

Planning Committee

Wednesday 08 February 2017

Late Observations Schedule

Schedule Items

<u>Item</u>	<u>App No</u>	<u>Observations</u>
2	16/0180	<p><u>Officer Comments</u></p> <p>Members should note an error in the report, paragraph 1 of page 40 should refer to an Education contribution of £162,428.72 for 8 secondary places.</p>
3	16/0488	<p><u>Additional Comments from Parish Council</u></p> <p>The Parish have been consulted on the revised plans that were received prior to the preparation of the report and are being considered by members. They comment on them as follows:</p> <p><i>"Following discussion Council noted the information and planning documents that had been provided relating to the proposed development amendments and adopted a resolution that the application is Recommended for Approval."</i></p> <p><u>Additional Comments from Neighbours</u></p> <p>6 further letters of objection have been received from local residents in response to the consultation on the revised plans. These raise objection on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Building on green land is obtrusive, and the proposal is not in-keeping with current properties. <p><u>Officer Comment:</u> It is recognised that development will result in the loss of countryside. Notwithstanding, this matter was considered during assessment of the outline application which recognised that this loss and impact on landscape character was not sufficient to outweigh the benefit to housing supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The apartment block will be an eyesore and should be built away from current housing to allow for similar properties, in keeping with those adjacent, to be constructed.• Properties fronting Clifton Green have a 1.8m fence between themselves and Clifton Green, whereas existing properties are open fronted. This will result in the development being isolated from the village.• Fencing to Clifton Green is too small and would not prohibit access to Clifton Green when residents wish to access the local shop and playground.• Concerns that the internal access road will link to the network through Clifton Green, which does not have the capacity to cope with additional traffic. <p><u>Officer Comment:</u> The original Layout sited dwelling which had a rear facing aspect to Clifton Green, with back gardens and associated paraphernalia and 1.8m privacy fences being exposed to the street. Visually this was considered to detract from the local area. The Layout revision has relocated apartment block and sites a dwelling having a front facing aspect to Clifton Green, enabling an outward facing development to Clifton Green, an open and landscaped frontage to Clifton Green with low level fencing adjacent to the footpath. The apartment block will be 2 storey in appearance, constructed of brick/tile and has a dual aspect design to Clifton Green. This revision is considered in-keeping with properties in the locality, would safeguard the visual quality of the street and encourages inclusion of the development within the existing community. A fence line will be incorporated along the boundary of Clifton Green and submitted drawings indicates the internal road to terminate</p>

within the scheme, and not joining to Clifton Green. It is understood that there is a ransom strip adjacent to this boundary which acts to prohibit any form of access from the development to Clifton Green.

- The proposal provides for landscape buffering around all aspects of the proposal, except where it buffers existing houses. It feels as though existing residents adjoining the site for whom impact will be massive are being overlooked. Landscape buffering to the north is not necessary and should be relocated adjacent to existing houses to benefit old and new residents.
- Hedging to the western boundary of 1 Stanagate should be retained and would help shield the property from the development. The proposal contravenes Policy HL2 since it adversely affects amenity and privacy of neighbouring properties, and does not retain important features or habitats.
- Overlooking from relocated apartment block of neighbouring dwellings on Clifton Green.
- Disturbance during the construction period.

Officer Comment: Landscape buffering to the countryside edge formed part of the outline application and is a requirement for any reserved matters application. This is necessary to ensure a smooth transition between the development and countryside. Landscape buffering to existing housing is not considered necessary and back to back layouts are a common design solution for village expansion proposals. Separation between the development and neighbouring dwellings is considered to be sufficient to ensure no unacceptable impact to the amenity of existing or prospective occupants. It is recognised that there will be disruption during the construction period, controls can be used to minimise disruption for adjacent residents including hours of construction, wheel wash facilities, vibration and dust controls. Conditions were attached to the outline consent and will be required to be complied with during construction of the development.

- 1.8m fencing, trees and shrubs planted around the vehicular entrance to Preston Old Road will reduce visibility of oncoming cars. Clifton Green would be a better option for the site access.
- amount of cars coming and going and the disturbance endured on a daily basis.
- Reference to Salwick Train Station as part of the public transport infrastructure is still disputed due to the small number of trains stopping at this station, no parking, and pedestrian route being narrow and unlit.

Officer Comment: The vehicular access from Preston Old Road and network impact resultant from additional vehicles associated to the development, was considered during assessment of the outline application and assessed to be acceptable. The revised Layout indicates the planting of trees adjacent to the access point and planting/ retention of hedgerow, but importantly a 1.8m fence line is not indicated as stated by the objector. Trees do not obstruct visibility and hedging will be planted/ trimmed so as not to obscure visibility. Indeed approval of the access design is conditional of the outline consent. The comment relating to Salwick Train Station is noted, though cannot influence assessment of this proposal since relating to matters of principle and highways, which have previously been determined by the outline consent.

Additional Condition

An additional condition is suggested requested to ensure dual aspect properties within the development:

Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, drawings to provide for dual aspect properties on Plot numbers 3, 8, 10, 27, 31, 33, 34, 39, 46, 51, 54 and 74 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to safeguard the visual qualities of the street, in accordance with Policy HL2 of the adopted Fylde Borough Local Plan (October 2005).

7 16/0817 Officer Correction

Members should note that the second sentence of the final paragraph on page 127 '*An appropriate condition has been recommended requiring any future application for reserved matters to demonstrate compliance with the principles of the submitted landscape strategy in order to satisfactorily minimise its visual impact.*' is not related to this development and is removed from the report.

Additional Neighbour Comments

In addition to those reported, 6 objection letters have been received in response to consultation undertaken with residents concerning the revised layout and increase of dwelling. Concerns raised relate to:

- Opposition to any increase of the 25 dwellings already granted consent. Such an increase would have a detrimental effect on the geographical balance, and character of the village, overburdening the already limited educational and medical resources.
- Highway safety on the A586 from increased vehicles resultant from the development.
- Pedestrian crossings over the A586 would endanger those using the facility.
- Development is not sustainable - declining bus service, no shop, no schools, no post office, bank, ATM, health centre, community facilities, sport or recreational facilities. Nearest of services in Gt Eccleston, though there is no ATM or bank, health centre has a 4 week wait and the dentist is not taking on new patients, primary and secondary schools are full.
- Parking at the schools will get worse.

Officer Response to Neighbour Comments

The highway assessment of the proposal has not reported any unacceptable impact to highway safety, indeed no objection has been received from both the Highway Authority and Highways England. With regards to impact of the development on existing parking problems at adjacent schools, this matter is not necessarily related to the development itself, but rather the school roll numbers of the school dictating the number of pupils in attendance.

All other matters raised are considered in the Committee Report.

9 16/0905 Additional Consultee Comments - LCC Highways

The Council has received formal consultation comments from Lancashire County Council Highways which are as follows:

Lancashire County Council as highway authority, in principle, have no highway objections to this planning application. However, I would like to draw your (and the applicants) attention to the following notes and, if you are minded to approve this application, please could you add the following conditions to any planning permissions granted.

The traffic expected to be generated by the development will be similar in volume to that created by the existing use and will have no adverse impact upon the operation of the local highway network.

The closest bus stops on St David's Road North are both to DDA compliant standards and therefore I don't feel that any contribution to public transport infrastructure can be requested from this development. The subsidy for the evening bus service along this route has been withdrawn but I feel that a request of £100,000 for 5 years subsidy to support this evening

service would not be proportionate to the scale of the proposed development.

The parking provision for the development is below standards for the communal parking for the apartments. Standards recommend a total of 27 parking spaces be made available for a development of this type, only 21 are shown on the submitted drawing 16 2231 PN002 Rev E. This may lead to an increase in on street parking demand in the local area. This is a loss of amenity issue and not cause for an objection on highway grounds. I would also like to point out that the drawing states that there are 7 parking spaces to the west of the apartment block however the drawing only shows 6 usable spaces.

After advice from one of LCCs section 38 (adoptions) specialists, I have been informed that the layout, as proposed on revised plan 16 2231 PN002 Rev E, will NOT be adopted by the highway authority as it is below the standards required for highway adoption.

The response then highlights a series of technical issues relating to the size of some parking spaces, access by refuse vehicles, position of pedestrian paths, etc. that prevent this adoption.

Officer comments on Consultee Comments

It is noted that the comments express concern in two key areas (parking and the layout of the internal access roads) but don't raise objection to the development on the basis of these issues.

With regard to the parking shortfall, it is a relatively small difference between the actual provision of 20 viable spaces and the level sought by the parking standards of 27. As these standards are a maximum provision and the site is in a sustainable and highly accessible location to the Town Centre and St David's Road shops it is not considered that this shortfall is of sufficient concern to warrant a reason for refusal.

With regard to the layout issues, these have been raised with the developer who is looking to make any revisions to the scheme that are needed to address safety issues identified.

It is expected that this will be resolved without a material change to the scheme being required and so the officer recommendation remains appropriate as any changes can be included under the Head of Planning and Regenerations authority during the preparation of the s106 agreement.

10 16/0968 Consultee Comments have been received from the council's Conservation Officer.

The comments are generally supportive of the scheme subject to the appropriate control being maintained over the details of the finished buildings, and in particular the style and materials of windows.

These matters are already covered in the conditions on the agenda papers and so no amendment to the recommendation is required.

11 16/1030 Neighbour Comments

An additional neighbour letter has been received which expresses concerns about the lack of detailed information in the application relating to the proposed dune transects, fencing, and the build-up of wind dispersed sand, and how the scheme is to be managed.

Officer Comments on Neighbour Representation

The comments raised by the neighbour are valid in some respects. The information submitted in support of the application did contain some gaps initially in terms of the

extent of the re-profiling and so additional information has now been secured to allow the impacts on the nearest dwellings to be adequately assessed.

Consultee Comments - Natural England

They have reviewed the submission and advise *“currently there is not enough information to determine whether the likelihood of significant effects can be ruled out and therefore further information is required”*

Their concerns centre on the proximity of the application site to the internationally designated site at the Ribble and Alt Estuaries Special Protection Area which is 75m from the site, and is also designated as a Ramsar site and a SSSI. They highlight the national and European legislation that protects such sites and requires that the council as local planning authority undertakes an assessment to be satisfied that the potential impacts of the project are fully understood and considered. This involves undertaking a Habitats Regulations Assessment with particular attention to be paid to the timing and duration of the project, the measures to be taken to avoid bird disturbance, the measures to be taken to avoid potentially contaminated material being brought onto the site, and the in-combination effects of the project with other developments in the area such as the flood defence works and the development at the Pontins site.

With reference to the SSSI they make the following comments:

“If your Authority is minded to grant consent for this application contrary to the advice contained in this letter, we refer you to Section 281 (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), specifically the duty placed upon your authority, requiring that your Authority;

- Provide notice to Natural England of the permission, and of its terms, the notice to include a statement of how (if at all) your authority has taken account of Natural England’s advice, and*
- Shall not grant a permission which would allow the operations to start before the end of a period of 21 days beginning with the date of that notice.”*

Officer Comments on Natural England Comments

Natural England are a member of the council's Dunes Steering Group which has been involved in drawing up the proposal. However, that does not avoid the need to comply with the legislation surrounding works that can impact on areas that are subject to ecological designations such as the dunes. Their comments on this application make it clear that the council is not currently able to determine the application favourably.

As such the recommendation should be revised to delegate the decision to the Head of Planning and Regeneration so that this matter can be progress appropriately before any decision is issued on the application.

Revised Recommendation

To delegate the decision on the application to the Head of Planning and Regeneration following the completion of a satisfactory Habitat Regulations Assessment and any modifications to the scope and methodology of the works that are required to prevent any adverse impacts on matters of ecological importance.