

Planning Committee

Wednesday 04 November 2020

Late Observations Schedule

Schedule Items

<u>Item</u>	<u>App No</u>	<u>Observations</u>
-------------	---------------	---------------------

1	19/0673	<u>Additional neighbour comments</u>
---	---------	--------------------------------------

Further comments have been received from two neighbours in respect of the revised plans. One of these refers to:

- Plans are not in keeping with the local surroundings.
- This traditional barn has already been converted and in its current state fits in well with its location.
- It is extremely close to 2 other properties and the proposed plans mean it will overlook these and give no privacy to the neighbouring properties.
- I do not believe a traditional barn conversion should be destroyed like this and replaced with an oversized building with no character.

The other:

- Queries the extent and nature of the obscured glazing
- Expresses a view that the balcony and second lounge area will allow unacceptable overlooking
- That landscaping should be provided in advance of development
- Request confirmation that obscured windows are to be non-opening

Officer Response to Additional neighbour comments

The comments largely repeat matters raised previously and so addressed in the report. The exception is the queries over the nature of the obscured glazing and opening arrangements of the windows which is clarified in suggested condition 4 which sets out the area of glazing to be obscured, the level of obscurity, and confirms that the windows are to be non-opening.

The neighbour expresses concern over the inter-visibility between the side facing front lounge of the application property and the patio and bedroom to his property. On reflection this is considered to be a valid concern and so condition 4 is to be further revised to reference this area being obscurely glazed also.

Revised Plans

Since the publication of the agenda revised plans have been received which indicate the obscured glazing and privacy screen referenced on the report, and those suggested following the additional neighbour comment above, but make no further changes to the proposed dwelling. These plans have been added to the file for consideration in the determination of the application.

Revised Recommendation

The recommendation remains unchanged but condition 2 is revised to relate to the

revised plans, and the wording of conditions 4 and 5 is changed to reflect the fact that the details referred to in the report and this Late Observations Schedule are now part of the submitted drawings.

The change to condition 4 results in the wording being as follows:

The following areas shall be obscurely glazed to standard equivalent to at least level 3 on the Pilkington Scale (where 1 is the lowest and 5 the greatest level of obscurity) to a height of up to at least 1.7m measured from the first floor height of the building, and shall be non-opening below that height as shown on the plans listed in condition 2 of this planning permission.

- *central section of glazing to the first floor of the western elevation (ie that which is alongside the stairs and the kitchen / dining area)*
- *the western facing section of the glazing to the corner window serving the front lounge area at first floor*

Only this style of glazing shall be installed during the construction of the dwelling and it shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling at Fir Trees Farm in accordance with the requirements of Policy GD7 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032.

2 20/0315 Late observations:

Alterations to landscaping scheme:

Since the preparation of the committee report the applicant has submitted amended tree protection and soft landscaping plans (drawing references 6240.02 Rev C and 6240.03 Rev D) alongside an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment ('Revision C') and Landscape Management Plan ('Revision B'). These plans and documents have been updated to include the removal of a *circa* 45m long stretch of existing hedgerow '22G' located along the southwestern boundary of the site where it borders the equestrian land. The additional works to 22G are required to allow for the regrading of the land to the south of plots 36 and 37 in order to form a sloping earth bank to the site boundary and thus prevent the need for the construction of a retaining wall alongside the southern edge of plots 36 and 37.

The ground remodelling works required to create the banking prevent the retention of the central part of the existing hedgerow '22G'. However, the updated soft landscaping plan provides for the introduction of new tree, hedge and native shrub planting within the same area to compensate for the loss of the existing hedgerow.

Additional consultee comments:

On 28 October and 3 November United Utilities submitted the following comments regarding the foul water drainage strategy proposed within the updated Flood Risk Assessment:

28.10.20 - "The revised flood risk assessment has changed the approach for foul drainage from a pumped connection to a gravity connection. For low-lying sites (where the ground level of the site is below the ground level at the point where the drainage connects to the public sewer) care should be taken to ensure that the property is not at increased risk of sewer surcharge. This was not previously a concern because the original FRA proposed a pumped connection. The applicant has now revised this

approach to propose a gravity connection. At the current time there is limited information available on the finished levels. However, based on an initial review we may request that proposal to drain the site via foul pumping is reinstated rather than a gravity connection.”

03.11.20 – “Following additional discussions between our drainage engineer and the applicant’s drainage engineer we thought it appropriate to suggest additional minor amendments to the proposed planning condition [no. 8]. They reflect our earlier comment regarding the foul drainage. The amendments specifically require mitigation measures to the foul drainage to protect against sewer surcharge for low lying properties in the form of a pumped foul connection. I also note that there are two flood risk assessments but with the same reference. Therefore you may consider whether it is necessary to update the FRA reference accordingly. Please note that the latest flood risk assessment is only acceptable to United Utilities in the context of the surface water proposals. The foul drainage proposals need to be agreed and incorporate foul pumping as previously noted. This is reflected in the proposed additional amendments for your consideration.”

United Utilities have requested minor alterations to the wording of recommended condition 8, including the introduction of additional criteria regarding a pumped foul connection.

Additional representation:

A further representation has been received from the Newton Residents Association (NRA) following the publication of the committee report. A copy of that representation, along with the photographs accompanying it, is attached in full as an Appendix to the late observations report. The main issues raised in the additional representation are summarised as follows:

Drainage – The NRA opine that the committee report has failed to properly consider the evidence of existing drainage and flooding issues provided in several photographs showing instances of surface water flooding in the vicinity of the proposed surface water outfall. Furthermore, the NRA indicate that the downstream capacity of land within the field to the west of Parrox Lane to cope with the surface water flows from this development and the Woodlands Close scheme is insufficient and has not been proven by the applicant. Additional photos of surface water flooding nearby are included in support of that assertion and the NRA opine that “we do not believe that simply fixing the culvert as a result of the Woodlands Close Development will solve the problem.” Additional concerns are raised with respect to the proposed development’s interaction with the ditch within Sandy Gap to the north of the site which is to be reprofiled as part of the Woodlands Close development having regard to its ongoing maintenance, tree protection, landscaping, infilling of existing gaps, fly tipping, resident safety, wildlife and boundary treatments.

Highways – The committee report suggests that the improvements at the A583/Bryning Lane junction are likely to commence before the end of 2020. If, however, these improvements are not made as part of the Woodlands Close development before the Oak Lane scheme commences then a commitment from the Oak Lane developer to undertake these works is required to ease congestion and address the existing accident rate at the junction.

Density – The committee report acknowledges that the development’s density is 34 dwellings per hectare rather than the 30 dph figure mentioned in policy H2. Some dwellings have been squeezed onto the site and the layout is too dense. This is evidenced by the small gaps between dwellings which require wheelie bins to be dragged along narrow passageways over long distances and will inevitably result in

these being stored in front gardens. The use of an average car parking standard to offset the lack of 2 in-curtilage parking spaces for plots 19, 20, 21, 29, 30 and 31 is not satisfactory and LCC Highways objections have made clear that the layby parking for these plots cannot be allocated to those properties. The report has failed to consider the wider implications of the scheme's high density.

The conclusion in the representation indicates that "we [the NRA] believe the report has failed to consider and address the issues and evidence raised above, and consequently the decision could be flawed if ratified by the DMC based on the report as it stands."

Officer responses:

Alterations to landscaping scheme:

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment identifies hedgerow 22G as a group of low value mixed species falling within retention category "C". The retention category "A" and "B" trees to the east and west of 22G (19T, 20T and 21T – the latter of which is protected by a preservation order) would be retained alongside peripheral sections of 22G that border those trees. The updated soft landscaping scheme includes the introduction of a row of 9 heavy standard trees, a continuous hedge and native shrubs in place of group 22G, within the same location.

The Council's Tree Officer has been consulted on the updated tree removal and soft landscaping plans and advises that "as the hedge line will be reinstated with suitable species and aesthetically improved, I do agree that this will mitigate the short term loss of the corridor". Therefore, it is considered that the loss of existing hedgerow 22G as a result of the proposed ground re-modelling works in this area of the site would be adequately compensated for through the introduction of replacement planting in its place following the completion of the regrading works. Accordingly, the revisions to the landscaping scheme which include the removal and replacement of 22G do not alter the conclusions in the committee report with respect to the appropriateness of the proposed landscaping strategy.

Additional consultee comments:

United Utilities' (UU) additional comments relate to whether the finished levels of the development would allow for the use of a gravity fed foul drainage system, or whether a pumped solution would be required. As noted in UU's comments, details of finished levels for the development are presently unknown (though they are required by recommended condition 6) and so it cannot be determined at this stage whether a gravity fed foul drainage system would be possible, or whether a pumped solution will be required. However, UU's additional comments of 03.11.20 suggest that they favour a pumped foul water connection in order to minimise the risk of sewer surcharge for the new dwellings.

The additional comments from UU relate to the technical aspects of whether a gravity fed or pumped foul drainage system will be required to serve the development. The comments from UU do not, however, require the final solution to be confirmed before the application can be decided. Instead, they request alterations to recommended condition 8 in order to require those details as part of the final drainage design. Accordingly, UU's additional comments can be addressed through minor changes to the wording of recommended condition 8.

Additional representation:

All of the issues raised in the NRA's additional representation are addressed within the

committee report. While there is no need to repeat the relevant parts of the committee report within the late observations, references are made to specific pages of the report in order to highlight where the matters raised by the NRA are dealt with.

Drainage – Pages 61-63 of the committee report (under the subheading ‘flood risk’) address resident objections regarding drainage – specifically within the final 3 paragraphs on p. 62 and the first 2 paragraphs on p. 63. In particular, it should be noted that:

- The surface water drainage strategy for the Woodlands Close development has already been approved as part of condition discharge application 18/0769 in consultation with the LLFA (who have also granted land drainage consent). There is, therefore, no opportunity (or need) to revisit this issue as part of this application for development on a different site.
- Neither the LLFA nor UU have raised any objections to the indicative drainage strategy set out the Flood Risk Assessment and a suitable condition has been imposed to control the detailed design of the final drainage scheme. There is, therefore, no reason to conclude that the indicative drainage scheme would result in any conflict with policies CL1 or CL2 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032.
- Existing surface water flooding issues on Parrox Lane arise due to the presence of a fractured pipe within the culvert that runs under the road and a damaged headwall flowing into that pipe. These issues are to be rectified through the construction of a new headwall and installation of a replacement pipe to repair the culvert as part of the surface water drainage strategy for the Woodlands Close development approved by condition discharge application 18/0769.

The development’s relationship with and impact on Sandy Gap is addressed on p. 48 (with regard to boundary treatments/resident access), 55 (in terms of its interaction with sustainable links) and 66 (with respect to tree issues) of the committee report.

Highways – Pages 51-54 of the committee report outline the background to the Bryning Lane/A583 junction improvements (including the means by which these are secured as part of the Woodlands Close development) and the reasons why it is not considered reasonable or necessary to impose a condition which prohibits commencement of the Oak Lane development before those works are carried out (including reference to the comments of the Local Highway Authority).

Density – Pages 44-45 of the committee report deal specifically with the issue of density (under a subheading with the same title) and the section titled ‘character and appearance’ addresses the development’s wider visual effects on the area. The final paragraph at the top of p. 50 confirms the reasons why bin storage provision is considered sufficient and the subsection concerning ‘parking’ on p. 55-56 clarifies why the level of parking provision proposed is considered sufficient with reference to the standards in Table A of the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan (which makes a specific allowance for the use of average parking standards for proposals involving 30+ dwellings). The Local Highway Authority’s most recent response of 21.10.20 also makes clear that they are not objecting to the application on the grounds of a lack of parking provision for plots 19, 20, 21, 29, 30 and 31, but simply drawing attention to the fact that if these spaces are to form part of the adopted highway they could not be allocated for exclusive use by the occupiers of those dwellings.

Modifications to conditions and recommendation:

As a result of the proposed alterations to the landscaping scheme summarised above changes are needed to update the drawing and document references mentioned in recommended conditions 2, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15. Specifically, those conditions have been amended to read as follows (with changes highlighted in bold):

2. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Drawing no. LP01 – Site location plan.
- Drawing no. J32-4820-PS-001 Rev C – Preliminary site access.
- Drawing no. PL03 Rev N – Proposed layout.
- Drawing no. BT01 Rev J – Boundary treatments plan.
- Drawing no. HL01 Rev H – Hard landscaping plan.
- Drawing no. MP01 Rev G – Materials plan.
- Drawing no. MAT-01 – Site material schedule.
- **Drawing no. 6240.03 Rev D – Landscape proposals.**
- **Drawing no. 6240.02 Rev C – Tree protection plan.**
- Drawing no. 674-BUNG-EBH Rev D – Bungalow EBH.
- Drawing no. 862-DAL-110 Rev B – Dalemain EBG.
- Drawing no. 862-DAL-116 Rev B – Dalemain MB.
- Drawing no. 912-GOS-110 Rev C – Gosford EBG.
- Drawing no. 912-GOS-111 Rev C – Gosford EHG.
- Drawing no. 862-HAD-110 Rev C – Haddon EBG.
- Drawing no. 862-HAD-112 Rev C – Haddon ERG.
- Drawing no. 862-HAD-116 Rev C – Haddon MB.
- Drawing no. 862-HAD-118 Rev C – Haddon MR.
- Drawing no. 1166-LON-110 Rev C – Longleat DBG.
- Drawing no. 1255-LUD-112-ALT Rev D – Ludlow DBH.
- Drawing no. 1255-LUD-112-ALTOP Rev E – Ludlow DBH.
- Drawing no. 1183-MON-112 Rev C – Montacute ERG.
- Drawing no. 950-PET-110 Rev C – Petworth EBG.
- Drawing no. GA01 – Single garage.

Except as provided for by other conditions to this permission, the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of proper planning in accordance with the policies contained within the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 and National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Unless alternative details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the soft landscaping scheme for the development shown on **drawing no. 6240.03 Rev D** shall be carried out during the first planting season that occurs either: i) in the case of landscaping within the curtilage of the dwellings, after the dwelling on each associated plot is first occupied; or ii) in the case of landscaping on the external areas of the site located outside the curtilage of the dwellings, after the development is substantially completed. The areas which are landscaped shall be maintained as landscaped areas thereafter in accordance with the details contained in the Landscape Management Plan by tba landscape architects (**report reference BH/6240/REV B/LMP/OCT20**) dated **October 2020 (Revision B)**. Any trees, hedges or shrubs removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced by trees, hedges or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Reason: To ensure appropriate landscaping of the site in order that the development assimilates sympathetically into its surroundings, to provide an appropriate landscape buffer with surrounding land uses, to enhance the character of the street scene and to provide appropriate biodiversity enhancements in accordance with the requirements of Fylde Local Plan to

2032 policies ENV1, ENV2 and GD7, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. With the exception of those specimens identified on **drawing no. 6240.02 Rev C**, no other trees or hedges shall be pruned, topped or removed unless details of those works and, in the case of removal a scheme for the provision of appropriate compensatory planting which includes details of the type, size, species, siting, planting distances and the programme of planting for replacement hedges and trees, have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any compensatory planting to be introduced pursuant to this condition shall be carried out in accordance with a timetable which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the existing trees and hedgerows on the site that are shown to be retained as part of the scheme and to ensure appropriate compensatory planting is introduced to offset any additional tree and hedge removal required as part of the development in the interests of visual amenity, to safeguard the amenities of existing and future occupiers and to ensure appropriate protection for and/or replacement of valuable ecological habitats and networks in accordance with the requirements of Fylde Local Plan to 2032 policies GD7, ENV1 and ENV2.

12. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the tree and hedge protection measures detailed in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (**Revision C**) by **tba landscape architects (report reference MG/6240/AIA&AMS/REV C/OCT20) dated October 2020 and indicated on drawing no. 6240.02 Rev C**. The identified tree protection measures shall be implemented before any development takes place and maintained as such thereafter for the entirety of the construction period.

Reason: To ensure that adequate measures are put in place to protect existing trees which are to be retained as part of the development before any construction works commence in the interests of ensuring good arboricultural practice and to protect existing habitats and networks of ecological value in accordance with the requirements of Fylde Local Plan to 2032 policies GD7, ENV1 and ENV2.

13. No works associated with the monolithing of the Ash trees 4T, 5T, 6T and 8T (as identified on **drawing no. 6240.02 Rev C**) shall take place until a scheme containing precise details, a schedule and programme of the monolithing works has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All monolithing works shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the duly approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed monolithing works to retained Ash trees 4T, 5T, 6T and 8T are carried out in accordance with good arboricultural practice in order to minimise the impact on the retained trees, to safeguard future occupiers of the development and to ensure that the monolithed trees continue to contribute towards biodiversity in accordance with the requirements of Fylde Local Plan to 2032 policies GD7, ENV1 and ENV2.

15. The scheme for the installation of bat and bird boxes shown on **drawing no. 6240.03 Rev D** and identified in paragraphs 5.7 and 5.13 of the Ecological Appraisal by Bowland Ecology dated February 2020 shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any of the dwellings are first

occupied.

Reason: To ensure that the development delivers appropriate biodiversity enhancements within a suitable timeframe as recommended in section 5 of the Ecological Appraisal in accordance with the objectives of Fylde Local Plan to 2032 policy ENV2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The latest comments from United Utilities require alterations to condition 8, including the introduction of additional criteria relating to the provision of a foul water pumping station. Specifically, the wording of condition 8 has been amended to read as follows (with changes highlighted in bold):

8. No above ground works of development shall take place until a scheme for the design, based on sustainable drainage principles, and implementation of a strategy 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 **surface water drainage** scheme shall be based on the hierarchy of drainage options contained in the Planning Practice Guidance and shall demonstrate compliance with the principles of the drainage strategy contained in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy by Reford Consulting Engineers Limited (report reference 19.753) dated April 2020 (**amended version received 7 August 2020**). The scheme shall include:
 - a) Separate systems for the disposal of foul and surface water (with no surface water draining directly or indirectly to the public sewer).
 - b) A final **foul and** sustainable drainage layout plan appropriately labelled to include: i) Pipe/structure references; ii) Dimensions; iii) Design levels; and iv) Finished Floor Levels (FFL) in AOD with adjacent ground levels for all sides of each plot to confirm a minimum 150mm+ difference for FFL.
 - c) Details to demonstrate that, and how, the surface water run-off and volume from the development will not exceed the pre-development runoff rate, which has been calculated at 8.3l/s Qbar.
 - d) Sustainable drainage flow calculations (1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 + climate change (pre & post development), volume of attenuation required (post development)) with allowance for urban creep, to include summary of permeable/impermeable areas of site used within calculations, and return period summary of critical results by maximum levels.
 - e) A plan identifying areas contributing to the drainage network.
 - f) Measures to be taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters, including watercourses.
 - g) A plan to show overland flow routes and flood water exceedance routes and flood extents.
 - h) Evidence of an assessment of the site conditions to include site investigation and test results to confirm infiltrations rates **in accordance with BRE365**.
 - i) **Mitigation measures to prevent sewer surcharge in the form of a pumped foul connection.**
 - j) **Details of the size, height, materials, finish and design of all apparatus and means of enclosure associated with any foul water pumping station.**
 - k) Details of an appropriate management and maintenance plan for the sustainable drainage system for the lifetime of the development. This shall include arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker or management and maintenance by a Management Company and any means of access for maintenance and easements, where applicable.
 - l) A construction phase surface water management plan to include how surface water and pollution prevention will be managed during each phase

of construction.

The duly approved scheme shall be implemented before any of the dwellings are first occupied, or within any other timescale first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, and the drainage system and infrastructure shall be retained, managed and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is not at risk of flooding and does not increase flood risk elsewhere, that water quality is not adversely affected by the development, that appropriate measures are put in place for the disposal of foul and surface water, to identify a responsible organisation /body/ company/ undertaker for the sustainable drainage system to ensure its ongoing maintenance **and to ensure that any drainage infrastructure visible above ground is of an appropriate design** in accordance with the requirements of Fylde Local Plan to 2032 policies CL1, CL2 **and GD7** and the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is recommended that members of the committee resolve to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Housing to GRANT planning permission in accordance with the resolution contained on p. 68 of the committee report, subject to the changes to recommended conditions 2, 8 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15 as set out above.

5 20/0644 Further Representation - BAE

The confirm that they have no objections to the application.

Planning Application 20/0315 Land Adjacent to 8 & 12 Oak Lane, Newton with Scales, PR4 3RR is to be considered by the Planning Committee meeting on 4th November 2020.

We have studied the officer's report on pages 22 – 78 of the published agenda for this meeting.

We believe the report has failed to consider and address the issues and evidence raised on the above, and consequently the decision could be flawed if ratified by the Planning Committee based on the report as it stands.

Our detailed concerns are described below. The Drainage and Highways issues mainly concern the relationship with this application and the already approved Woodlands Close Development for 50 houses pursuant to planning permissions 16/0554, 17/1046 and 18/0862.

We refer to these developments below with OLD (Oak Lane) and WCD (Woodlands Close) Developments

Drainage

The officer's report has failed to consider evidence of issues with drainage, merely stating that there is "no evidence to support".;

The report states - "Perceived lack of downstream capacity" - "no evidence to support" (page 62).

Evidence has been provided through photographs many times to highlight the problem with flooding on Parrox Lane in the vicinity of the proposed surface water outfall. Also a statement from the landowner of the field on the western side of Parrox Lane into which the culvert / pipe exits, demonstrates further concern relating to flooding in that the downstream capacity is insufficient for either OLD or WCD. We ask that the downstream capacity be properly evaluated by the developer and these concerns addressed. If sufficient capacity is not demonstrated, then an alternative solution for surface water drainage should be found prior to conditional approval. The pool network to the south west of this site into which the pipe eventually drains will also exacerbate problems already experienced in Freckleton further downstream as well as the villagers on Oak Lane, Grange Lane and then onto Thames Street. The water flooding down and bubbling up from the combined sewer on Grange Lane onto Thames Street on the last set of heavy downpours demolished a wall and flooded a garage. We do not believe that simply fixing the culvert as a result of the WCD will solve the problem.

With regard to the surface water drainage from the WCD into the northern perimeter of the OLD site, we would like to remind the Planning Committee that WCD diagrams (see below) have been provided showing the solution agreed by the authorities for the use of the occupation track (Sandy Gap) for the surface water scheme of the WCD. This authorises the creation of a wide open ditch with re-profiled sides. This issue is not mentioned in the OLD officer's report, and so there is no evidence that the impact of this has been considered or addressed. Condition 11 on the WCD required a timetable for the implementation of the solution be provided. We are not aware of any implementation timetable.

We fail to understand how the WCD drainage usage of Sandy Gap and its ongoing maintenance plan can be reconciled with the OLD tree protection and soft landscaping plans and the ongoing OLD management plan for the northern boundary of the site that abuts Sandy Gap. This conflict, which we have raised in previous representations is not addressed or considered in the officer's report.

Density

It is acknowledged that the density proposed is 34 dwellings per hectare (page 44) rather than the 30dph in policy H2. Some dwellings are clearly squeezed into the plan.

The position taken that a wheelie bin of 58cm (page 50) going down a 75cm pathway is an acceptable solution to overcome the objections of unsightly wheelie bins being left at the front of houses confirms the present design to be too dense. The occupants of plots 32 and 29 would need to drag their 3 bins on recycling week out of their gardens, across the back, then the full length of the adjoining properties garden and finally the front of their neighbouring plots to put their bins out. There is little doubt that that in reality wheelie bins will be left at the front of properties.

The argument of using an average number of car parking spaces to get over the fact that the 2 bedroom houses, which should have 2 allocated car parking spaces but do not (page 55 plots 19,20,21,29,30,3), is not satisfactory. LCC highways objections stated that when the highway became adopted lay-bys could not be allocated to properties for reserved use.

The report has failed to consider the wider implications of the high density of the site. The report attempts to justify the higher density than that of Policy H2 in purely legalistic terms. All aspects of the effects of high density housing should have been considered and issues addressed.

In summary

We believe the report has failed to consider and address the issues and evidence raised above, and consequently the decision could be flawed if ratified by the DMC based on the report as it stands.

**Planning Application 20/0315 Land Adjacent to 8 & 12 Oak Lane, Newton with Scales,
PR4 3RR**

Photos of Flooding in the vicinity of the site on 29 October 2020

**Flooding on southern part of Parrox Lane –
Photo taken from Oak Lane direction towards the proposed site surface water outflow**



**Flooding at the junction of Parrox/Oak/Grange Lanes
Water at this junction flows south to Grange Lane and Thames Street**



**Surface water from Oak Lane flows into Grange Lane then onwards into Thames Street
Some of the water flows into the White Barn 37 Grange Lane and then out of this
property onto Thames Street**



The original damage to the White Barn occurred on the morning of 11 August 2020

