

## Planning Committee

Wednesday 09 August 2017

### Late Observations Schedule

#### Schedule Items

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

1	15/0400	
---	---------	--

St Annes Town Council Comments:

The Town Council have requested details of how the proposal meets the criteria set out in the Design Guide for St Annes on the Sea. Stating that the application does not demonstrate any regard to the design guide in the supporting information, contrary to Policy DH1.

Further comments on the revised plans have been made on behalf of St Anne's on the Sea Town Council who consider that:

- The application makes no reference to and does not comply with the provisions of the St. Anne's Design Guide or Neighbourhood Plan.
- The officer report does not set out how the proposal meets the Design Guide.
- The policies of the plan are relevant to the determination of this application.
- The comments of the Town Council have been ignored in preparing the report, for example, there is a reference to roof coverings, but no mention of renewable energy, water recycling, solar gain, and links to the existing footpath/cycle routes/bridleways.
- The Town Council have offered their Design Guide as a resource for determining applications in the wider borough and it is, therefore, surprising that the guide is being ignored.

The Town Council have requested that the application be deferred in order to allow further consideration of the detailed proposals.

Officer Response:

Policy DH1 requires applicants to demonstrate how their proposed development has responded to the Design Guide SPD. Notwithstanding, it should be realised that this current application was submitted in June 2015 where at this time there was no requirement for applicants to demonstrate compliance with the Design Guide SPD. Notwithstanding there is assessment of the proposal against the St Annes Town Council Neighbourhood Plan and Design Guide SPD in the Committee Report. Further to this, Members should note that the Design Guide SPD should be used for guidance only.

The request for deferral is a decision for Committee, but the officer recommendation is that the application should be determined as the agenda papers as the matters raised by the Town Council are addressed in the report.

Additional Neighbour Comments

A further 5 letters have been received since the Committee Report was written, relating to the following matters:

- Supportive of Landscape and Tree officer comment with regards to landscaping of development adjacent to the boundary of 2 Tudor Gate.
- It is recognised that there is no right to a view, but could there be some sympathetic consideration to relocate the detached garage further away from our boundary and affected window?

- Concern for removal of landscape buffer zone to the rear of 83 Heyhouses Lane (and neighbours) with close mown grass and soft landscaping, and impact this would have for privacy and noise reduction.
- No school within the proposals.
- Temporary access to Queensway has been competed, is on a blind bend and is dangerous.
- Vermin in back gardens due to building work in the area.
- Need for increased separation to dwellings on Tudor Close to improve amenity.

**Officer Response to Neighbour Comments:**

- The applicant has revised the proposal in order to re-site the referred garage further from the common boundary with neighbours on Tudor Gate.
- The revised landscape drawing does provide for landscaping to the boundary of the site adjacent to housing on Heyhouses Lane. Notwithstanding, a 40m separation to the objectors property (83 Heyhouses Lane) is sufficient to safeguard any privacy or noise disturbance from houses within the development. Tree planting is indicated within this locality and would act to soften the visual presence of the housing development, furthermore, revision has also been received to plot types which now provides for 2 storey dwellings adjacent to the boundary with 83 Heyhouses Lane.
- This scheme does not provide for a School on the site. However the Legal Agreement associated with the outline consent requires that the land is gifted to Lancashire County Council Education department and requires financial contributions from the developer toward a new school. Delivery of a new school is not therefore expected by the developer, but by the Education Authority.
- The temporary access for construction purposes has been implemented, and whilst the concerns are acknowledged it is considered that this is a safe form of access.
- Any vermin currently on the site is likely to be disturbed and displaced from the site during construction of the development. Displacement is likely to be to areas of open fields surrounding the site, though it is acknowledged that there could be displacement to the residential area. Private companies offer services to deal with any resultant vermin problem, but in any event this matter is not considered sufficient to warrant refusal of the proposal.
- The site layout has been revised in order to take account of the relationship to properties situated to the head of the cul-de-sac on Tudor Gate. These properties have windows within their side elevation which will overlook the application site. Proposed dwellings in the vicinity of the two affected properties have been re-orientated to have a side on relationship to these neighbours thereby removing any overlooking from the development. A13m separation and tree planting is provided and a garage has also been re-sited further away from the affected dwellings. This revision is considered to minimise impact of the development to neighbours, providing for a satisfactory relationship.

**Shadow Habitat Risk Assessment:**

As per the Committee Report, prior to making a final decision on this application, it will also be necessary to carry out an assessment in line with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

To accord with this regulation, the applicant has undertaken a Shadow Habitat Risk Assessment which concludes that because the mitigation scheme has already been established and is under management, there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the Ribble and Alt Estuaries and Martin Mere SPA's. This conclusion is valid for the scheme alone and in combination with other plans and projects.

Consultation is currently being undertaken with Natural England to confirm acceptability, or otherwise, of this document.

Ecology (Greater Manchester Ecology Unit GMEU):

Supporting information supplied is considered satisfactory.

No design details of the ponds to the front of the site (northern boundary to Heyhouses Lane). The ponds are constrained, lack of associated habitats are isolated from the wider landscape and would not function particularly well as wildlife habitat.

New planting proposals seem generally acceptable, although no details of species or planting frequency has been provided.

Officer Comment:

It is understood that the primary function of the pond areas located to the north of the site adjacent to Heyhouses Lane is for landscape purposes. There will be some wildlife habitat value, though this is not viewed as the primary function of this space.

A detailed soft landscaping condition was attached to the outline consent (condition 10). Detail with regards to species, frequency of planting and location of planting will be assessed through discharge of this condition.

Environment Agency:

No further comments to add to their previous response as reported in the agenda papers.

Lead Local Flood Authority:

No objection to the proposed development subject to the discharge of conditions attached to the outline consent and an additional condition requiring implementation of attenuation basins and flow control devices/ structures prior to any development phase.

Additional Plans

The applicant has provided a series of additional plans that relate to various streetscene views, landscaping of the site and minor alterations to then layouts to introduce amendments requested by officers. The suggested condition relating to the approved plans will be amended accordingly to refer to these updated plan references prior to any decision being issued.

2      17/0296      Additional Information

The applicant has provided an A4 leaflet to summarise their position on the application and to request that it be approved. It is understood that this has been circulated to Committee members.

Officer Response

The matters raised in the leaflet are addressed in the agenda report.