vicinity of the site however ADSL broadband is available and BT has forecast the local exchange at Clitheroe will be enabled for 21CN WBC and be able to offer Wholesale Broadband Connect in the area from February 2011. 21CN (21st Century Network) is a Next Generation Network (NGN) being deployed by British Telecom.

4.6 SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

4.6.1 Proposals for the new development would include discharge of surface waters to the drains on the site and possibly to Pendle Brook at Greenfield Runoff Rates. A break down of the existing and proposed runoff rates are presented at Appendix H.

4.6.2 Constraints presented to the option site by the surface water drainage would be as follows:

- Flood Zone 2 & 3 would have to remain outwith any developable area as would the existing drains on the site
- An 8.0m maintenance easement would need to be provided from the top of the bank to Pendle Brook and a 5.0m maintenance easement from the top of the banks along the drains
- Any road crossing proposed to the drains would be subject to relevant consents from the Environment Agency
- The controls in Pendle Brook could greatly affect the approved runoff rate from the development site and be limited to that required by the EA so as not to impact on those controls already in place
- Large areas of surface water attenuation will be required for the proposed development. These would greatly reduce the developable area for the site
- There are no surface water sewers in the local vicinity of the site and United Utilities no longer, generally, accept surface water runoff into their sewer network

4.6.3 Although a surface water drainage solution is likely to be available for a development in this locale it would impact greatly on the developable area of the site and would
result in a very large abnormal cost for any developer taking on the site for construction. Calculations for storage estimates are presented at Appendix H.

4.7 FOUL WATER DRAINAGE

4.7.1 Foul flows from the option site have been calculated approximately at 49.88l/s and calculations for the same are presented at Appendix J of this report.

4.7.2 As there are no sewers located to the east of the site and it is likely that flows will have to go out to Little Moor to the 300mm diameter sewer and it is anticipated that those flows will have to be pumped from the site to meet the existing infrastructure, if indeed it is possible to make a connection here.

4.7.3 Constraints presented to the proposed development site at this time are as follows:
   - Foul flows from a development of the proposed size would be large and may be difficult to accommodate in the existing drainage system
   - There is no drainage infrastructure in place to the east of the site, all drainage falls within the demise of the town of Clitheroe itself and as such foul flows could really only flow this way if utilising existing infrastructure
   - Flows from the development site would have to be pumped regardless of the route taken. Land will be required for an adoptable pumping station.

4.7.4 United Utilities and the Environment Agency have been consulted regarding proposed development at this site. At the time of writing this report no response has been received from either authority.
5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

5.1.1 There are existing gas mains, water mains and BT infrastructure within close proximity of the site boundary. Full details of the existing electricity network will be forwarded when received.

5.1.2 There will need to be consideration of the existing water distribution mains within the site boundary and how this will affect the development. The developer will need to ensure the scheme layout allows for an area either side of these mains to remain free from development or level change and ensures there would be access at all times to facilitate repair and maintenance. The other option is to consider diverting these supplies but this could attract significant additional costs.

5.1.3 There are no anticipated up stream reinforcement costs with regard to the gas network. It is likely there will be network reinforcement costs with regard to the electricity and water supplies. As soon as this information is received it will be forwarded.

5.1.4 Sewers are located only within the demise of Clitheroe itself. There are no public sewers located to the east of the option site and options for draining the foul flows from the site are limited.

5.1.5 Pendleton Brook has control measures in place in the form of weirs. The EA will have to be consulted if surface water runoff from the option site is to discharge to the brook.

5.2 NEW INFRASTRUCTURE

5.2.1 Initial Investigations have not highlighted any concerns or engineering difficulties with servicing the proposed development with new gas or telecommunication connections.

5.2.2 Details with regard to servicing the proposed site with new electricity and water connections are yet to be received. As soon as these are available the information will be forwarded.
5.2.3 Foul water flows from the site will need to be pumped. An adoptable pumping station will have to be provided. Foul flows from the development proposal are large and it may not be possible to accommodate these in the existing infrastructure.

5.2.4 Surface water flows from the development site will have to be attenuated on site as presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>QBar Rural Runoff Rate (Ha)</th>
<th>Design Criteria</th>
<th>% Hardstanding (Ha)</th>
<th>Impermeable Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Surface Water Attenuation (m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Site</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>229.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential and School Site</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>1 in 100 year +20%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4657-7523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1 in 100 year +20%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>173-270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>1 in 100 year +20%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1881-2939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.5 Maintenance easements along Pendleton Brook and the drains on site will have to be provided.

5.2.6 Consents and approvals will have to be sought from the EA to achieve a deliverable solution for the surface water runoff from the site.
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Existing Water Mains Plan & Conditions regarding
Water distribution apparatus
These general conditions and precautions apply to the water distribution system of United Utilities.

Please ensure that a copy of these conditions is passed to your representative and contractor on site.

1. United Utilities provides approximate locations of its water mains or apparatus according to its records. These records are not necessarily accurate or complete nor do they necessarily show the positions of private service pipes from the mains to properties. Where service pipes are shown, a blue background line indicates their approximate position. No person or company shall be held liable for any damage caused by removal of the actual positions and/or depths being different from those indicated.

2. Special requirements relative to our apparatus may be indicated. United Utilities employees will visit any site at reasonable notice to assist in the location of its underground water apparatus and advise any precautions that may be required to obviate any damage. To arrange a visit or for further information regarding new or existing connections, extensions, cabling, future proposals for construction of company apparatus or any notification required under these General Conditions, please telephone us on 0845 740 2200 or write to United Utilities, PO Box 453, Warrington, WA5 2NN.

3. In order to achieve safe working conditions adjacent to any water apparatus the following should be observed:
   (a) All water apparatus should be buried by hand digging prior to the use of mechanical excavation.
   (b) During construction work where heavy plant may have to enter the line of a water main, and the service and render a contingency of adequate standard of construction, crossing points should be suitably reinforced with steel plates or a specially constructed reinforced concrete slabs as necessary. These crossing points should be clearly indicated and marked to the line of the water main at other pipes should be protected. United Utilities employees will advise on this type of replacement necessary. This is particularly important on underground or main line, where the loam or clay may have significantly reduced the original cover.
   (c) No explosive should be used within 32 metres of any United Utilities apparatus without prior consultation with United Utilities.
   (d) Where it is proposed to carry out work within 15 metres of any water main United Utilities should be consulted so that the affected main may be surveyed.

4. During any excavation, it is important that measures should be taken to ensure that support for any water main is likely to affect its support, the main must be supported to the satisfaction of United Utilities.
   (a) Where a trench is excavated running or parallel to the line of a water main, the backfill should be adequately propped to prevent any settlement which could subsequently cause damage to the main. In special cases it may be necessary to provide permanent support to a main which has been exposed over the length of the excavation in both back filling and reinstatement is carried out. No backfill should contact the main.

5. No other apparatus should be laid over or along the line of a water main irrespective of ownership. A minimum clearance of 450 millimetres should be allowed between any plant being installed and any existing main, to facilitate maintenance and repair, whenever the adjacent plant is proposed to or crossing the main. No manhole, chamber, or other obstruction should be built over or around a water main.

6. Where a water main is coated with special wrapping and the wrapping is damaged, even to a minor extent, United Utilities must be notified, and the excavation must be left open for ready access so that repairs can be made. In case of any material damage to the main itself causing leakage, or weakening of the mechanical strength of the pipe, the person or body responsible should immediately notify United Utilities in order that the necessary work can be carried out. The full cost of the necessary remedial work will be charged to the person or body responsible for the damage.
7. If you propose to change existing levels over water mains you will need to inform us. We will need specific locations to be identified together with precise details as to the scale of the proposed changes to existing ground levels. Changes to existing levels may require the diversion of our apparatus at your cost. However, in certain circumstances we may wish to leave our apparatus where it is. On these occasions you will usually be required to protect our apparatus by means of a concrete raft and either raise or lower any surface boxes affected.

8. Under no circumstances should our surface boxes be either buried or left in a situation where they are raised above finished ground levels. You should re-use and re-set any surface boxes affected by your works into the new surface so that they align over the water apparatus below. You will be responsible for the cost of replacing any damage to our apparatus as a result of your works.

9. Where proposals involve resurfacing, you must notify United Utilities if your excavation will be greater than 750mm in the highway and 300mm in a footpath, verge or other location.

10. For information regarding easements, deeds, grants, licences or wayleaves, please write to United Utilities Property Solutions, Coniston Buildings, Lingley Mere Business Park, Lingley Green Avenue, Great Sankey, Warrington WA5 9UJ (Tel 01925 463 601).

**Tree planting restrictions over water mains**

a) Poplar and willow trees have extensive root systems and should not be planted within 10 metres of any water main.

b) The following trees and those of a similar size, whether they are deciduous or evergreen, should not be be planted within six metres of any water main:

• Ash, beech, birch, elm, horse chestnut, lime, oak, sycamore;

• Apple trees and pear trees;

• Most conifers.

c) United Utilities requires access to the route of its mains at all times to inspect for leaks and carry out surveys. We recommend that no shrubs or bushes which might obstruct or interfere with our access should be planted within one metre of the centre line of any water main.

d) There may be instances when both United Utilities and the landowner wish to plant shrubs or bushes close to the water main for screening or other purposes. The following shallow rooting shrubs would be suitable for this purpose:

• Blackthorn, broom, coltsfoot, elder;

• Hazel, laurel, privet, quickthorn, snowberry;

• Most ornamental flowering shrubs.

e) In areas where soft fruit is grown, blackcurrant, raspberries and gooseberries may be planted close to the main, provided that a path is left clear for inspection access and surveys. United Utilities can give additional advice where required in particular circumstances.
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United Utilities Sewer Maps
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Flood Map
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Surface Water Drainage Calculations
ICP SUDS Mean Annual Flood

Input:

Return Period (years) 2
Area (ha) 0.150
SPAR (mm) 1052
Soil 0.450
Urban 0.000

Results 1/s

QBAR Rural 2.5
QBAR Urban 2.5
Q2 years 2.3
Q1 year 2.2
Q30 years 4.2
Q100 years 5.2
ICP SUDS Mean Annual Flood

Input

Return Period (years) 2
Area (ha) 3.800
SSAAR (mm) 1052
Soil 0.450
Urban 0.000
Region Number Region 10
QBAR Rural 26.9
QBAR Urban 26.9
Q2 years 25.0
Q1 year 23.4
Q30 years 45.6
Q100 years 55.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gladman Developments Ltd</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria Way</td>
<td>Residential and School Greenfield Runoff Rates Standen Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton</td>
<td>Date Dec 2011 Designed by GH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire CM12 LLR</td>
<td>File Checked by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Drainage</td>
<td>Micro Drainage Source Control W.12.6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICP SUDS Mean Annual Flood

**Input**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return Period (years)</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>SAAR (mm)</th>
<th>Region Number</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results** 1/s

- Q2AR Rural 137.3
- Q2AR Urban 137.3
- Q2 years 127.9
- Q1 year 119.4
- Q30 years 232.7
- Q100 years 285.5
ICP SUDS Mean Annual Flood

Input

Return Period (years) 2 Soil 0.450
Area (ha) 34.000 Urban 0.000
SAAR (mm) 1010 Region Number Region 10

Results 1/s

QBAR Rural 229.4
QBAR Urban 229.4
Q2 years 213.6
Q1 year 199.6
Q30 years 388.9
Q100 years 477.1
Microdrainage Quick Storage Estimate – Employment Land (3.8Ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Volume 1</th>
<th>Volume 2</th>
<th>Volume 3</th>
<th>Volume 4</th>
<th>Volume 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Detention Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infiltration/Percolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Recharge capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Recharge storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Further details and calculations are provided in the supporting documents.
Microdrainage Quick Storage Estimate – Residential and School Land (19.4Ha)
APPENDIX J

Foul Water Drainage Calculations
GLADMANN

Foul Flows for the Standen Estate Site, Pendle Road, Clitheroe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Use</th>
<th>Criteria for Calculating Foul Flows</th>
<th>Foul Flows (l/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1040 Residential Houses</td>
<td>4000 litres/dwelling/day</td>
<td>48.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Pupil Primary School</td>
<td>50 litres/person/day</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Centre approx. 315m²</td>
<td>1 person/6m² floor space</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 litres/person/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment - 16680m²</td>
<td>1 person/6m² floor space</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 litres/person/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FLOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geraldine Homer BEng CEng MICE  
Technical Manager

Date: 19th December 2011  
Rev A
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introduction

1.1 My name is Carol Ann Ashley. I hold a Bachelor of Science Honours Degree in Civil Engineering, a Master of Science Degree in Transportation Engineering and Planning, and a Doctorate in Transportation Planning. I am a Fellow of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, a Member of the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport, and a Member of the Academy of Experts. I am the author of many papers published in technical journals, the book 'Traffic and Highway Engineering for Developments', and associate editor and contributor of the book 'Mathematics in Transport Planning and Control'.

1.2 I am a Director of Ashley Helme Associates (AHA), and have 38 years' experience of transportation planning and traffic and highway engineering. I have extensive experience of the analysis of traffic behaviour and performance of highway networks, with emphasis placed on issues of transport sustainability and providing appropriately for the needs of all road users, as well as issues of highway safety and capacity. In summary, I have extensive experience of the issues that would be raised when considering and appraising the highway/transport aspect of a proposal for residential (and other use) development on an area of land.

1.3 I am appointed by Gladman Developments to provide highways evidence for the public inquiry for the appeal against the planning authority Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC) for the refusal of planning permission for residential development on land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe.

1.4 As part of the Regulation 25 stage consultation process, RVBC are considering, for suitability for residential development, the alternative site referenced in the RVBC Consultation Report 2011 as 'Alternative Option D: land at Standen Estates' (henceforth referred to herein as 'Standen Estates'). I am additionally appointed by Gladman Developments to undertake an objective professional overview appraisal, for matters of transport/highways, of the Standen Estates site.

1.5 I explain in Chapter 2 the basis I adopt for my transport/highways overview appraisal, that is applied to the Standen Estates site.
1.6 I consequently set out in Chapter 3 the findings and conclusions arising from my overview transport/highways appraisal of the Standen Estates site.

1.7 My conclusions are summarised in Chapter 4.
2

background

2.1 The extant local plan for Ribble Valley (adopted June 1998) is the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan (RV-DLP). Saved Policy T1 sets out the context for assessing the transport accessibility and sustainability aspects of the proposed residential development, identifying a range of criteria to ensure that new developments are sustainably located and provide a range of transportation choices.

2.2 Policy T1 states that:

"In making decisions on development proposals the local planning authority will attach considerable weight to:

- the availability and adequacy of public transport to serve those moving to and from the development;
- the relationship of the appeal site to the primary route network;
- the provision made for access to the development by pedestrian, cyclists and those with reduced mobility;
- proposals which promote development within existing developed areas at locations which are highly accessible by means other than the private car;
- proposals which strengthen existing town and village centres which offer a range of everyday community shopping and employment opportunities by protecting and enhancing their viability and vitality;
- proposals which locate developments in areas which maintain and improve choice for people to walk, cycle or catch public transport rather than drive between homes and facilities which they need to visit regularly;
- proposals which limit parking provision for developments and other on or off street parking provision to discourage reliance on the car for work and other journeys where there are effective alternatives."

In undertaking my overview transport/highways appraisal I am mindful of Policy T1.

2.3 The key areas I address within my overview appraisal for each of the 2no sites are:
Accessibility to local amenities by a choice of walk, cycle and public transport.
Traffic impact on highway infrastructure.

2.4 It is essential to provide an access strategy that provides suitably for journeys to be
made on foot, cycle and public transport, particularly for access to a range of
everyday amenities. The access strategy must also provide suitable arrangements for
vehicular access, recognising that journeys will also be made by car. In this respect,
there must be suitable improvements to acceptably mitigate/accommodate the
traffic impact of the development.

2.5 In undertaking my objective professional appraisal I approach this from the stance
of being fair and reasonable.

2.6 Specifically, I adopt the pragmatic basis of considering what is the realistic potential
for access to a range of everyday amenities by walk, cycle and public transport,
taking account of reasonable assumptions about improvement measures for
walking, cycling and public transport that may reasonably be expected to be
included as part of a residential planning application for the site.

2.7 I similarly consider the likely requirement for highway Infrastructure improvements to
mitigate/accommodate the traffic impact of residential development on the site.
For the avoidance of doubt, in this overview appraisal I have not undertaken any
quantitative analysis and/or modelling of junctions. Rather, at this stage I have relied
upon my background knowledge of local traffic conditions (as set out in my
highways evidence for the Henthorn Road site appeal ref
APP/T2350/A/11/2161186/NWF) and my extensive experience of estimating and
quantifying development traffic impact.

2.8 I note that the RVBC Consultation Report 2011 sets out the following regarding the
scale of development being considered by the Council for the Standen Estates site
(Alternative Option D):

"The area is of an appropriate scale to accommodate approximately half of the
borough's required housing and economic development."
2.8 In terms of quantum of housing, my understanding is that the number of houses that the Council were may be provided by the Standen Estates site is 1500 dwellings.

2.9 I initially drafted this report in November 2011. On 12 December 2011 I was informed that RVBC have, at their last committee meeting on 8 December 2011, agreed to a 'Direction of Travel' for the emerging core strategy. Arising from this, the site area to which the Standen Estates land refers has been reduced from that previously being considered. I have, therefore, updated this evidence report to reflect the current situation, with the revised Standen Estates site boundary.

2.10 The RVBC Core Strategy Topic Paper 'Discussion on the approach to the Preferred Option' (dated November 2011 and first seen by me on 12 December 2011), sets out at para 1.2 thereof that the quantum of housing proposed for the Standen site is 1040 units.
3

standen estates

3.1 POTENTIAL ACCESS LOCATIONS

3.1.1 The scale of development (Council considering circa 1040 dwellings and economic development) would require at least two points of vehicular access if the scheme is to successfully connect/integrate with the existing area. The site has highways frontage on the 2no public highways:

- Little Moor View,
- Pendle Road.

3.1.2 Little Moor View

I note the following characteristics of Little Moor:

- Lack of footway along much of the route, and in particular between the site and Whalley Road,
- Key route to amenities and bus services on Whalley Road; a safe route for pedestrian traffic is very important,
- Likely need to upgrade the Little Moor/Whalley Road junction, which is presently only a simple priority (give-way) control junction.

3.1.3 Pendle Road

I note the following characteristics of Pendle Road:

- De-restricted speed limit. It is desirable for a new access for the residential development to be in a 30mph speed limit zone. Thus, there is a likely need to relocate the speed limit change, which requires a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). I would anticipate support for this from the highway authority LCC, in connection with a planning consent,

- Footway on one side only,
• Possible need to upgrade the Pendle Road/Four Lane Ends junction, which presently operates as a priority (give-way) control crossroads junction. The need for upgrade is dependent upon traffic volumes and geometry, and/or highway safety considerations.

• Need to upgrade the Pendle Road/A59 junction, which is a priority control staggered crossroads junction. I anticipate that introduction of a roundabout is required. This would be consistent with the roundabout arrangements along the A59, eg to the south at Barrow. Traffic signals would be incongruous in this location if isolated signals along the A59 which has a series of roundabouts.

3.2 STANDEN ESTATES PROPOSAL

3.2.1 I have seen a plan prepared on behalf of Standen Estates that indicates a proposed vehicular access strategy that comprises 2 new vehicular access points, one each on Pendle Road and on Little Moor View.

3.2.2 Little Moor View

3.2.2.1 I have strong reservations about the 'deliverability' of a main vehicular site access on Little Moor View, in terms of providing a suitable and safe layout. My concerns relate to the prevailing geometric conditions along Little Moor, and the lack of footway along most of this route. If it is possible for additional land to be acquired to achieve geometric improvements, then these concerns may be capable of being overcome. However, presently I have no information available to suggest this outcome is secured as deliverable.

3.2.2.2 My concerns in respect of pedestrians walking along Little Moor are even greater. Presently, there is no footway on either side of Little Moor View for most of the distance between the potential site access and the A59. There needs to be footway, at the very least between the site access and the A59, and there does not seem to be a secured way of providing this. I also note the established trees, but comments on these are outside my area of expertise.
3.2.2.3  In summary, I have strong doubts about the deliverability of a safe and suitable site access on Little Moor Road, utilising only land within the identified site area boundary.

3.2.3  **Pendle Road**

3.2.3.1  I conclude that provision of a site access on Pendle Road is both suitable and achievable. This is subject to some matters, e.g. TRO to reduce speed limit. Whilst there is only footway on one side of the road, it is on the ‘site side’ of Pendle Road, and this may prove acceptable.

3.2.3.2  Undoubtedly, a significant proportion of the development generated traffic would travel via the Pendle Road/A59 junction, which at present has a staggered crossroads layout operating under priority (give-way) control. I expect that this junction would need improvement to acceptably accommodate the traffic impact of the development. As set out above, para 3.1.3, I anticipate that a new roundabout will be required. There will be options for the provision of this, and detailed investigation is required to establish the preferred option. It will need to be demonstrated that the required land is secured.

3.2.3.3  **Summary**

In view of my concerns about the achievement of an acceptable all-vehicle access on Little Moor View, there is presently considerable doubt about the opportunity to achieve the through route access strategy indicated on the drawing I have seen that was prepared on behalf of Standen Estates. I conclude that a single vehicular access to serve large scale residential development of circa 1040 houses is not appropriate. Thus it is essential that the viability and deliverability of the access strategy put forward by Standen Estates is demonstrated. I further, and similarly, conclude that the deliverability of a safe pedestrian footway route between the site and Whalley Road must be demonstrated.

3.3  **WALK**

3.3.1  National guidance in PPG13 sets out that:
"Walking is the most important mode of travel at the local level and offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly under 2 kilometres" (para 75).

3.3.2 A 400m distance corresponds to a walk time of 5 minutes, based upon typical normal walking speed. It is widely recognised that commuting distances of up to about 2000m (which typically corresponds to about a 25 minute walk) can be acceptable.

3.3.3 I would anticipate that a development of the scale proposed would also include some amenities within the site itself, eg play area, possible school, convenience store. These can meet some everyday needs, but there remains a need for access to a more comprehensive range of amenities, outside the site area.

3.3.4 Most of the town’s amenities lie to the north/west of the site. Thus, it is important that the Little Moor View route is upgraded to cater for pedestrian movements, as this will be a key route to local amenities for residents of the site. However, for Little Moor View there is the identified problem of here being no footway between the site and Whalley Road (refer para 3.2.2), and no apparent likelihood of securing introduction of this. This is an issue that must be addressed for residential development at the site.

3.3.5 There should be a thorough in-depth analysis of the walk routes between the site and the town centre, to identify any shortcomings and need for pedestrian infrastructure improvements, eg pedestrian crossings, signage etc. Such works will need to be developer-funded.

3.3.6 Opportunities should be sought for providing as many pedestrian/cycle links between the site and the surrounding area as is practical. I anticipate this including:

* Pendle Road site access,
* Little Moor View.

However, this does not afford a good level of safe pedestrian integration with the surrounding built-up area. This is because of the lack of pedestrian footway along Little Moor View with no certainty of pedestrian infrastructure being secured along Little Moor View. The Council is considering the Standen site as being suitable for perhaps 1040 dwellings, and I conclude that reliance on only pedestrian infrastructure
along Pendle Road to link the site to the established area of Clitheroe is not acceptable.

3.3.7 The development should seek to provide pedestrian/cycle only routes that transect the site area:

- North-south, and
- East-west: between Pendle Road and Little Moor View.

The information presently available to me does not provide evidence that safe and convenient pedestrian infrastructure that achieves this can be secured.

3.4 CYCLE

3.4.1 National guidance sets out that:

"Cycling also has potential to substitute for short car trips, particularly those under 5km and to form part of a longer journey by public transport" (para 78).

3.4.2 Opportunities for cycle links are as identified in para 3.1.5 & 3.1.6.

3.4.3 Clitheroe town centre is within cycling distance, and hence the amenities provided there and encountered en-route can be reached by a cycle journey. Beyond the environs of the built-up area of Clitheroe itself, the roads and cycle route opportunities extend into a pleasant rural area that provides excellent opportunity for leisure cycling, with the attendant health benefits.

3.4.4 The provision of a road through the site, linking Pendle Road and Little Moor View, affords a new on-road cycle route opportunity. As well as being available for residents of the, site, it would also be available to existing residents of Clitheroe, perhaps as part of a cycle leisure trip.

3.5 BUS

3.5.1 There are existing bus services that are routed to the north and west of the site and also along Pendle Road (east of site). Unsurprisingly, these existing bus routes do not
offer convenient existing bus stop opportunity for anyone living within the site. This is because at present the site is vacant.

3.5.2 The bus services presently routed in the vicinity of the site are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M-Sat Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Clitheroe town circular</td>
<td>60mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Clitheroe - Peel Park</td>
<td>60mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Clitheroe - Nelson</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Nelson - Clitheroe</td>
<td>60mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clitheroe-Whalley- Longridge</td>
<td>120mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Blackburn - Clitheroe</td>
<td>30mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Accrington-Whalley-Clitheroe</td>
<td>9/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Clitheroe-Accrington- Blackburn Hospital</td>
<td>9/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280/X80</td>
<td>Preston-Clitheroe-Skipton</td>
<td>12/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.3 The 'Standen' bus services outlined above include routes through the residential area east of Whalley Road and to the north/northwest of the site, eg Goosebutts Lane, Highfield Road, Standen Road etc. Pedestrian link(s) between the site and these bus routes must be provided. Additionally, the services 70/71 travel along Pendle Road offering a 'halt and ride' stop arrangement anywhere on the route where it is safe to stop. Hence, the services 70/71 would be available for residents of the site. Service 70 travels northbound along Pendle Road and service 71 travels southbound. However, as the service 71 frequency is only hourly and service 70 is only on a Sunday, for the very large scale of residential development being proposed, developer funding to increase the service 71 to a 30 minute frequency should be investigated.

3.5.4 The bus stops closest to the site at which the Whalley Road services outlined above call are on Whalley Road (stop on each side of the road), north of Little Moor View. As I have identified, this would require residents of the development to walk along Little Moor View with no footway available for this walk, and no apparent certainty of
introducing footway (para 3.2.2). The 'main' service along Whalley Road is the 225, with daytime 30 minute frequency, operating between Clitheroe and Blackburn. It would seem unlikely that this existing Whalley Road bus service 225 would be re-routed to divert into the site, because of the additional journey time this would incur; in any case even if re-routing were to be secured, this is likely to incur developer funding requirement to accommodate the scheduling costs to maintain a 30 minute frequency service (ie an additional bus would likely be required). The other Whalley Road bus services may have some greater potential for re-routing into the site, but this needs to be investigated.

3.5.5 It is my understanding that all of the existing Clitheroe bus services require subsidy from the public purse. On the one hand, residential development on the site offers potential new bus passengers and revenue. However, for this to be realised, there needs to be a re-routing of existing service(s) to call within/near the site and/or a new bus service. A new bus service would dilute the opportunity for the site's residents to swell the bus passenger numbers (and revenue) on the existing bus services.

3.5.6 The plan that I have seen that was prepared on behalf of Standen Estates indicates a bus route through the site, along an east-west alignment between Pendle Road and Little Moor View. I have identified concerns about the deliverability of an all-vehicles site access on Little Moor View (refer para 3.2.2.1). However, I do not rule out a Little Moor View site access that provides for pedestrians/cycle and also a bus gate (ie available for a bus route).

3.5.7 In summary:

- There are existing bus services routed along roads around the periphery of the site, to the west (Whalley Road), north (Standen residential area) and east (Pendle Road),
- Whalley Road: the walk between the site and Whalley Road along Little Moor View has no footway and no apparent means for it to be secured that footway is introduced,
- 'Standen' bus service routes (C1 & C4): pedestrian link between the site and existing residential area is needed to access these bus routes.
• Pendle Road (71): hourly weekday service accessible. For the scale of proposed development, consider developer funded increase of frequency to 30 minutes,
• Site through-route: given the scale of development and the distance to existing bus routes, there is a need to either divert existing service(s) into the site and/or fund a new service. This requires developer funding for a minimum of 5 years.

3.6 RAIL

Clitheroe rail station is within a circa 2km walk of the centre of the site. The shortest walk route is via Pendle Road (1985m), and similar via Little Moor View (2160m). There is an hourly (typically) frequency rail service from Clitheroe station to Manchester, via Blackburn, Preston and Bolton, and also local stops. Journeys between the appeal site and the rail station can also be made by cycle (cycle stands are provided at the rail station) or by bus, subject to developer funding support of suitable bus services being secured.

3.7 SUMMARY

Transport sustainability must be a key principle underlying residential development at the site. National and local policies place emphasis on encouraging journeys by the sustainable transport options of walk, cycle and public transport. The following give rise to concern and need addressing:

• Pedestrian footway link between the site and Whalley Road: Essential. Considerable uncertainty as to whether it will be possible to provide this - issue needs resolving.
• Little Moor View 'all vehicle' access: Considerable uncertainty as to whether this can be provided. If not (as presently seems likely), then the 'all vehicle' access options appear to be restricted to Pendle Road,
• There is potential for suitable pedestrian, cycle and public transport accessibility of the site to be achieved, but this cannot be confirmed without further investigations into the deliverability of safe pedestrian links between the site and surrounding area (Whalley Road and existing Standen residential area) and the bus services that can be secured.
4.1 As part of the Regulation 25 stage consultation process, RVBC are considering, for suitability for residential development, the alternative sites referenced in the RVBC Consultation Report 2011 as Alternative Option D (Standen Estates). I have undertaken an overview appraisal of the transport/highways issues and impacts relating to this. I initially prepared this in November 2011. However, on 12 December 2011 I was informed that RVBC have, at their last committee meeting on 8 December 2011, agreed to a ‘Direction of Travel’ for the emerging core strategy. Arising from this, the site area to which the Standen Estates land refers has been reduced from that previously being considered. I have, therefore, updated this evidence report to reflect the current situation, with the revised Standen Estates site boundary.

4.2 I identify that for the Standen Estates site there are transport improvements/infrastructure that require to be developer provided/funded. This is usual practice for large-scale residential development.

4.3 However, I also conclude that there are some specific transport/highway-related issues for which further investigation is required to be satisfied that there are acceptable solutions to overcome the transport drawbacks of residential development at the site.

4.4 For the Standen Estates Option D:

- Pedestrian footway link between the site and Whalley Road: Essential. Considerable uncertainty as to whether it will be possible to provide this - issue needs resolving,
- Little Moor View ‘all vehicle’ access: Considerable uncertainty as to whether this can be provided. If not (as presently seems likely), then the ‘all vehicle’ access options appear to be restricted to Pendle Road, with no ‘all vehicle’ through route as indicated on the Standen Estates plan,
- There is potential for suitable pedestrian, cycle and public transport accessibility of the site to be achieved, but this cannot be confirmed without further
investigations into the deliverability of safe pedestrian links between the site and surrounding area (Whalley Road and existing Standen residential area) and the bus services that can be secured.
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INTRODUCTION

This landscape summary document has been produced by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd on behalf of Gladman Developments Ltd. FPCR have been asked to comment on landscape and visual matters with regard to deliverability of a proposed strategic site added to Ribble Valley Council’s Core Strategy options in August 2011. During the course of our assessment Ribble Valley Council released a further document (Core Strategy Topic Paper November 2011) which updated the proposals for this site. The publication is also considered within this assessment.

A broad landscape appraisal of the site has been undertaken in order to establish the existing landscape features and sensitivities and the resultant potential constraints and opportunities for development.

The site is located to the south east of Clitheroe and is bounded to the north by Pendle Road and open countryside, to the east by Four Lane Ends, open fields and the A59, to the south by the wooded course of Pendle Brook and woodland at Stansen Hall and to the west by residential areas and a school. Pendle Hill (Forest of Bowland AONB) is located just over a kilometre from the eastern edge of the site, beyond open fields. A second smaller parcel of land is included within the settlement area to the west of Littlemoo Road on an area of land identified within the local Plan as ‘Essential Open Space’ (saved Policy G6).

The Topic Paper published in November 2011 recognises potential visual and highways issues for development of the site area and as a result reduces the site area by pulling the site boundary back some 200 metres from Four Lane Ends and the AONB. The Topic Paper also lists the smaller parcel of land to the west.

2 METHODOLOGY

Identification of Landscape Features, Constraints and Opportunities

2.1 The report is based upon guidance given in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Second Edition) and Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Wales (Countryside Agency and Scottish Heritage, 2002).

2.2 The report also draws upon our preliminary review of the site undertaken as part of the FPCR Landscape and Visual Review of the Clitheroe SHLAA Sites and Additional Regulation 25 Sites (June 2011). This included a desktop review which assessed the broad landscape character of the area for the site as defined by the relevant published landscape character assessments. It also identified key potential statutory constraints from a search of the government’s database MAGIC.com and from the Ribble Valley Local Plan. A site visit was also undertaken as part of the study in order to identify potential visual receptors and sensitive environmental features. Photographs of the site are included at Figure 8 of the report. Refer to the FPCR SHLAA sites review report.

2.3 A detailed landscape and visual study considers the potential environmental capacity of the site for development against the capacity proposals that have been made as part of the other representations to the LDF process. Public footpaths were walked across the site in order to identify potential landscape and visual constraints and assess opportunities for development. Aerial photographs and the OS 1:25,000 base were also used to identify the landscape features on and adjacent to the site.
Mature deciduous woodland associated with Standen Hall (southern boundary);
Deeply cut wooded course of the Pendle Brook (south western boundary);
Standen Hall (Grade II* Listed);
Mature hedgerow and field trees within the site provide parkland character close to the hall;
Hedgerows within north-east of the site
Heavily vegetated deeply cut tributary to the Pendle Brook currently contains Clitheroe and divides the site;
Line of former roman road.

Development Capacity Assessment

3.4 In accordance with best practice, development proposals should ensure that the mature landscape structure of the site be retained within a robust Green Infrastructure designed to provide containment of the development and mitigation against potential landscape and visual effects on the identified sensitive receptors. This approach has been robustly applied to the Hendthorn Road planning application masterplan. It ensures that any sensitive landscape, heritage, ecological and arboricultural features are retained, protected and where possible, enhanced. The following recommendations draw upon the conclusions of the separate ecological and arboricultural assessments;

- A landscape buffer with woodland planting should be implemented along the eastern boundary to contain the development and mitigate against impact on views from Pendle Hill AONB. This would provide an extension to the woodland around Standen Hall;
- A landscape buffer should be provided between the development edge and the Standen Estate woodland, this is necessary to buffer the ecological habitat, and to ensure that proposed properties are far enough from the fall distance of mature trees within the woodland and would not overshadowed;
- Higher Standen Farm and buildings at Higher Standen overlook the site. If retained a suitable landscape buffer will be required;
- The line of the roman road should be retained within the open space;
- A buffer to the watercourses will be required for maintenance as well as retention of wildlife corridors/protection of vegetation;
- Hedgerows should be maintained within minimum 10metre width corridors;
- Field and hedgerow trees to be retained and root protection areas maintained free of built development. A tree and hedgerow survey will be essential to fully assess the constraints and determine where development can feasibly be accommodated;
- The routes of two public rights of way within the site will need to be accommodated with a suitable landscape corridor;
- Surface water drainage attenuation areas will also need to be accommodated on site.
3.5 A Development Capacity Plan (Figure 1) has been prepared in order to further understand the environmental capacity of the site for development. This is based upon the site area added to the Core Strategy Options in August 2011. The site comprises approximately 51 hectares (our calculation of the red line boundary area shown on Taylor Young Plan 0.001A) and includes a smaller parcel of 1.78 hectares to the west. The environmental constraints identified by our preliminary assessments are accommodated within the Green Infrastructure of the site with appropriate mitigation to the identified sensitive landscape receptors. Within the Green Infrastructure provision the following landscape buffer principles are assumed; a 10metre corridor for retained hedgerows, a 30metre minimum buffer to the Standen Estate woodland, 20metre corridor for retained public rights of way and a 50metre buffer towards the AONB. Other specific buffers are annotated on Figure 1. No specific provision for play or surface water attenuation areas is indicated as this will vary depending upon the scale of the proposal.

3.6 The remaining land (a total of 35 hectares) is identified as potentially developable land. The site is proposed as a 'strategic mixed use' site and the Taylor Young plan that accompanied the Standen Estate representations proposes 5.84 hectares of employment land. Given the scale of the development at the settlement edge it would be a fair assumption on a statistical basis that the level of residential development proposed would trigger the need for a one form entry school (1.2 hectares standard) on the site and that a small local centre with community facilities would be required. Once these requirements are taken into account the remaining developable area for residential use is 27 hectares. If applying the same average density as for the Henthorn Road Masterplan (32.6dph) this would allow for 906 dwellings. This calculation does not include any allowance for highways infrastructure.

3.7 The Capacity proposals shown in Figure 1 do not necessarily address the landscape and visual issues relating to proximity of the site to the AONB and visual prominence of land towards the north east of the site, including the employment land. The visual issues relating to the site were recognised in the Core Strategy Topic Paper published in November. Paragraph 3.3 of the Topic Paper highlights "visual impact of such a large site" as one of three 'key weaknesses' of the site identified within the Sustainability Options Report. At paragraph 3.4 of the Topic Paper the response to this is; "In addressing these concerns, yet still ensuring that the benefits of a strategic site are achievable (in terms of infrastructure delivery), under the preferred option it is proposed that the strategic site is reduced in overall size by up to a third. This would provide for a smaller, yet still strategic site of 30ha for both employment land and residential land. It is considered that a smaller site would also have a positive impact on addressing potential visual impact issues (though detailed work on this would still be needed),".

3.8 The Topic Paper states at paragraph 3.5 that 1040 dwellings could be accommodated on the reduced site area. In order to test this we have prepared a second development capacity plan (Figure 2). This applies the same development principles as set out in Figure 1. The plan shows 23.55 hectares of developable land of which 3.8 hectares would be employment (the same proportion of employment as for Figure 1) with 1.2 hectares indicated for a school and a further 0.35 hectares for a local centre with community facilities. The remaining land for residential development would be 18.2 hectares. At 32.6dph average this would provide 593 dwellings, well below the 1040 dwellings figure. A density of 57dph would need to be applied to achieve the 1040 units. This is clearly an inappropriate density for a rural settlement edge location. Should all of the developable part of the site be given over to purely residential use this would still only
achieve 768 dwellings. A density of 44dph would need to be applied to this area to achieve 1040 dwellings (again too high for a sensitive settlement edge location). The calculations also presume that the built development edge would be brought up to the eastern boundary of the allocation site and that other land under the control of the applicant between here and Four Mile End would be planted up to provide a landscape buffer to the AONB. Should this not be the case then the development capacity of the site would reduce further from the figures indicated.

3.9 The Development Capacity Plans (Figure 1 and 2) are based upon the preliminary assessments. Further detailed landscape/visual, ecological, arboricultural, drainage and heritage assessments are recommended, particularly to identify surface water attenuation requirements, protected species constraints, tree root protection areas and archaeological constraints as these will all have a bearing on the developable area of the site. The heritage report identifies high potential for archaeological features on the site associated with the roman road and the ecology report identifies potential for protected species, which if found on or in proximity to the site may require further mitigation on site. The tree report also identifies a number of mature trees both within fields and hedgerows which are likely to have significant root protection areas.

4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 This landscape and visual appraisal identifies the landscape features of the proposed strategic site and potential landscape and visual issues for development. In doing so it highlights significant shortcomings in the representations made to Ribble Valley Council on the development capacity of site. Development capacity can only be defined properly if based upon site survey evidence. In order to fully assess the environmental capacity of the site we recommend further survey work be undertaken (FRA, trees, ecology, noise, landscape/visual and heritage).

4.2 The eastern part of the site is in close proximity to Pendle Hill within the Forest of Bowland AONB. A full landscape and visual assessment is recommended to establish the likely impact of any development proposals on this sensitive receptor of national significance. The site also contains a mature landscape structure including watercourses, hedgerows, hedgerow and field trees and peripheral woodland areas. Significant mature woodland surrounds Standen Hall at the southern boundary along with areas of parkland character to the north of the hall and a roman road with potential archaeological associations crosses through the site.

4.3 The Capacity Plans at Figures 1 and 2 conservatively suggest indicative buffers for the identified landscape features, however after detailed assessment is undertaken the buffer areas shown may need to be increased. The Capacity Plans therefore suggest the maximum potential capacity of the sites for development. We recommend that provision for boundary treatment and landscape buffers to the sensitive landscape features be fully considered to assist in determining a realistic capacity of the site for development.

4.4 The type of development should also be carefully considered in relation to its context. The north eastern area is the most visually prominent part of the site and any development here would need to be sensitively designed to minimise visual impacts on receptors within the AONB in particular. Should employment be included its form and massing would need to be sensitively designed and an adequate buffer provided to the existing residential edge. Further consideration should be given to the best location for employment with regard to landscape and visual issues. The Core Strategy Topic Paper published in November 2011 recognises the visual sensitivity of
the Standen site reducing its area by a third and drawing its boundary back in towards Clitheroe and away from the sensitive landscape receptors at Standen and Pendle Hill (within the AONB).

4.5 Given the settlement edge location of the sites, built development should take a form and density that is sensitive to the rural context. In calculating a realistic residential capacity we have applied an average low-medium density of 32.6dph (as was applied for the Henthorn Road planning application).

4.6 The representations for the site propose 1377 dwellings plus 5.64 hectares employment land (Taylor Young drawing 0.014 rev B) with residential development densities of 30-40dph. Figure 1 demonstrates that once the known potential environmental constraints are incorporated the preliminary capacity calculations for this site area would be substantially lower at 906 dwellings. However at this level the extent of built development and its visual impact is questionable and a detailed landscape and visual assessment would still be required to fully understand the impacts of a development of such a significant size on the identified sensitive receptors.

4.7 Figure 2 presents a site area with reduced visual impact however the size of the site would not be sufficient to accommodate 1040 dwellings, particularly if delivered as a mixed use development. Our preliminary calculations suggest 593 dwellings (788 if the developable area is entirely residential) and these are generously based upon the presumption that the essential landscape buffer with mitigation planting to the eastern boundary would be provided off-site on other land under control of Standen Estates. To achieve 1040 dwellings on the developable area an average density of 57dph (44dph if all of the developable area is residential) would be necessary. This density is not appropriate for a sensitive rural edge location.

4.8 With the representations no provision appears to have been made within the capacity calculations for highways infrastructure or community facilities including schools and a local centre that would likely be required for developments of 1000+ dwellings. A full review of the environmental constraints and development requirements for the site is recommended prior to determination of its capacity for future development.
Indicative Development Capacity Plan (Based upon Taylor Young Plan 0.0014B)

A substantial landscape buffer to views from the AONB is recommended, width of buffer to be determined following detailed visual impact assessment. 50m within the site is indicated conservatively on this plan.

Potential access from Pendle Road would need to be carefully designed to minimise impact on the existing mature boundary hedgerow and trees.

A substantial drainage ditch and associated vegetation retained (plus attenuation / POS zone, area required to be determined).

Potential vehicle link would require careful design to minimise impact on mature trees and hedgerows & a bridge crossing would be required over the ditch.

Retained area of parkland character.

Hedgerows and trees maintained within 10 metre wide corridors.

25m landscape buffer with 15m wide belt of structural planting to rural edge / adjacent industrial uses.

30m landscape buffer to Standen Estate woodland.

Potential access from Littledor Road. The suitability and capacity of this road to accommodate development traffic would need to be assessed.

Objected Development protected as 'Essential Open Space' (saved Local Plan Policy G6). The residential capacity of this area at 32.6dp is 58 dwellings.
Indicative Development Capacity Plan
(Based upon Core Strategy Topic Paper November 2011)

Hedgerows and trees maintained within 10m wide corridor

15m wide buffer to rural & residential edges

Potential access from Pendle Road would need to be carefully designed to minimise impact on the existing mature boundary hedge and trees

IMPORTANT NOTE: Development is shown up to the edge of the allocation, however this is on the assumption that structural planting would be provided on the adjacent land (also under control of Stanen Estates) to provide some mitigation against the visual impacts of the development on the AONS.

Standen Farm/Higher Standen

Standen Hall (Grade II* listed)

Retained area of parkland character

25m landscape buffer with 15m wide belt of structural planting to rural edge/adjacent industrial uses

30m landscape buffer to Standen Estate woodland

Potential vehicle link would require careful design to minimise impact on mature trees and hedgerows & a bridge crossing would be required over the ditch

Extension of off-site woodland to supplement landscape buffer

Site boundary

Employment

Residential

School site (form entry)

Local centre facilities

Green infrastructure

Existing public footpath

Indicative off-site structural landscaping

Standen Estate land calculations:

Site area = 36ha approx
Development capacity = 25.56ha approx
of which:
Employment = 5.06ha approx (16% of developable area)
Residential capacity = 18.2ha approx
School = 1.26ha (1 form entry)
Local Centre = 0.25ha approx
Green Infrastructure = 10.45ha (29%) approx

*with community hall, health care facility and local convenience store.

For residential assume 32.5 dph average density (density applied to Hemlock Road planning application) = 593 dwellings

Public open space requirements for 593 dwellings (assumed 2.4 people per dwelling) = 3.41ha public open space of which 2.28ha should be formal space provision. (Fields in Trust standards applied to calculation on RBBC Policy RTS on public open space and play has not been saved)

This plan simply indicates the maximum presumed 'strategic mixed use' capacity of the site subject to detailed assessment. No provision for surface water attenuation or public open space is indicated as the areas required for this will be subject to detailed assessment consultation and final development. A one form entry school is shown indicatively as it is considered a reasonable assumption that a 'strategic mixed use' development of the size indicated would trigger the requirement for a school.
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Appendix 9 Clitheroe Mixed Use Strategic Site Development Capacity Summary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Site Area (Hectares)</th>
<th>Dwellings (Units) (Gross)</th>
<th>Employment Land (Hectares) (Gross)</th>
<th>Primary School (Hectares)</th>
<th>Local Centre (Hectares)</th>
<th>On-Site Green Infrastructure taking Account of Constraints (Hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of The Staden Estate Representations 15 October 2010</td>
<td>51.42</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Shown but Areas Not Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVBC Generation of Alternative Development Strategy Options June 2011</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Mentioned but not specified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellants Assessment of The Staden Estates Representations 15 October 2010 and RVBC Generation of Alternative Development Strategy Options June 2011</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Strategic Site Considered by RVBC Planning and Development Committee on 8 December 2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellants Assessment of Reduced Strategic Site Considered By RVBC Planning and Development Committee on 8 December 2011</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 10  Clitheroe Mixed Use Strategic Site Indicative Development Timetable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-outline application preparation and surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public consultation/hascon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Further pre-outline application preparation including Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Assessment Scoping and Scoping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Planning Application and Environmental Statement Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Planning Application Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section 106 Agreement Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outline planning permission issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marketing of the site and pre-contractual negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Site sale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>First reserved matters application preparation and preparation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information to discharge conditions precedent and technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approvals,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>First reserved matters applications consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Precendent conditions applications consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Technical approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Site start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>