

## Planning Committee

Wednesday 12 February 2020

### Late Observations Schedule

#### Schedule Items

<u>Item</u>	<u>App No</u>	<u>Observations</u>
1	19/0248	<u>Additional Neighbour Comments</u>

Following the publication of the February Committee agenda a further neighbour representation has been received as follows:

*"It has been argued that there is no absolute maximum to the number of dwellings that can be fitted into the plot. However what the planner is asserting is an opinion and not an absolute fact. We have a contrary opinion which we believe is more in accord with a common-sense view that the development is much more dense than any other development in the locality and that is leading to a change, for the worse, in the appearance of the site and the locality. Moreover Policy GD7 of the adopted Fylde Local Plan to 2032 as shown pages 80-81 list general principles of good design. It states that*

*A Densities in new residential developments should "reflect and wherever possible enhance the local character of the surrounding area". Also it specifically says that densities of new residential development reflect and wherever possible enhance the local character of the surrounding area.*

*Patently the proposed development fails on this count. 18 flats on the plot at 259 is equivalent to 133 per hectare compared with the present maximum in the vicinity of 69. The developer has had to arrange for half the flats to have living rooms overlooking to the rear of the block, overlooking and being overlooked by the bedrooms of properties on Clifton Drive. All the flats will have bedrooms overlooking 261 Inner Promenade. This is not the norm for our area where residences look out to the front with bedrooms to the rear*

*B New developments should be "sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers, and avoid harm to the visual amenities of the local area".*

*The proposed tenement is more cramped and congested and visually different from any development in the surrounding area and will cause a much worse impact than the presently approved development.*

*C Parking should sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area and not be compromised by inadequate space, poor layout, or inconvenient access arrangements.*

*It is noteworthy that page 9 of the submission for the forthcoming planning meeting records a traffic engineer's view from LCC that the scheme warrants provision of 27 parking slots required for visitors / trades vehicles. There is not enough space in the proposal to accommodate 27 spaces and it has been argued by the developer that that 18 is enough.*

*However the current plans envisage parking and a turning area at the rear of the*

*property, requiring access down a narrow passage past the main entrance where residents and trades vehicles will inevitably, regularly, need to park. Also the steep slope which will be necessary to get from the Inner Promenade to the sunken ground level of the proposed development will make access to and from the front parking slots difficult. The inconvenience that these limitations will create is arguably is not our concern but inevitably this layout will discourage use of on site parking slots and this will imply that the achievable parking capacity will, in practice be less than that declared in the plans. Residents will look to park off site, where (legal) off site parking is in short supply.*

*D Developments should include adequate outside amenity space for the needs of residents.*

*It is noteworthy that every single property on the Inner Promenade in the vicinity of Granny's Bay and Fairhaven Lake enjoys some external amenity space for the use by residents. The proposed development will have none at all.*

*All this reinforces our view that 259 is the worst remaining place on the Inner Promenade to envisage such a high density development project.*

*The recommendations for approval in principle allows important issues (see page 34 of the agenda papers) to be delegated to a council official without further exposure to the democratic process involving the Planning Committee. That these issues are contentious is witnessed by the fact that they have not yet been resolved after many months of work prior to today. Given this failure it is surely right to reject the proposal and allow the developer to appeal if he so wishes."*

#### Officer Comments on Neighbour Representation

The comments raised are addressed in the officer report but can be summarised as follows:

- Density – There is no maximum density that cannot be breached, with the test in the policy being to ensure that the scheme does not cause any harmful impacts
- Character of area – The development will alter the streetscene, but the officer assessment is that this is not a harmful impact given the position of the site and the nature of surrounding land uses.
- Parking arrangements – The highway officer is satisfied that 1 space per flat is appropriate in this location, and whilst the visitor spaces that he suggests are not provided there are readily accessible visitor parking areas in the vicinity of the site
- Amenity Space – It is the case that there is no private amenity space within the development, but this is not uncommon with a flat development and there is considered to be reasonable access to public amenity space in close vicinity of the site.

#### 2 19/0450 Additional Observations:

One additional letter of objection has been received following the publication of the committee agenda papers. The letter reaffirms comments previously submitted in objection to the application and indicates that the "*submission of a revised noise assessment makes no material difference to the substance of previous objections*". The objector also opines that "*the track record of the applicant would also suggest that the imposition of noise conditions would in practical terms be incapable of effective enforcement*".

Officer response:

Issues relating to noise and the need for appropriate planning conditions to control the use are dealt with at length in the Officer Report. The additional objection does not raise any new issues that are not already covered by the current Officer Report or the conditions recommended therein. Accordingly, no amendments to the report or suggested conditions are required.

3      19/0690      Additional neighbour representations

Following publication of the agenda a further two objections have been received, making comments that reiterate those made previously and outlined in the published agenda.

Additional Consultee response

At officer's request LCC Education have confirmed that the contribution towards education from this development will be for five primary school places at Kirkham St Michaels CE. The amount requested is £80,252.70.

5      19/0927      Additional Details

Since the agenda report was completed the council has received details of the proposed surface and foul water drainage scheme. This has been passed to United Utilities who have approved the details and request a condition requiring the drainage for the proposed development to be carried out in accordance with those details.

9      19/1011      Newton-with-Clifton Parish Council comments following notice of revised plans:

As the scheme was revised to reduce the scale of the building the Parish Council were re-notified to establish if this change addressed their concerns, with the following comments received:

Council adopted a resolution that the proposed development be refused planning permission for the following reasons;

- 1) The proposal is outside the existing limits of development and contrary Fylde Local Plan Policy GD4. The application does not evidence development essentially needed for the continuation of an existing agricultural enterprise, facility or operation and therefore the proposed development does not justify any policy exception.
- 2) Planning application drawings remain subject to the previously requested amendment/update relating to application 19/0858 Members referred to the site history and the fact that the current application states that a new or altered pedestrian or vehicular access to or from the public highway is not proposed. However members note the existing/proposed site layout plans indicate a second access, west of the main entrance, and near to existing out buildings, which is not currently in situ.
- 3) It is still considered that proposed development will significantly increase the property footprint to an unacceptably excessive degree.
- 4) Should the local planning authority however be minded to grant planning permission in this instance it be conditioned to a single dwelling only on the site and that no subsequent permitted development rights should accrue.

### Officer Response to Parish Council comments

The comments received raise objection to the application on the same grounds as originally raised, and so are addressed in the officer report. To assist the summary of these points is as follows:

- 1) The site is in the Countryside, but contains a dwelling and Policy GD4 allows for replacement dwellings
- 2) The scheme does not alter the access arrangements. The access arrangements are shown on the plans have been considered to be acceptable by LCC and Fylde officers.
- 3) The scale of the replacement dwelling complies with the size limitations of Policy H7
- 4) The scheme is for a single dwelling and the officer report proposes that permitted development rights are withdrawn.