

Pre App Application

Land off Watt Street – Sabden

Pre App meeting RVBC Offices

Attending

Stephen Kilmartin	RVBC Planning
Christopher Nolan	LCC Development Support
Jay Everett	Addison Planning Consultants Ltd
Darren Lever	DGL Associates Ltd

Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> Dec 2017

Concerns Raised.

Width of adoptable estate road.

The developer submitted a plan at the meeting with small amendments along with some dimensions. This has indicated that the road would be 5.5m wide for the first length and it was agreed that this would be acceptable to support traffic entering and leaving the development site. The plan then indicated that the road width would be reduced to only 4.8m wide. It was explained that though this was seen as sufficient, the council would be looking for a preference of 5.5m for the extent of the estate road to be adopted.

Footway Widths

It was explained that we would be looking for all roads built to adoptable standards to have a footway on both sides when these facilities would lead to domestic properties. The footway should be built to adoptable standards and of a minimum width of 2.0m. We would not be looking for situations where residents were expected to cross and re-cross an adoptable estate road to be able to use footways.

Turning facilities.

Concern was expressed with regard to the turning facility outside Plots 13-16. It was considered that the facility did not meet current standards as found in the Lancashire county council Residential Road Design Guide, presently set at the width of the road plus 9.4m, please see attached .pdf. The client has agreed to undertake tracking to ensure the facilities will meet the needs.

The Square – As a feature

Discussions were undertaken with regard to the square section of proposed highway. It was considered that such a configuration would not be acceptable. The client indicated that they were hoping to make a feature of this area, with the possible use of blocked paving. It was expressed that we would not be looking for adopted roads with a blocked paved finish due to the high cost of maintenance. The approved surface for the adopted roads should be Hot Rolled Asphalt. It was suggested that the area could be omitted from the adopted highway. No commitment was given on this matter and it was suggested that we would be looking for a through route of adopted road.

The stub of road that allows access to plots 26-31 would not be considered for adoption. This does not mean that the road cannot be built to adoptable standards but the county council would not be looking to adopt such a short length of highway as this would not be in the common interest.

## Site Layout Conclusions

After looking at the points raised it was agreed that the plans would be revisited with regard to the layout and the length of estate road that may be presented for adoption under a section 38 agreement.

## Parking Requirements.

The standards for parking were outlined as follows:

1. A standard parking bay is to be set at 2.4m wide and 4.8m long. When such a bay is perpendicular to an adopted highway then a further 0.8m length will be required to avoid overhanging the adjacent footway making such bays 2.4m wide and 5.6m long
2. A standard garage, to be counted as a parking bay will need to have minimum internal dimensions of 3m wide by 6m long to allow for an amount of storage including cycles. For double garages the internal dimensions should be a minimum 6m by 6m.
3. All new properties will be built with facilities for charging electrical vehicles. If no garage is available then this should be an external unit.

## Speed Limit

All new adopted highway within residential estates should be subject to a 20 mph limit and the developer would be required to pay a sum to cover the legal and administration costs to cover this work along with any necessary signage. This would be part of any Section 278 or Section 38 agreement that would be required.

## Off Site Works

The illumination of Watt Street has been noted to be lower than would be acceptable for a development of this nature. The developer would be required to undertake a lighting survey of both Watt Street and the length of Whalley Road that is between the junction with Watt Street and the access to the plots 26 – 31. It was noted that such work is likely to indicate the need for three new columns on Watt Street.

New kerbing works will be required to both the entrance to the development from Watt Street and Whalley Road. These works will need to be subject to a Section 278 works.

The new estate is the third recent development off Watt Street and though the sightlines at the junction of Watt Street with Whalley Road are good it is considered that this development would indicate that it is time to look at the parking restrictions at this point. As with the Traffic Regulation Order for the speed limit the developer would be required to meet the administration and legal cost associated with this work along with the initial road marking and signs that may be required.

## Pedestrian Facilities to the north of the site.

It was recognised that a pedestrian facility fronting the development would be required, along the south side of Whalley Road, between the access to plots 26-31 and the junction of Whalley Road with Watt Street. However there is presently a problem in that the land required for such a facility is not highway or in the ownership of the developer. Previous work on this site as indicated that the present ownership of the area is unknown. This is a matter that will need further investigation and

would need to be resolved prior to the need for the footway/footpath being included in conditions with regard to the development of this site.

#### **Bus Shelter**

The county council would be looking for the present bus shelter, at the junction of Whalley Road and Watt Street, should be improved. The reported condition of the present brick and wood unit is that this is in a very poor condition and should be replaced with a more modern unit. The parish Council Has recently installed a new unit at the eastern end of Whalley Road, close to its junction with Padiham Road. It was suggested that a similar unit at this point would be advisable. Unfortunately the present unit is reported to be a Highways unit on the same disputed plot as would be required for the pedestrian facility.

Any new bus shelter should be passed to the Parish Council to maintain once agreements have been completed and the new facility has been fitted. This will need to be agreed with the Parish council.

**Chris Nolan**

**Development Support**

**Community Services**

**Lancashire County Council**



320180361r

**Pre-Application Response**

**Officer:**

**Stephen Kilmartin**

**Description:** Victoria Mill Sabden

**Application Ref:** 2017/ENQ/0076

**Response Ref:** 2017/ENQ/0076/UD/02

**Case Officer:** S.K

**Issue Date:** 13/03/18



**Ribble Valley  
Borough Council**

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

**General Observations:**

- 1.1 The introduction of the ecology tower is a welcome addition. However no justification has yet been put forward to the authority in respect of the loss of the Chimney as per my previous observations. Whilst it is accepted that the ecology tower provides a number of benefits, I am not convinced at this stage that such benefits outweigh the loss of the chimney in its entirety. I do consider that the introduction of an additional ecology tower, perhaps located on the northern side of Sabden Brook within the 'Public Access Space, may further mitigate the aforementioned loss. I also consider that the construction of the proposed tower (and additional tower if agreed) from stone used in the construction of the existing chimney would assist in ensuring the notion of a continued legacy or 'narrative' between the new development and the previous site uses which are considered to be of heritage value.
- 1.2 Notwithstanding the inclusion of the ecology Tower(s) it will be expected that the dwellings accommodate integral features for building dependant species including integral bat and bird boxes. Given the habitat value of the site I would expect such provision to be substantial in numbers.
- 1.3 No details have been provided in respect of all boundary treatments within the site, particularly those that delineate plot ownership boundaries or the peripheral boundaries of the site. As previously suggested, where boundary treatments interface with existing vegetation I would request that 'green screen' systems be implemented. I would also suggest that such systems/screening is utilised where standard boundary treatments would be afforded a high level of visibility from the public realm, particularly the north western extents of the site. The intention is to limit the visual dominance of standardised close board fencing and to ensure the development integrates sensitively with the immediate surrounding context.
- 1.4 No elevations of the garages for plots 1-5 have been provided I am therefore unable to provide observations in respect of these.
- 1.5 No details of the 'Public Access Spaces' have been provided, I would expect such areas to be usable with features/street furnishings that ensure these areas remain attractive for the user. Careful

consideration to the illumination of these spaces will be required, particularly if the Ecology Towers are to be accommodated within them. Lighting should not undermine the attractiveness of the towers to species of conservation concern.

- 1.6** No details at this stage have been provided in respect of facing/roofing materials for the proposed dwellings, nor has any detail been provided in respect of the proposed window framing system or colour. I am therefore unable to provide any substantial comments in these respects but would suggest that it may be beneficial to explore a glazing system which benefits from a darker frame colour to afford the proposals an additional level of visual depth.
- 1.7** Plots 1-4 (and similar): Explore omitting the first floor bathroom window for that of one that benefits from a more vertical emphasis, perhaps one more akin to that which serves the cloak room at ground floor.
- 1.8** Plot 05: The main elevation proportional and language is primary symmetrical which is to some degree compromised by the off-centre relationship between the first floor central window and its alignment with the ground floor porch. As a result it is likely that the window position is likely to be read as anomalous and discordant as the remainder of the elevation is clearly ordered.
- 1.9** Plot 06: Rationalise the ground floor window serving the hall on the front elevation, at present it appears misaligned. This may be intentional but potentially appears anomalous. This could be countered by having a centrally located tri-pane window at first floor in-lieu of dual windows, thereby removing the need for the ground floor window to align with that above.
- 1.10** Plot 07: Explore an additional feature window at ground floor serving the hall to reduce the extent of blank elevation.
- 1.11** Plot 08: As per point 1.7 above.
- 1.12** Plots 09-10: As per point 1.7 above
- 1.13** Plot 11: As per point 1.10 above.
- 1.14** Plots 12 & 15: Explore the introduction of chimney detailing to the lower gable. Also consider projecting the porch area further forward than the principle elevation to which it forms part of, a distance of 200-300mm would suffice. Glazing to front elevation should; also benefit from transom detailing.
- 1.15** Plots 13, 14, 16, 17 and 21: First floor window above door (serving hallway) to be vertical feature

window (lessen width). I also consider that the fenestrational arrangement should benefit from transom detailing as per the remainder of the scheme.

- 1.16** Plot 18: Additional features required on 'Elevation B', at present this elevation remains largely inanimate and requires further animation given its direct relationship with the public realm. Given the level of visibility afforded to the rear elevation, full window surround detailing will be required on this elevation along with transom detailing to the glazing on this elevation.
- 1.17** Plot 19: Consider introduction of vertical feature window at ground floor to ensure the southern elevation engages positively with the public realm. Given the level of visibility afforded to the rear elevation, full window surround detailing will be required on this elevation along with transom detailing to the glazing on this elevation.
- 1.18** Plot 20: Elevation 'D' Gable - Given the level of visibility afforded to this element, full window/door surround detailing will be required on this elevation along with transom detailing to the glazing on this elevation.
- 1.19** Plots 22, 23 & 24: I would suggest that the windows to the south elevation benefit from a more vertical emphasis, I would also suggest that the window arrangements on this elevation benefit from transom detailing. I do have some concerns in respect of the relationship of the east elevation first floor door/balustrade and that of the lower window, at present the interface/relationship appears overtly visually cramped.
- 1.20** Plot 25: Explore additional chimney detail to south facing elevation. Bay window potentially to be projecting feature oriel bay which may integrate more successfully into the language of the dwelling.
- 1.21** Plot 26: Window proportioning of first floor window above porch to be revised to match the proportioning of the ground floor windows on front elevation.
- 1.22** Plot 27: Query the rationale behind the arched porch detail. Given its limited projection would also query its visual effectiveness.
- 1.23** Plots 28, 29 & 30: The garage/home office arrangement perhaps needs rationalising. The windows within the eaves level above the garage doors appear overtly cramped and rather discordant. I would suggest these are omitted and the eaves level further dropped, the inclusion of eaves detailing will also assist. It is important that this element of the proposal maintains a utilitarian appearance. Rear elevations to benefit from full window surround detailing along with transom detailing given the level of visibility afforded to these elevations.

**1.24** You will note my previously issued comments in respect of financial contributions, particularly in respect of leisure/play facilities within Sabden. I trust these do not need reiterating at this stage.

**Concluding Observations:**

**2.1** The above observations have been provided on the basis of the level of information submitted and the comments contained within this response represent officer opinion only, at the time of writing, without prejudice to the final determination of any application submitted.

**2.2** Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me.

**Officer: Stephen Kilmartin**



3201803612

**Pre-Application Response**

**Officer:**

**Stephen Kilmartin**

**Description:** Victoria Mill Sabden

**Application Ref:** 2017/ENQ/0076

**Case Officer:** S.K

**Response Ref:** 2017/ENQ/0076/UD/01

**Issue Date:** 22/11/17



**Ribble Valley  
Borough Council**

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

**General Observations:**

**1.1** The observations contained within this response are made in relation to the following submitted information:

- Chimney Survey (4<sup>th</sup> July 2017)
- Structural Report (17140/SR/01)
- Heritage Statement of Significance
- Affordable Housing Justification
- Submission Plan 1582SPL/VMS-Fpa01
- 3D Views 1582SPL/VMS-Fpa02

**Heritage Impacts**

**2.1** As you will be aware, the majority of the site lies within the designated Sabden Conservation Area, as such Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 (among others) are invoked, engaging a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.

**2.2** I have noted from the submitted details that you now intend to fully demolish the existing chimney on site and partially rebuild at the site entrance at a height of 4m. The Sabden Conservation Area Appraisal states that the designation of the proposed Sabden Conservation Area derives from, among other matters, the village's industrial past and links with cotton weaving and printing.

**2.3** The Sabden Conservation Area Appraisal states that *'The village economy was for nearly 200 years dependent on the calico print works, cotton mills and weaving sheds. During the 20th century, these businesses have reduced their workforce and eventually closed. Some mill premises have found other uses, other mills have all but disappeared'*. The latter point is important – whilst Victoria Mill is not as well preserved as Union Mill it provides the only other extant mill structures for the industrial village.

**2.4** The Chimney plays a fundamental role in providing a tangible link to the aforementioned villages industrial heritage whilst also being identified as a Focal Building within the CA Appraisal. You will also note that the 'office block' and Mill building fronting Whalley Road are identified as buildings of

Townscape Merit. The proposal as submitted would result in the wholesale loss of all three aforementioned components. In my opinion this results in an adverse impact which seriously affects key elements of Sabden Conservation Area's special architectural or historic interest.

- 2.5** I do not believe that Union Mill alone would readily identify Sabden and its conservation area as a mill village. This would appear to be substantial harm according to the NPPG and the significance assessments in the Sabden Conservation Area Appraisal. Notwithstanding substantial/less than substantial harm arguments, 'Considerable importance and weight' should be given to the duty at Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act when assessing the proposals against other 'material considerations' which have not been given this special statutory status in the 'planning balance'.
- 2.6** In this respect I do note your intention to 'rebuild' the Office Block building, no specific details have been provided in respect of this other than an indicative north elevation. Whilst I accept the rebuilding of the structure may to some degree protect one of the identified buildings of townscape merit, I do not consider that this in isolation would be significant enough to warrant or justify the removal of both the Chimney and Mill Building. It is my opinion that the Chimney plays a fundamental role, not only in acting as a focal point within the CA but also in maintaining a legible link to the village's industrial past as does the Mill Building (Building A within the Structural report).
- 2.7** I note that a steeplejack and structural survey have been submitted and that the Chimney on Site has subsequently been reduced in height following the serving of a Dangerous Buildings Notice. I note the findings of the surveys but also note that no specialist advice has been sought in respect of the potential for chimney repair/restoration.
- 2.8** At this stage no convincing argument has been put before me as to why the chimney, even in a rebuilt state, could not be retained at a height of 15m within the context of the development. I would not consider the reconstruction of a portion of the stack in isolation, at a height of 4m adjacent the entrance, would be considered as adequate or acceptable.

### **Matters of Design**

- 3.1** I have noted that a full complement of elevational details have not been submitted in support of your enquiry and therefore any observations made in respect of the design, scale and external appearance of the dwellings are solely restricted to those as shown on Drawing: 1582SPL/VMS-Fpa01.
- 3.2** I am encouraged that a number of the observations/suggestions made by the authority have already

been incorporated into the proposal and consider, for the most part, that the elevational language conveyed in the submitted details will respond positively to the character of the area and character of the defined Sabden Conservation Area (CA).

- 3.3** I have some concerns regarding the 'end-form' structure to the west elevation of plot 32 and how this will be articulated, particularly regarding its interface with the roof towards its southern extents. I also have concerns as to how this will be elevated, in the absence of any detail I cannot provide a view in respect of its compatibility with the defined CA.
- 3.4** I have concerns regarding the flat-roof treatment of what I assume to be a garage area adjacent plot 30. Whilst I can see that there may be merit in arguing that such a treatment gives the structure a more 'utilitarian appearance', I consider it would appear anomalous and incongruous when read in context with the remainder of the development, particularly as any views of the structure from the north will be from an elevated position. I would suggest a gabled roof form be implemented and the structure be detailed in a manner that would allow it to be read as part of the adjacent building.
- 3.5** I am unsure as to why it appears that a gutter has been extended along the feature gable of plot 01 on the submitted elevations and consider this may be an omission.
- 3.6** The extensive use of chimney detailing greatly assists in animating and articulating the overall roofscape. I also note that a 'vent' detail has been incorporated on the building that accommodates plots 30-32 as requested. I would suggest you explore potentially introducing an additional similar detail on these plots given the overall proportion of roofscape that will be viewable from the public realm to the north. At present the scale of the feature appears to be largely lost against the scale of the roof to which it relates and consider the addition of another vent (or the up-scaling of the existing feature) will allow it to appear more robust.
- 3.7** I would suggest that plot 21 also benefit from the inclusion of a chimney detailing, this will assist in acting as a device that creates a visual resolution between the scale of its host and the scale of the adjacent plots (19, 20, 25 and 26).
- 3.8** I welcome the inclusion of the second floor gable detailing associated with Plots 19/20 and 25/26 and note your preference of utilising weatherboard. I would therefore suggest that a dark colour be specified that allows the gable element to be visually reflective of the notion of the roof-margin. I do consider that the recessing of these elements or the use of an exaggerated window/door reveal will allow for the upper floors to benefit from additional visual depth and relief.
- 3.9** I welcome the inclusion of eaves detailing in the form of exposed rafter feet/projecting corbel stones.

I would suggest that such details be incorporated within the main body of the proposal also.

### **Layout**

- 4.1** In relation to the proposed layout I have a number of concerns relating to the proposed offset distances as follows:
- Rear elevation to flank (side gable) off-set distances should be no less than 13.5m where primary habitable rooms will face on to a two-storey facing/opposing elevation. It would appear the relationship between plots 5-3, 9-6 and 19 & 26 – 23 may fall short of this requirement unless the structures to be side on to their facing counterparts are single storey in height.
  - I have concerns in relation to the offset distances proposed between plots 27-28 and 24 particularly if 'decks' are proposed on the southern elevations of plots 27-29. However I note that no details in respect of the location of habitable room windows for these plots have been provided at this stage.
  - Plot 5 – It would appear that any habitable room windows located on the southern elevation of this dwelling will result in the direct over-looking of neighbouring private amenity space.
- 4.2** From the submitted details an accurate measurement cannot be taken from the rear elevations of plots 10-14 to the facing elevations of neighbouring dwellings to the south. Please be aware that the Local Planning Authority will accept no less than a 21m back-to back facing distance. I also note that the rear garden areas in this location fall short of the normally required length of 10.5m.
- 4.3** No details have been provided in respect of how parking provision will be allocated, in particular plots 19, 20, 25 and 26. Whilst I note the presence of a parking court to the south west of these plots I cannot ascertain whether such provision is dedicated to these plots or the adjacent plots. I am also unable to provide a view in respect of the provision proposed as I do not have accurate bedroom information before me at this stage.
- 4.4** Refuse storage and waste management will have to be considered. No details have been provided in respect of how storage provision for refuse receptacles will be accommodated. Of particular concern are those dwellings that are mid-terrace and will not benefit from a route to bring refuse storage receptacles from the rear of the property to the front (where collection will be required from front of

plot). This is a particularly applies to plots 2, 3, 8, 19, 25 and 26.

- 4.5 Further to the above point refuse storage points will have to be provided for plots 27-29. Given these plots do not appear to benefit from any private residential curtilage I would suggest a bespoke storage arrangement be considered and that such a solution be integrated into the overall architecture of the buildings they serve. This may equally apply to plots 5 and 6 although as no floorplans have been presented I am unsure of the actual arrangement of these plots.
- 4.6 A number of boundary treatments that delineate private residential curtilage appear to directly front the public realm and as such are afforded a high level of visibility. In such situations it is imperative that non-standard boundary treatments are implemented and proprietary products are avoided such as close board fencing. I would also suggest that where such boundary treatments are directly adjacent the footway, measures are implemented to ensure such boundary treatments are sufficiently animated or accompanied by a landscaped margin to soften their overall appearance.
- 4.7 No details are provided in respect of the proposed boundary treatments at the peripheral locations of the site, particularly the southern and western boundaries. The Local Planning Authority actively encourages the use of living 'green-screen' boundary treatments, a number of which have been secured and implemented in a number of locations across the Borough. I would suggest that you explore employing such treatments particularly to the southern and western extents of the site where boundaries will directly interface with existing vegetation and woodland. The use of such screening should also be considered adjacent the Brook and in locations where the boundaries serving side curtilages are afforded a high level of visibility (For example plots 9, 18, 20, 22, 23, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35)
- 4.8 The use of green-screens will counter the potentially anomalous appearance that would result from the use standard boundary treatments whilst contributing to overall ecological and biodiversity enhancement as required by Key Statement EN4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.
- 4.9 I would also request that all boundary treatments, both peripheral and internal, benefit from measures to maintain and enhance wildlife movement within and around the site by virtue of the inclusion of suitable sized gaps/corridors at ground level.
- 4.10 I am disappointed to note that you do not intend to provide a footbridge link across Sabden Brook, a feature which the Local Planning Authority has considered as being essential to ensuring permeability and connectivity within the site. I note you have cited commercial, regulatory and commercial constraints but no information relating to these has been submitted in support of the omission of the bridge.

- 4.11** No details have been provided in respect of the proposed 'Pocket-Parks' however I do note that they appear limited in size and question what they could meaningfully accommodate. It must also be ensured that such areas benefit from natural passive surveillance to aid in deterring potential anti-social behaviour in such areas.
- 4.12** Variations in the surfacing materials to be utilised within the public realm element of the proposal will assist in delineating and defining differing areas. I have noted that you have proposed a 'Central Square' as a focal point to the development. I consider this area would be more successful if it benefitted from a transition in surface materials from the remainder of the highway within the development.
- 4.13** The parking areas to the east of plot 29 may be afforded a high level of visibility from the adjacent public realm, as such I consider visual screening measures should be implemented that will lessen the appearance of the parked motor vehicle, particularly from the northernmost entrance point off Watt Street.

### **Landscape & Ecology**

- 5.1** You will note that due to the significant presence of bats (roosting and foraging) the previous proposal contained the provision of a significant structure to accommodate a dedicated bat roost. In addition to this numerous integral bat and bird boxes were proposed to be integrated into the building fabric of the proposed dwellings. I note that no such details have been provided at this stage. Following the undertaking of appropriate surveys the Local Planning Authority will require that you demonstrate the proposal, as a whole, will result in an overall net enhancement in biodiversity and ecology.
- 5.2** The existing millpond on site was previously considered to meet the criteria to be classed as UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitat and as such the provision of an offsite compensatory pond was proposed 300m to the west of the site. I would suggest that you familiarise yourself with the requirements that would have been imposed should the previous consent have been granted. This may assist in informing the extent and scope of survey work that needs to be undertaken, some of which is summarised below.
- 5.3** The previous consent, at the time of being taken forward to Planning & development Committee contained a requirement that no site clearance, site preparation or development work be undertaken

place until details of methods for the rescue of fish (including Species of Principal Importance) has been submitted and approved in writing by Ribble Valley Borough Council in consultation with specialist advisors. In this respect I would advise you consult with the Ribble Rivers Trust in respect of work that has already been undertaken on site and any potential impacts upon aquatic life/habitat as a result of the development.

5.4 In addition to the above further conditions were imposed that required no site clearance, site preparation or development work be undertaken until a scheme of habitat creation, enhancement and management has been submitted and approved by Ribble Valley Borough Council in consultation with specialist advisors. The approved management plan shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details. The scheme shall include but not be limited to further details of adequate replacement tree planting (numbers, species, location), brook corridor treatment, nesting bird habitats, replacement ponds and surrounding terrestrial habitat, and habitat connectivity within the application site and the wider landscape.

5.5 No landscaping proposals have been provided in respect of the proposal however I have noted that there appears to be very little provision for landscaping margins within the proposal. I would suggest that the proportion of landscaping provision within the proposal be increased to assist in contributing to the overall biodiversity enhancement of the site.

#### **Affordable Housing Provision**

5.6 Following the submission of details in relation to existing and proposed floorspace I can confirm there is no requirement to provide on-site affordable housing provision. This is based on the submitted floorspace details contained within your letter Ref: APC00082 (Dated 6<sup>th</sup> October 2017). A full re-assessment will be made at the detailed application stage should there be any significant deviation from the figures provided.

5.7 Further to the above you will be aware that Key Statement H3 states the following:

*Providing housing for older people is a priority for the Council within the Housing Strategy. Within the negotiations for housing developments, 15% of the units will be sought to provide for older people on sites of 10 units or more. Within this 15% figure a minimum of 50% would be affordable and be included within the overall affordable housing threshold of 30%.The remaining 50% (i.e. the remaining 50% of the 15% older people's element) will be for market housing for older people.*

As a result the Local Authority considers that there is still a requirement to provide 7.5% of the open market dwellings for occupation by older people (aged 55 and over) if the proposal is to be considered to be in accordance with the Adopted Development Plan.

- 5.8 For the avoidance of doubt the Local Planning Authority will require any such housing provision to meet the following definitions:

**Bungalow accommodation solely for occupation by those over 55 years of age:**

*A unit of accommodation/dwelling that shall not be occupied by a person under the age of 55 years except that in circumstances of a married couple or civil partnership at least one person in the married couple or civil partnership is not less than 55 years of age.*

*The unit of accommodation/dwelling shall provide a principle bedroom and bathroom at ground floor, in addition to and without compromising kitchen/dining and living room provision, all of which shall be designed to meet national space standards. The internal and external arrangements of the unit of accommodation shall accord with the specifications and requirements of category 2 housing as defined in M4(2) of Approved Document M (volume 1 2015) of The Building regulations 201 (or any subsequent revisions).*

*For the avoidance of doubt the ground floor accommodation shall possess the ability to be habitable without necessitating the need for access to upper floor accommodation by the user.*

**Non-bungalow accommodation for occupation by those aged over 55:**

*A unit of accommodation/dwelling that shall not be occupied by a person under the age of 55 years except that in circumstances of a married couple or civil partnership at least one person in the married couple or civil partnership is not less than 55 years of age. The internal arrangements and external arrangements of the unit of accommodation shall accord with the specifications and requirements of category 2 housing as defined in M4(2) of Approved Document M (volume 1 2015) of The Building regulations 201 (or any subsequent revisions).*

- 5.9 Should you wish to discuss the above requirements further I would advise you contact our Strategic Housing Officer, Rachael Stott (Rachael.Stott@ribblevalley.gov.uk).



**6.1** A financial contribution will be sought by the Local Planning Authority in respect of a contribution towards leisure/play facilities within Sabden. The contribution sought will be based on the following occupancy ratios at a rate of £216.90 cost per person:

- 1 bed unit - 1.3 people
- 2 bed unit - 1.8 people
- 3 bed unit - 2.5 people
- 4 bed unit - 3.1 people
- 5 + bed unit - 3.5 people

A commitment to meet such requirements should be contained within any Heads of Terms submitted with the application.

**6.2** It is likely that LCC Contributions will seek a financial contribution towards educational places within the area (both primary and secondary). I would therefore advise you contact LCC Contributions Team (Schools.Planning@lancashire.gov.uk) to discuss whether at present there will be requirement to provide a contribution towards a shortfall in primary or secondary school places in the vicinity and the method of calculation to be used. Please note an accurate figure will only be made available when accurate bedroom information can be provided.

**6.3** LCC Highways may require a contribution towards off-site highways improvements. I have previously advised that you approach the Highways service separately as they operate an independent pre-application process, they will also provide feedback on the adoptability of the proposed highways arrangements and any concerns in respect of the highway operation of the development upon request.

#### **Application Requirements**

**7.1** I would advise that the following information be submitted in support of any subsequent application to allow for an accurate determination of the proposal to be made and to limit the need to impose conditions (should consent be granted):

- Location plan identifying the extents of the site 1:500/1:1250
- Existing and Proposed Floorplans (Dimensioned) at scale of 1:100/1:50
- Existing and Proposed Elevations (Dimensioned) at a scale of 1:100/1:50

- Proposed Roof Plans at a scale of 1:100/1:50
- Existing and Proposed Site Plan (Dimensions to be shown between existing properties and those which are proposed) at a scale of 1:200/1:500
- Proposed Streetscenes at a scale of 1:100 or 1:200
- Proposed cross sections through the site (North to south and east to west)
- Details of all boundary treatments - locational and elevational details (Elevational details to be at a scale of 1:100/1:50)
- Details of proposed materials (If possible at time of submission) including door/window framing materials
- Details of proposed surfacing (If possible at time of submission).
- Details of proposed landscaping including types and numbers of trees and shrubs to be planted, their distribution on site, those areas to be seeded, turfed, paved or hard landscaped, including details of any changes of level or landform
- Full details of existing and proposed ground levels and proposed building finished floor levels (all relative to ground levels adjoining the site) including the levels of the proposed roads. For the avoidance of doubt the submitted information shall include existing and proposed sections through the site including details of the height, scale and location of proposed housing in relation to adjacent existing development/built form (where applicable)
- Details of refuse storage locations and routes for access by residents (where applicable)
- Details of parking provision allocation
- Details of any works adjacent the watercourse
- Arboricultural impact assessment including details of tree protection for tree to be retained that are directly affected or within influencing distance of the development.
- Heritage Statement
- Bat Survey (Including precise details of mitigation/enhancement where appropriate)
- Newt Impact Assessment (Including precise details of mitigation/enhancement where appropriate)
- Habitat/Ecological Survey (Including precise details of mitigation/enhancement where appropriate)
- Precise nature for the provision for building dependant species (bat/bird)
- Design & Access Statement
- Heads of Terms
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Transport Assessment
- Noise Assessment (relating to work premises to south of site)

- **Planning Statement (If required)**
- **Structural report (Chimney and other buildings)**

**7.2** Please note that this list is not exhaustive and there may be the need to provide additional or revised information during the determination of the application following consultation with internal/statutory consultees.

**Concluding Observations:**

**8.1** A definitive view of the proposal cannot be offered at this stage due to the omission of information that would be considered integral to the determination of any such application. Notwithstanding this the Local Planning Authority is of the view (notwithstanding other Development Management and Heritage considerations) that the principle of the development of the site for residential purposes, whilst directly contrary to Key Statement DS1 and Policy DMG2, may be considered acceptable based on its regeneration merits.

**8.2** However I must emphasise that there will also be an expectation to meet the requirements as outlined in the main body of this response and any associated financial contributions.

**8.3** I also consider that at this stage you have failed to robustly demonstrate that the proposal conserves and enhances the identified Conservation Area, its heritage assets or setting and for that reason the proposal, at this stage could not be supported.

**8.4** Given the level of elevational and landscaping information that remains outstanding I would strongly advise that such details be forwarded to ourselves for comment prior to the submission of any formal application. This may allow for any outstanding issues to be resolved outside of the application process.

**8.5** The above observations have been provided on the basis of the level of information submitted and the comments contained within this response represent officer opinion only, at the time of writing, without prejudice to the final determination of any application submitted.

**8.6** Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me

**Officer: Stephen Kilmartin**

