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INTRODUCTION

1.1. PWA Planning is retained by Mulbury Homes and THT & L & Q Developments LLP to progress a reserved matters application for the proposed development of 23 no. dwellings on land to the rear of 23-25 Old Row, Whalley Road, Barrow, BB7 9AZ.

1.2. This application seeks Ribble Valley Borough Council’s consent with respect to the scheme’s access, layout, landscaping, scale and appearance (the ‘reserved matters’) and follows the grant of outline consent on 3rd January 2017 (planning application reference 3/2016/0146).

1.3. This Planning Statement provides a description of the proposed development together with an appraisal of the planning merits of the scheme and should be read in conjunction with the following suite of supporting documents:

- Acoustic Assessment;
- 1APP Form;
- Archaeological Scheme of Works Report;
- Arboricultural Method Statement;
- Bat Survey Report;
- Design Justification Statement;
- Drainage Scheme;
- Drawings:
  - Housetype 745 (no. 1249-M-HT-745 A)
  - Housetype B (no. 1249-M-HT-B A)
  - Housetype D (no. 1249-M-HT-D A)
  - Housetype F2 (no. 1249-M-HT-F2 A)
  - Housetype G (no. 1249-M-HT-G A)
  - Housetype H (no. 1249-M-HT-H A)
  - Housetype 3 (no. 1249-M-HT-J A)
  - Housetype K (no. 1249-M-HT-K A)
• Housetype L (no. 1249-M-HT-L A)
• Planning Layout (no. 1249-M-PL01 B)
• Affordable Housing Plan (no. 1249-M-AH01 A)
• Location Plan (no. 1249-M-LP01)
• Materials & Boundary Treatment Plan (no. 1249-M-MB01 D)
• Refuse Strategy Plan (no. 1249-M-RF01 B)
• Streetscenes (no. 1249-M-SS01)
• Landscape Plan (no. 3033 102 E)
• Planting Plan (no. 3033 104 E)
• Proposed Site Access Arrangement (no. 2464-F01)
• Tree Protection Plan (no. 3033 103 E)
• Tree Survey (no. 3033 101 B)
• Swept Path Analysis (no. 2464-SP01)

• Phase I Habitat Survey Report;
• Phase II Residential Site Investigation;
• Tree Survey Report.

1.4. In summary, for reasons identified in this statement it is considered that the proposed development is entirely appropriate and consistent with national and local planning policy, and outline consent reference 3/2016/0146. It will be demonstrated that the scheme represents sustainable development and that the reserved matters approval ought to be granted.
SITE DESCRIPTION & BACKGROUND

2.1. The application relates to a plot of land to the rear of, and including, 23-25 Old Row.

2.2. The site specifically contains two vacant buildings (23-25 Old Row), including an attached dwelling and the former Italian restaurant ‘LA Taverna’ both of which front onto Whalley Road. Both properties differ in scale with the restaurant being much taller than the dwelling but are both traditional in their appearance. Each have painted brickwork, with the dwelling in cream and the restaurant in pale pink both with pitched roofs.

2.3. The site then contains an access track which leads on to a car park to the rear of the properties facing Whalley Road which is used by local residents (outside of the application site boundary) and then onto a large rectangular field to the east.

2.4. A public right of way runs along the site’s northern boundary beyond which is Barrow Primary School, along with its associated playing field, the garden area for the residential dwelling at Penryhn and further open fields. To the east are also open fields with the A59 beyond whilst to the west is Whalley Road and the terraced housing that runs along it. To the south are two children’s play areas and some playing pitches, existing residential development on Trafford Gardens and Washbrook Close and a mix of commercial / business and retail development within the Barrow Brook Business Village. It is understood that a children’s nursery is also being delivered in the area to the south of the site within the Barrow Brook Business Village.

2.5. An aerial image of the site in the context of the surrounding area is provided at Figure 1 overleaf.
2.6. The site is not identified by the Environment Agency’s flood risk map as being at risk from flooding and there does not appear to be any other statutory designations within or immediately adjacent to the application site.

2.7. On 3rd January 2017 outline planning permission, including indicative details on site access, was granted (application 3/2016/0146 refers) for the site’s redevelopment into 23 no. dwellings and as such the principle of a 23-unit residential development including the site’s sustainability credentials have already been accepted by the Council and are therefore not matters up for consideration as part of this reserved matters application.

2.8. The outline planning permission included a number of conditional requirements, some of which are dealt with under this application whilst others will be dealt with under a separate application to discharge those matters controlled by condition in due course.
PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

3.1. PWA Planning and the applicant engaged in formal pre-application discussions with the LPA to discuss matters relating to layout, appearance, scale, landscaping and tenure.

3.2. A pre-application meeting took place on 22nd March 2018 between Principal Planning Officer Robert Major and Housing Strategy Officer Rachael Stott, the applicant, GTD Architects and PWA Planning which was on the whole positive and shortly after the Council’s formal written pre-application response was issued, a copy of which is provided at Appendix 1 of this statement.

3.3. Since receiving the written response discussions continued between PWA Planning and officers of the Council on all design related matters as well as the proposed tenure mix of the scheme, and how this sat within the context of the s106 that is linked to the outline permission. A copy of this dialogue between Senior Planner Emily Robinson (PWA Planning) and Principal Planning Officer Robert Major (RVBC) is provided at Appendix 2.

3.4. As can be seen from the correspondence provided at Appendix 2, the LPA have confirmed they are happy with the proposed affordable mix and that whilst this deviates slightly from the requirements of the s106, this deviation can be agreed via letter as opposed to a formal deed of variation. Note that the amount of affordable housing being proposed does not fall foul of the s106 requirement but rather the type of housing is slightly different, hence the deviation. The LPA query whether the RP will take on the properties without a bath but the RP and applicant Trafford Housing Trust have confirmed that they will take the units on this basis.

3.5. It can also be seen from the correspondence at Appendix 2 that the LPA are concerned that some of the affordable units fronting Whalley Road are below the national space standard but the RP has confirmed that they will take these units on at this size which should in turn alleviate the LPA’s concern in this particular regard.
3.6. The LPA also raises a potential issue with the parking arrangements proposed for Plot 3 which has 1 space however if this is confirmed as an issue by Lancashire County Council as the Highway Authority during determination it is considered this can be overcome through labelling up one of the adjacent visitor bays as a dedicated space for this unit. In the response, the LPA accepts our point on separation distances / overlooking for some of the plots and also accepts the use of reconstituted stone throughout the site but asks for natural slate on the three units facing Whalley Road. This request has been accommodated within the submitted plans. The response confirms the house designs are acceptable, although raises concerns over the projected bays and pointed eves which were shown on the plots facing Whalley Road but these plots have subsequently been amended to remove these elements and as such should now meet the LPA’s approval.

3.7. As can be seen from the formal pre-application response at Appendix 1, a new ecology survey was requested. This is not ordinarily required as part of reserved matters applications but is necessary in this instance as the original survey is out of date and the LPA need to be comfortable that any mitigation proposals for birds and bats boxes (required by condition on the outline consent) is based on a robust ecology assessment. To confirm, a new ecology survey has been undertaken and mitigation measures with respect to bats and birds is provided within the application submissions. In addition, noise mitigation proposals (to determine these a noise survey has been undertaken) and a drainage scheme are also being provided with this reserved matters application in accordance with the requirements of Condition 7 and Condition 17 on the outline consent respectively.

3.8. Moreover, the applicant and their design team have engaged thoroughly with the LPA on a pre-application basis. We have listened carefully to the pre-application advice provided by the LPA and have made several changes to the scheme in line with the comments given. As such, it is hoped the scheme that is submitted with the application is met with the officer’s full support.
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

4.1. The proposals involve the demolition of 23-25 Old Row, creation of a new internal estate road and erection of 23 no. dwellings as per the following mix:

- 11 no. detached four-bedroom houses;
- 2 no. detached three-bedroom houses;
- 3 no. semi-detached three-bedroom houses;
- 1 no. semi-detached two-bedroom house;
- 1 no. attached three-bedroom house;
- 2 no. semi-detached two-bedroom bungalows;
- 3 no. detached two-bedroom bungalows.

4.2. During the design process, consideration has been given to the layout in order to avoid any loss of privacy to existing and future residents. A note identifying areas where there are non-habitable rooms is included within the submitted layout (no. 1249-M-PL01) so as to assist officers in their assessment of separation distances.

4.3. The properties include a mix of two storey dwellings and bungalows, as per limitations set out at the outline stage.

4.4. The walls of the properties are to be constructed out of reconstituted stone, with some of the bungalows incorporating areas of cream render and roofs are to be grey concrete interlocking tiles, with the exception of Plots 1-3 which are to have natural slate roofs. Windows and doors of the properties are contemporary in their style and are grey in colour. Moreover, the materials combined with the design of the properties ensures the development is traditional yet with a contemporary twist which as a result respects local character whilst at the same time creating something new and innovative.

4.5. All properties have access to good sized rear gardens, all of which are shown grassed with paved areas whilst front gardens are also proposed which are to be a mix of grassed areas and ornamental planting. Each property has the ability to store bins for
waste and recycling to the rear which can be accessed externally and for more details in this respect please refer to the submitted Refuse Strategy (drawing no. 1249-M-RF01).

4.6. Some of the detached houses have detached double garages and driveways whilst parking for the remaining properties is provided on private driveways. Two visitor spaces are also provided within the layout, adjacent to the site entrance off Whalley Road.

4.7. A Landscape Scheme (drawing no. 3033 102 D) is submitted with the application which denotes the existing trees and shrubs that are to be retained along the site’s boundaries and sets out the new landscape features that are proposed within the development. It also confirms the hard surfacing that is proposed, which is to comprise tarmac to the internal estate road, parking areas and footpaths, and concrete flag paving to the rears and sides of the properties.

4.8. In terms of boundary treatments, these include a mix of timber fencing and screen walling. A 4m acoustic fence is also proposed to the south-east corner of the site to the rear of Plots 16 and 17 so as to mitigate against the noise arising from the commercial unit located to the south of these plots.

4.9. In terms of access, this is to be off Whalley Road to the west and follows the principles agreed in the outline application. Moreover, a site access plan (no. 2464-F01) is provided with this application which shows how the access achieves the required visibility splays.

4.10. Also included within the layout is a private footpath that is located in between Plots 15 and 16. This is to be controlled by Admiral Taverns and used by the agricultural tenant of the neighbouring fields only.

4.11. Moreover, for full details and rationale behind the final layout and design of the proposed development, together with information on matters of materials, waste,
sustainability, boundary treatments, biodiversity, and landscaping, please refer to the submitted Design Justification Statement.
PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

5.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; meaning any other supplementary / supporting planning documents (SPDs) and the government’s guidance as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018).

The Development Plan

5.2. The statutory Development Plan for the application site comprises the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which was adopted in December 2014 and the Proposals Map (1998) associated with the former Local Plan, which is still in place until such time as the plans which form the Housing and Economic Development DPD are adopted.

5.3. Given that the principle of the proposed development of the site for a residential use has already been accepted under the extant outline planning permission (reference 3/2016/0146), it would be superfluous to provide a full planning policy assessment (in this respect please refer to the Committee Report that went with the outline application). That said, those policies considered relevant to the scheme’s access, scale, layout, appearance and landscaping (the ‘reserved matters’) will be considered in respect of the detailed plans submitted with this application. These policies are set out below.

5.4. **Key Statement DS2 Sustainable Development** looks to mirror Paragraph 11 of the NPPF. It sets out the sustainable development principles which are to guide both authorities and developers, and encourages authorities to develop proactive relationships with applicants in order to ensure that, where possible, applications are approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.5. **Policy EN2 Landscape** primarily focuses on protection of the Forest of Bowland AONB through ensuring development contributes to the conservation of the area by
enhancing and protecting the landscape and character. The policy does offer more general coverage by linking the policy to the protection of all landscapes outlining that the council expects all development to be in-keeping with the character of the landscape.

5.6. In the council’s justification for the policy they state that:

“The Council will also seek to ensure that the open countryside is protected from inappropriate development. Developers should adopt a non-standardised approach to design which recognises and enhances local distinctiveness, landscape character, the quality of the built fabric, historic patterns and landscape tranquillity.”

5.7. **Policy EN3 Sustainable Development and Climate Change** sets out how new developments must be designed and constructed in a sustainable manner which combats climate change.

5.8. **Policy EN4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity** outlines that development should look to conserve and enhance local biodiversity and geodiversity and any negative impacts should be avoided arising from new developments. The policy is in place mainly to add further protection to designated sites of environmental and ecological importance.

5.9. **Policy DMG1 General Considerations** provides detailed development guidance with respect to design, access, amenity, the environment and infrastructure, which all seek to ensure that all future developments are of the highest possible quality.

5.10. **Policy DMG2 Strategic Considerations** outlines further strategic considerations and is to assist in the interpretation of the Development Strategy and underpins the settlement hierarchy for the purposes of delivering sustainable development. The policy states that within the Open Countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting.
5.11. **Policy GMG3 Transport and Mobility** seeks to promote sustainable travel and maximise the opportunities for development sites to be well connected for pedestrians and cyclists to existing settlements and infrastructure. It also states that new developments are expected to provide car parking in accordance with the Council’s approved standards.

5.12. **Policy DME2 Landscape and Townscape Protection** places great emphasis on the protection and avoidance of significant harm to the borough’s important landscape or landscape features. Such features are outlined as including:

1. "Traditional Stone Walls.
2. Ponds.
4. Woodlands.
5. Copses.
6. Hedgerows and Individual Trees
7. Townscape Elements such as the Scale, Form, and Materials that Contribute to the Characteristic Townscapes of the Area.
8. Upland Landscapes and Associated Habitats Such as Blanket Bog.
9. Botanically Rich Roadside Verges (That are Worthy of Protection).”

5.13. **Policy DME3 Site and Species Protection and Conservation**, as with DME2, this policy seeks to protect elements of any proposal site which have notable value, with a focus on relevant ecological designations such as Special Protection Areas and SSSIs. Further to this it also places an emphasis on developers to incorporate measures within new developments to enhance biodiversity.

5.14. **Policy DME6 Water Management** states that development proposals will not be permitted where they stand to increase the risk of flooding and that applications should include appropriate measures for the conservation, protection and management of water. It states that all applications for planning permission should include details for surface water drainage disposal that are to be based on a sustainable drainage
hierarchy. Whilst this application is not an application for planning permission, exact details over how surface water is to be dealt with within the development site were not dealt with under the outline application but are included within this application, in line with Condition 7 of the outline permission.

5.15. **Policy DMB5 Footpaths and Bridleways** seeks to ensure the borough’s network of public footpaths are retained, maintained and improved as they provide a key contribution to the area’s leisure, health and tourism. Whilst this policy was listed in the Committee Report for the outline application and is therefore included within this statement for completeness, the PROW (route no. 3-47-FP 1) that runs along the site’s northern boundary sits outside of the application’s red edge and is therefore to remain in situ and unaffected by the proposals.
6. PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT

Access

6.1. Firstly, it is considered the use of the site for residential purposes has already been accepted in highways terms under the outline application, through which it was concluded that the proposed development is sustainably located and would not cause harm to the local highway network or road safety.

6.2. The development is to utilise an existing access point off Whalley Road, with necessary improvement and widening works. A site access drawing no. 2464-F01 is provided with the application which shows the precise details for the site access, including the appropriate visibility splays. The proposed access arrangements are considered to be an entirely suitable and safe means of access and egress.

6.3. Footpaths are proposed at either side of the internal estate road which will connect the existing footpaths on Whalley Road to the proposed dwellings, which will in turn increase pedestrian connectivity from the site to the existing facilities and amenities available in Barrow and beyond.

6.4. Parking for all 23 no. properties is provided off-road, most to the sides of the properties on private driveways and some within detached double garages, which helps to avoid a street scene that is dominated by parked cars. Sufficient space for the manoeuvring of large vehicles (namely those for the collection of waste) has also been accommodated within the layout and a swept path analysis plan no. 2464-SP01 is submitted with the application to demonstrate this.

6.5. Parking is on the whole provided in accordance with the relevant parking standards for the LPA, with the exception of Plot 3 which provides one parking space as opposed to the recommended two. However, this is only a 2 no. bedroom property and is to be an affordable rented unit under which tenure parking demand is generally lower than if it were to be available on the open market for sale. That said and if needed, this plot
could utilise one of the two visitor bays that are provided on the internal estate on the other side of the road from this property.

6.6. Based on the above, the proposals are thought to fully comply with Policy DMG3, in particular through increasing pedestrian connectivity from the site to the surrounding area and complying with the relevant car parking standards.

**Scale, Layout and Appearance**

6.7. The proposed layout, orientation of dwellings and housing density of the proposed development are all reflective of the parameters set out in the outline application and further to this reflect the existing pattern of (more recent) development in the surrounding area at Barrow.

6.8. The layout includes a healthy range of house types, including mix of detached, semi-detached and attached two storey houses and semi-detached and detached bungalows, all of which range from 2-4 bedrooms. As such, it is considered the development site will be attractive to a range of occupiers, namely young persons / first time buyers, families and the elderly. This type of housing is thought to meet identified local demands in this particular area of the Ribble Valley and accords with one of the LPA’s aims of increasing the availability of high-quality housing stock for young people and the elderly.

6.9. Great care and sensitivity has been given to the design of the proposed development, which as previously noted, has been the subject of thorough pre-application discussions with the Council.

6.10. The layout represents an efficient use of land, is of an appropriate density, respects the natural topography of the site where possible and through the placing of strategic landscaping measures generally creates an attractive place for both current and future residents to enjoy. The design of the scheme is thought to correspond well to the character of neighbouring, existing residential development whilst at the same time creating something architecturally interesting.
6.11. Properties have been orientated in such a way so that blank gable ends and the rears of properties are not visible from key viewpoints into and throughout the site.

6.12. The external appearance of the properties represents a modern take on the character of existing residential properties in the area and whilst samples / detailed specifications of all proposed external materials (roofs, walls, windows and doors) will be provided in due course, as is demonstrated on the submitted elevations, walls are to be constructed from reconstituted stone with some of the bungalows incorporating areas of cream render, whilst the windows and doors are to be a shade of grey. Grey interlocking tiles are proposed to the roofs of the properties save for Plots 1-3 which are to have natural slate, so as to blend in with the character of the existing properties along Whalley Road.

6.13. The scheme has been carefully designed so that there no impacts on existing or future residential amenity and the scale and layout are thought to conform with the parameters on scale and siting as approved at the outline stage. The submitted scheme has been designed to sit well within the boundaries of the site and the site layout demonstrates that sufficient separation distances have been retained throughout the development to ensure that there is no adverse impact whatsoever on residential amenity, avoiding any potential overlooking or indeed any other inter-visibility issues.

6.14. Through the provision of continuous footpaths on both sides of the internal estate road, the development will result in high levels of pedestrian connectivity. Through the design of the proposed properties and provision of off-road parking that is sited either to the side or rear of properties (thus avoiding a car dominated street scene) coupled with the proposed landscape measures, the scheme creates a high quality and attractive environment.

6.15. In terms of sustainability, a scheme which demonstrates how 10% of the development’s energy will be from renewables will be submitted against Condition no. 16 in due course.
6.16. Moreover, the scheme adheres to the requirements of Policies EN3, DMG1 and DMG2 that are relevant to the ‘reserved matters’ and is consistent with best practice and guidance on residential layouts. The proposed layout and associated house type drawings detail the applicant’s intention to develop a site which sits well within the surrounding area and which creates homes that enhance the site’s landscape character and sense of local distinctiveness. Taking the above guidance, the proposed development is considered to meet the Council’s requirements regarding the design and overall sustainability of new developments. The design of the proposed scheme is thought to be well-considered and of a very high standard that provides a quality addition to the local, family housing mix whilst being sympathetic to local character.

**Landscaping**

6.17. The majority of the site’s existing landscape features, namely those along the north and southern boundary, are to be retained as part of the development whilst further new soft landscape features are also proposed within the development such as hedgerow planting along the internal estate road and areas of ornamental tree planting so as to soften the impact of built development and to generally help create a visually attractive scheme.

6.18. As already noted, all properties have private, rear gardens which are of a size relative to the property to which they relate whilst areas of landscaping are also proposed to the fronts of the properties so as to create strong street scenes throughout.

6.19. Moreover, the proposals are also thought to comply with Policy EN2 and DME2, in so much as the development contributes towards the conservation and enhancement of the site’s existing landscape character, thus ensuring an enhancement to the site’s environmental value which will also in turn encourage biodiversity.

6.20. A detailed landscape scheme and planting plan, which follows the strategic landscape principles as set out in the outline consent, is submitted with the application which
demonstrates that the proposed landscaping measures help to ensure compliance with these aforementioned policies.

**Other matters**

6.21. It is not considered that the proposed development raises any other material considerations which would have any adverse impacts on interests of acknowledged importance and would therefore influence the determination of the application.

**Ecology**

6.22. This reserved matters submission on the whole places reliance upon the supporting technical information associated with application 3/2016/0146, with the exception of the ecology report which has been updated following a recent re-survey and provides a mitigation strategy with respect to bat and birds. Through the submission of the new ecology report and associated mitigation measures it is considered the proposals comply with the requirements of Policies EN4 and DME3.

**Noise**

6.23. In addition, a noise assessment has been undertaken so as to ensure compliance with Condition no. 17 on the outline consent which specifically requires the submission of a scheme for appropriate noise mitigation measures at the reserved matters stage.

**Waste and Refuse**

6.24. The proposed refuse strategy is shown on drawing no. 1249-M-RF01 which is submitted with this application and provides details of the locations of bin stores within the curtilage of each property and collection points. It is considered that these details are sufficient to ensure that there would be appropriate provision for the storage and collection of waste and recyclable material and the locations of the collection points are acceptable.

**Drainage**

6.25. In line with Condition no. 7 on the outline consent, a drainage scheme is also submitted with this application for approval which sets out how surface water and foul sewage is
to be disposed of and which follows the sustainable drainage hierarchy. On the basis of this submitted scheme it is considered the proposals are able to demonstrate compliance with Policy DME6.

**Archaeology**

6.26. In addition, whilst it is likely the report will need to be submitted against Condition no. 13 in due course, an Archaeological Assessment is submitted with this application which, following site investigations of seven trenches across the site, confirms that the site contains no archaeological remains and as a result the development can proceed without the need for further works in this respect.
7.1. PWA Planning is retained by Mulbury Homes and THT & L & Q Developments LLP to prepare and submit this reserved matters application for the erection of 23 no. dwellings with associated landscaping and infrastructure works on land to the rear of 23-25 Old Row, Barrow.

7.2. The application follows the approval of outline planning application 3/2016/0146 through which the principle of the development was accepted and it is considered that the detailed proposals submitted with this application have been demonstrated to accord with the parameters, plans and technical information that were approved under the outline consent.

7.3. The proposals are considered to be consistent with those policies as contained within the Development Plan relating to the scheme’s access layout, scale, appearance and landscaping and generally represents a sustainable development which will result in a significant contribution to the Council’s housing stock whilst also serving as a boost to the local economy during the construction phase.

7.4. Furthermore, given that the scheme is consistent with relevant development plan policies and with the concept of sustainable development as set out within the NPPF, it is considered that the scheme should benefit from the presumption in favour of such development as set out in the NPPF.

7.5. Finally, there are no material or technical reasons that would indicate that planning permission ought not to be granted
Pre-Application Enquiry Response

Dear Ms Robinson,

Following our meeting on 22nd March 2018 I write in response to your pre-application enquiry.

As you are aware, outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) was granted in March 2017 for the erection of 23 dwellings on land to the rear of 23-25 Old Row, Barrow.

Relevant Policies:

- DS1 – Development Strategy
- DS2 – Sustainable Development
- EN2 – Landscape
- EN4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- H1 – Housing Provision
- H2 – Housing Balance
- H3 – Affordable Housing
- DMI1 – Planning Obligations
- DMI2 – Transport Considerations
- DMG1 – General Considerations
- DMG2 – Strategic Consideration
- DMG3 – Transport and Mobility
- DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection
- DME3 – Site and Species protection and Conservation
- DMH1 – Affordable Housing Criteria
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Housing Mix:

The approved outline scheme includes a Section 106 Agreement which requires seven affordable units, all of which would be life-time home compliant with a bedroom located at ground floor level, however the pre-app as submitted would not meet this requirement. During our meeting the prospect of varying the Section 106 agreement was discussed to provide 4 or 5 affordable bungalows and 2 or 3 affordable (two storey) dwellings on this site.

 Obviously the Council’s preferred option was would be for the scheme to come forward as previously agreed with seven affordable bungalows, however the LPA did not rule out accepting a variation to the legal
agreement as detailed above, and the preference would be for five affordable bungalows to be provided (as opposed to four) and two affordable (two storey) dwellings. Furthermore upon discussion with the Head of Planning I can confirm that should an application to vary the Section 106 Agreement be submitted, the proposal would not necessarily have to go to Planning Committee, provided that the Council’s Housing Officer raises no objection to the alteration to the revised housing mix. Should the Housing Officer object to the variation of the 106 then the application would likely be determined at Committee.

In summary, should you seek to vary the affordable housing provision from the approved outline consent, a formal variation of the Section 106 application would need to be submitted, and I must also add that in addition to the planning fee for such an application the applicant would also be required to pay the Council’s Legal fees for any alteration to the agreement.

House sizes:

The submitted application does not include floor plans for the LPA to assess bedroom sizes, however from the detail provided it is apparent that house types B and J would not meet the national size standard.

Layout:

The submitted pre-app includes a revised layout (in comparison to the indicative layout submitted with the outline application) but without elevational details it is not entirely clear how potential window openings would relate. For information the Council seeks to ensure that a separation distance of 21m is achieved between principal elevations, 13m between principal and secondary elevations, and that rear gardens have a 10.5m length.

From the layout provided I would raise a concern in respect of the rear gardens of plots 12 and 16, as well as the separation distance between the front elevations of plots 16 and 20 – this however could be overcome with details of the exact positioning of windows in these elevations. A concern is raised in respect of the proximity of the front corners of plots 5 and 21 with the highway, however it is accepted that the visual impact is somewhat reduced by these properties being bungalows. Nevertheless, I would advise that these properties are located as far back from the back of the footway as possible in order to provide a sense of openness to the street scene. I would also like to reiterate that any units occupying prominent corner plots should have an element of dual aspect to prevent blank elevations addressing public view points.

An additional concern raised at the meeting was the length of the rear garden for plot 3, however it was agreed that one of the car parking spaces shown would be converted into additional garden area, and an additional car parking space for this dwelling provided elsewhere. Unfortunately LCC Highways will not provide comments on pre-application enquiries but from past experience I would expect that Highways would require two designated car parking spaces for the each 2-bedroom dwelling. Any reserved matters application should also include designated bin collection points as the Council’s refuse collectors will only pick up waste presented adjacent to an adopted highway.

Finally in relation to the layout, please be aware that the outline consent requires noise mitigation measures to be incorporated into the dwellings located in close proximity to the adjacent industrial unit.

Design:

The pre-app does not include any details of the house designs but the LPA would be seeking the use of stone and slate, with some elements of render on the dwellings being acceptable, and the potential for the use of an antique/buff brick and render towards the rear of the site (away from Whalley Road) on less prominent plots.

During the meeting you made reference to the indicative house types submitted with the outline application and having viewed these I would recommend that any reserved matters application should include more
detailing in respect of stone quoining, soldier courses, stone features etc... as my observation is that the house types submitted with the outline consent are somewhat bland in appearance.

**Trees and Ecology:**

As discussed at our recent meeting the reserved matters application will require the submission of updated tree and ecology reports, including details of all trees/hedges to be retained and the measures of protection. The Countryside Officer has commented that the existing trees and hedges along the edges of the site should be retained where possible in the interest of visual amenity and biodiversity/ecology.

The reserved matters application should also include details of in-built bat/bird boxes on all proposed dwellings, and failure to provide this detail would result in such a condition be added to any approval.

**Highways:**

As mentioned earlier in this response Lancashire County Council Highways do not offer pre-app advice to the Authority. However they are now offering pre-app advice to individuals and planning agents for a fee. If you require any additional information with regards to highways issues please contact them directly prior to a formal application being submitted in order to establish whether the existing site access would be deemed acceptable and if adequate sightlines can be met. Further details can be found via the following link:


**Section 106 Contributions:**

I would like to take this opportunity to draw your attention to a number of financial contributions included within the outline approval (either within the S106 or via condition) and these include financial contributions in respect of education, public open space and footpath improvements, along with Section 278 works to the access point and nearby bus stop improvements.

**Submission Requirements:**

Should you proceed to submission of a formal application it is my opinion that the Local Planning Authority would require the following information to accompany such an application:

- Location Plan
- Site Layout
- House Types – to include scaled elevations, floor plans and materials
- Design and Access Statement
- Updated Habitat/Ecology Survey
- Updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment / Tree Constraints Plan to BS5837 standard for trees on and adjacent to the site
- Proposed landscaping scheme and phasing/timing plan
- Scaled plan showing the proposed access and that works to provide adequate sightlines
- Utilities/Drainage Strategy
- Boundary details
- Floor and ground level details

Please note this aforementioned required information may not be exhaustive and is provided on the basis of the level of information submitted. Failure to provide required information is likely to result in an application being made invalid until such information is received or potentially refused on the basis of insufficient information.
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. Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely

Robert Major
Principal Planning Officer
APPENDIX 2
Housing Mix

- I note your email dated 01/11/18 in respect of the proposed affordable housing mix and need to discuss this with Rachel Stott (Housing Officer);

I have since spoken with Rachel Stott who confirmed that based on the proposed affordable housing mix, a deed of variation to the s106 would not be required and the Council could agree that not all the affordable units will have their principal bedrooms on the ground floor (thus contrary to the s106) in writing via exchange of letters. This however does not address the fact that the affordable housing by definition in the s106 is to be for over 55s only and our client does not want to be tied with this obligation. The LPA would therefore also need to confirm this deviation in writing.

To confirm, the affordable housing mix is as follows (slightly different to what I previously proposed):

- Units 1-3 affordable rent
- Units 4, 5, 20 and 21 shared ownership

It is likely that some of the other units within the development will also be affordable (shared ownership) although these cannot form part of any legal agreement as it would stand to affect grant funding. In this respect we do not want any restriction from other units being offered on an affordable basis.

I am currently awaiting confirmation from Trafford Housing Trust as to whether an exchange of letters will suffice / give them the legal certainty they require.

Rachael Stott has confirmed that the Council will provide a letter confirming that not all the affordable units need to be affordable. As such the LPA are satisfied with the affordable housing mix proposed by this application.

A potential issue however is the provision of a bath within the proposed over 55s bungalows. The Council is continually coming up against a problem in that RPs will not take the over 55 affordable units if they do not have a level access shower (as opposed to a bath). It is therefore advised that the bathrooms on the bungalows include a level access shower.

- I did previously raise a concern in respect of whether a number of the house types met the national size limit. The revised submission does not show the floor spaces for me to consider this matter further.

Roughly 1/3 of the properties (8/23) will not meet national described space standards but the vast majority will and where there is a shortfall this is only nominal. Please see below a comparison list of the proposed floorspaces (sqm) for each house type and the national described standards:
House Type 745 (total no. 2)
NDS 79
Proposed 69 (-13.5%)

House Type B (total no. 1)
NDS 93
Proposed 80 (-15%)

House Type D (total no. 3)
NDS 106
Proposed 103

House Type F2 (total no. 2)
NDS 93
Proposed 89

House Type G (total no. 5)
NDS 115
Proposed 128

House Type H (total no. 3)
NDS 124
Proposed 146

House Type J (bungalow – total no. 2)
NDS 61
Proposed 61

House Type K (bungalow – total no. 3)
NDS 61
Proposed 65

House Type L (total no. 2)
NDS 93
Proposed 88

On the basis that only some of the properties have a shortfall and that this is only marginal, please you confirm that the LPA will approach this pragmatically and accept the floorspaces proposed?

I accept that the open market houses and bungalows are marginal and therefore acceptable, however the affordable units at the front of the site are 13.5% and 15% below the national space standard and I do not consider this to be marginal or acceptable. There is a concern that RPs will not take the units at these sizes.

Layout

- I remain concerned over Plot 3 only being provided with one car parking space. I note that there are two visitor spaces nearby but I cannot confirm that this would be acceptable to LCC Highways. Your concerns are noted but the alternative is having the garden to Plot 3 reduced which I recall from the meeting is something you would prefer not to see.

It is correct that I would not support the shortening of the garden any further, but that does not mean that LCC highways will accept only 1 car parking space for this property. As previously mentioned LCC do not comment on pre-apps so I cannot second guess what they will say to this proposal when formally submitted – I can only advise that two spaces be
provided for this property. Could one of the visitor spaces be designated for this plot? (but again I cannot confirm if LCC would accept that)

- I remain concerned over the separation distance between plots 11 and 12 with plot 20. Specifically the first floor windows in plots 11 and 12 overlooking number 20. A revised layout is being produced which denotes non-habitable rooms on the plots you’ve queried, which should alleviate this issue.
- The same concern applies in respect of plot 13 overlooking plot 12. As above.

Noted

House Designs

Materials

- My opinion remains that the three plots facing Whalley Road (1, 2 & 3) should be constructed in natural stone with a natural slate roof. I also consider that the most prominent plots within the development site (mainly 4, 5, and 23) should also be constructed in stone with a slate roof.

In my email I have attached images / specifications of the following proposed materials:

- Reconstituted Stone Darlstone Walling buff black rural
- Grey concrete interlocking tile

It is proposed to use the recon stone throughout the entire development which we think would work well here. Whilst I note you would prefer to see natural stone on some of the more prominent units facing Whalley Road, this is not feasible for the developer and when taking into account existing surrounding developments which are made up of a wide mix of grey render (directly to the south), (natural and recon) stone (to the west and south), pebble dash (north) and red brick (south) we think reconstituted stone is more than reasonable in this instance. Please could you confirm that the LPA would accept the materials proposed?

- I am content with use of buff brick and tiles on the remainder of the site. Noted but it is now proposed to use recon stone throughout and tiles throughout.

I accept the use of reconstituted stone throughout the site, however my position remains that the three units fronting Whalley Road should have a natural slate roof as per the other properties fronting this highway.

House designs

- The submission does not show an elevation of plots 1, 2 and 3 together, this would have been advantageous in order to assess the visual impact of these three properties together on Whalley Road. Equally it would have been useful to see a street scene of how these three units related to the existing properties (eaves, ridge height etc….) I have included on my email the latest street scene drawing although note that some of the properties will be reduced in height slightly as per your comments below ...
Thank you for the street scene on Whalley Road, this is useful and I have no objection to the ridge heights of these three units fronting Whalley Road. However I would raise a concern in respect of the projecting bay windows and the front pike features which breach the uniform eaves line along this frontage. I advise that these features are removed and a more traditional frontage is provided.

- House types 745, F2, H – windows in these properties have a horizontal (square) emphasis whereas other properties on the site and in wider area generally have vertical emphasis. The preference would be for all properties to have a vertical emphasis within window openings. The properties showing the horizontal window emphasis are being amended in line with your preference for a more vertical emphasis.

- House types K and G – both these house types appear to have a disproportionate amount of roof. In respect of house type G the eaves to ridge height is 4m which is considered excessive. Even more so house type K measure 6.3m to the ridge, however approx. 4m of this is the roof – again this is considered to be excessive and somewhat odd visually. Is there a specific reason why these two house types (G and K) in particular have such high roofs? The roof heights of these properties in being amended in line with your comments.

Noted