

Development Management Committee

Wednesday 7 September 2016

Late Observations Schedule

Schedule Items

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

4	16/0280	
---	---------	--

Revised Plans

The applicant has provided a revised site plan that increases the separation between the proposed plots 31-34 on the development and the existing dwellings on the Wainhomes (Richmond Avenue) development by around 2m. This has resulted in revisions to the boundary treatment, materials and level plans.

In addition a landscaping layout, landscaping master plan and a revision to the trim trail proposal has been submitted.

Officer Comment on Revised Plans

The revisions improve the separation and allow an additional area of landscaping to be provided and so are welcomed. Condition 1 is to be updated to refer to the latest plans.

Consultation Replies

Since the agenda was published the council has not received any further consultation responses on the application.

Neighbour Representations

The council has received a further letter from the planning consultant acting for residents on the Wainhomes development. His letter includes a useful summary of the points made and so that is repeated here:

Whilst my clients do not consider that residential development per se to be intrusive, they have considered the proposed scheme and the further amendments thereto, in a measured and dispassionate way and have concerns that what is being proposed is contrary to the proper planning of this part of Wrea Green for the following reasons:

- The proposed overall density of development is higher than the general level of density within this part of Wrea Green and significantly higher than that on the adjacent development the "Fieldings", a fact acknowledged by all the main parties who appeared at the Public Inquiry and referred to by the Inspector
- The proposed development remains urban in both form and layout and fails to reflect the overall character of this part of Wrea Green which is, in their view, a rural settlement where development is centered in and around the substantial village green.
- The landscaping proposals, particularly along the western boundary of the site where it fronts Duckworth Avenue and Stony Grove remain grossly inadequate. They fail to have regard to the fact that, when viewed from Duckworth Avenue and Stony Grove, approximately 50% of the proposed built form and layout will be visible from several public vantage points and private properties. In accepting that no person has a "right to a view", it is nevertheless a legitimate planning objective to ensure that new development proposals sit comfortable in their surroundings and that appropriate levels of mitigation are introduced and incorporated into a development scheme to ensure that visually, the

proposal has the least adverse impact upon the wider character of the area and the particular residential amenities of those residents living most closely to it. My clients consider that the whole of the western boundary of the development where it fronts Duckworth Avenue and Stony Grove should be more robustly protected by improved planting and new hedgerows. Whilst it is acknowledged that some residential units have been moved further away, this does not in any way compensate for the wholly inadequate landscaping proposed for the western boundary of the development site.

Officer Comments on Additional Neighbour Representation

The comments raised cover matters that are addressed in the report. The latest revised plans improve the separation distance between the application site properties and those on the Wainhomes site and improve the provision of landscaping in the intervening area. This is considered to provide an acceptable relationship between the properties involved.

Agenda Items

5 Neighbour Representation

"I have read that part of the Agenda for forthcoming Development Committee Meeting on Wednesday 7th September 2016. Noting the Section 106 agreement of the sum of £110,000-0p. Also, noting that the agreement indicates, that the money is for the benefit of the residents in Medlar-with-Wesham. There being no agreement that the money is to be shared between Kirkham and Wesham.

The Development Committee is being required, in that Agenda, to deprive the residents of Medlar-with-Wesham of the sum of £90,000, to enable work to be done on the frontages of property in Kirkham, from the junction of Birley Street with Poulton Street, towards the Market Square.

I strongly protest against that expenditure, from money earmarked only for Medlar-with-Wesham, as it is the township of Wesham and it's outlying properties that have been subjected to the imposition of the retail park and football stadium in the area.

Causing increased vehicular activity, a greater movement of foot passengers to the football stadium and it's excessive noise and the inconvenience to local residents. Depriving them of the peaceful enjoyment of their homes. That is a human right and there is legislation in force still, to that right.

I am fully aware, that a similar planning application for that development had been originally submitted for development in the village of Wrea Green, and was successfully rejected by the local residents.

That development, was imposed on this township, albeit, by so-called democratic means; and now the Section 106 money, which was a form of compensation to Medlar-with-Wesham, is being seized for the benefit of another town, that does not have the inconvenience of the ongoing disturbances.

Whatever, the outcome is envisaged as a result of the Development Committee Meeting. I believe that the issue should not be considered for approval, until the opportunity for the elected members of the Medlar-with-Wesham Town Council, has been given, to make a detailed written representation that identify with the views of the local residents to the Fylde Borough Council Development Committee.

That would be democracy."

Officer Comment

The original intention of the public realm payments was primarily to off-set any adverse retail impacts on the existing centres as a result of the retail elements of the proposal. There are also conditions and restrictions attached to the Mill Farm planning permission that seek to mitigate potential highways and environmental concerns in the immediate vicinity of the development. In addressing public realm contributions, the Committee report that considered the Mill Farm proposal noted: "There is a declared Public Realm Scheme in Wesham Town Centre (10 in the Regeneration Framework) and also a scheme in Kirkham (number 6 in the Regeneration Framework). Given the nature & scale of the development proposed, it is considered reasonable for this planning application to make an appropriate contribution to these public realm improvements at a level to be determined as part of a section 106 agreement."

The Section 106 Agreement relating to Mill Farm defines the Public Realm Contribution as a "contribution of one hundred and ten thousand pounds (£110,000.00) to be paid to the Council towards securing Public Realm Works in the vicinity of the Development (and, for the avoidance of doubt, the parties agree that Kirkham and Wesham town centres are within the vicinity of the Development)".

The proposed use of the Public Realm Contributions in Kirkham Town Centre would be in line with the terms of the Section 106 agreement as Kirkham Town Centre is specifically referred to as an appropriate location that could benefit from these contributions.