PO Box 97 Bolton Lancs BL1 9PT

Head of Planning

Ribble Valley BC

Council Offices

Church Walk

Clitheroe

Lancs

BB7 2 RA 24.5.18

Dear Sirs

Planning Application - Land at 156 Pimlico Road, Clitheroe

We are instructed by Mr Frank Duffin of East Lancashire property (uk) Itd to lodge a full planning application for a scheme of 6 apartments with associated parking and outdoor hard and soft landscaping area on land at 156 Pimlico Road, Clitheroe. The application has been made via Planning Portal (PP- 06910088) and includes the completed application forms and certificates site location plan, details of the proposed layout, floor plans, sections and elevations and appropriate supporting documentation.

These include:

- 1. A Design and Access statement
- 2. A structural engineers' report regarding the retaining walls
- 3. A Heritage statement
- 4. A landscape scheme
- 5. Car and Cycle parking provision and bin store
- 6. Tree Survey
- 7. Topographic Survey

Site location and description

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Clitheroe in a residential area about a kilometre north of the town centre. It is also close to the main employment zone in Clitheroe. The site is screened by trees and other vegetation and the building

will be set back from the road. Additional planting along the Pimilco road frontage will be incorporated into the car parking area.

The proposal includes 4x2bed flats; 1x3bed penthouse flat; and 1x1bed fully disabled access ground floor flat with both car parking and cycle store and shared garden area as shown on the attached drawings. The bin store/recycling is located at the northern end of the car parking area to enable ease of access for the bin lorry. The proposal includes a lift. There are bus stops immediately outside the site and a public footpath follows the existing track up the side of the Black Horse public house.

Planning History

The previous application (RVBC Ref No. 3/2015/0785) was refused on 9.2.16 for 2 reasons:

- The proposal, by virtue of its scale, mass, orientation, internal layout and location of habitable room windows would be of significant detriment to the privacy and residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers by virtue of the resultant direct elevated over-looking of private amenity space and over-bearing and over-dominant impact, contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.
- The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy by virtue of its height, scale, mass and elevational language which would appear as an incongruous, discordant and unsympathetic addition into the street scene, exacerbated by the resultant removal of the existing boundary/retaining walls which would afford the proposed building high-level of visual prominence without adequate visual screening/mitigation.

A pre-application discussion (RV/2016/ENQ/00112) was held in January 2017 with Rachel Horton of RVBC and the applicants' architects following this decision. A copy of the written email response to the pre-app is included with this application.

A revised scheme taking account of that discussion and the supporting documentation and reports are now submitted. The key issues from the pre-app written reply are responded to by this application and particular aspects highlighted herewith:

- Structural survey report of wall is attached and confirms it is in reasonable condition and suggests some minor works to it (see report for details). It further makes recommendations regarding the interface of the wall and foundations for the proposal.
- 2) The ground level will be lowered and graded (see proposed site plan 14-051-03E) so there is level access from the parking area into the proposed building. The ground level has been reduced compared to the previous application and the walls will be retained, apart from a small section as indicated on the

proposed site plan drawing which will need to be removed. The building will be set down and back from the Pimlico Road and existing and additional trees along the site frontage will provide screening.

- 3) Topographic survey is attached to this application.
- 4) Heritage statement regarding the walls is attached. The Heritage consultant concludes: 'In summary, the walls are not considered to have enough heritage interest as a non-designated asset for their significance to be a material consideration in the planning process. It is considered that the proposal meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular para. 131.'
- 5) Soft landscaping for details of the proposed soft landscaping see proposed site plan 14-051-03E
- 6) Materials proposed we confirm are as shown on the attached drawing 14-051-07D show timber frame windows, stone masonry for the walls and blue slate roof to reflect character of other buildings in area.
- 7) Previous concerns were expressed about impact of overlooking. In order to address this as well as lowering the ground level, the further amendments have been made. The internal layout has been amended so habitable rooms face toward Pimlico Rd, the north elevation has no windows and the east has bathroom windows (which will be obscure glazed) on ground, first and second floors, the remaining elevation has bedroom windows and the staircase, the latter of which could also have obscure glass. The penthouse is in the roof space and only has windows facing Pimlico Road for the kitchen/living/ding space with rooflights providing light to the bedrooms and bathroom.
- 8) Plan 14-051-03E shows the bin store located at the northern end of the car park next to the main site access for easy access by the bin lorry.
- 9) Plan 14-051-03E also shows the secure cycle parking area.
- 10) Floor plans, elevations and cross sections (14-051-10) to show the lift and how it is situated in the building.

Planning Policy

NPPF para 14 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development and notes that for decision takers proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay.

Para 50 of NPPF details the need for a wide choice of homes in regard to size, mix, type, tenure and range of dwellings. The NPPF also acknowledges at para 48 that it is reasonable for LPAs to include for a windfall allowance within their housing supply if this reflects the trends in the area.

These criteria are also present in the consultation draft NPPF 2018.

In local policy Ribble Valley BC have an adopted Core Strategy (2014). Key Statement DS1 sets out the development strategy for the borough and states that the majority of new housing will be in the 3 main settlements or on the strategic site. Clitheroe is identified a principal settlement.

Key Statement DS2 mirrors para 14 of NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Key statement H1 deals with Housing Provision and notes that 5600 dwellings are required over the plan period. This figure RVBC acknowledge as a minimum. H2 of the Core Strategy relates to Housing balance and seeks to ensure a mix of homes. Key statement H3 sets out the criteria for affordable housing and on sites of 5 or more units require 30% of the units to be affordable but this can be reduced to 20% if a viability appraisal so indicates. H3 also notes the need for more homes suitable for the elderly though this criterion applies to sites of 10 or more units.

Policy DMG1 General Considerations covers design, access, amenity, environment, infrastructure and other.

IN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS, ALL DEVELOPMENT MUST: DESIGN

- 1. BE OF A HIGH STANDARD OF BUILDING DESIGN WHICH CONSIDERS THE 8 BUILDING IN CONTEXT PRINCIPLES (FROM THE CABE/ENGLISH HERITAGE BUILDING ON CONTEXT TOOLKIT.
- 2. BE SYMPATHETIC TO EXISTING AND PROPOSED LAND USES IN TERMS OF ITS SIZE, INTENSITY AND NATURE AS WELL AS SCALE, MASSING, STYLE, FEATURES AND BUILDING MATERIALS.
- 3. CONSIDER THE DENSITY, LAYOUT AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BUILDINGS, WHICH IS OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE. PARTICULAR EMPHASIS WILL BE PLACED ON VISUAL APPEARANCE AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO SURROUNDINGS, INCLUDING IMPACT ON LANDSCAPE CHARACTER, AS WELL AS THE EFFECTS OF DEVELOPMENT ON EXISTING AMENITIES.
 4. USE SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES WHERE POSSIBLE AND PROVIDE EVIDENCE THAT ENERGY EFFICIENCY, AS DESCRIBED WITHIN POLICY DME5, HAS BEEN INCORPORATED INTO SCHEMES WHERE POSSIBLE.
- 5. THE CODE FOR SUSTAINABLE HOMES AND LIFETIME HOMES, OR ANY SUBSEQUENT NATIONALLY RECOGNISED EQUIVALENT STANDARDS, SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO SCHEMES.

ACCESS

- 1. CONSIDER THE POTENTIAL TRAFFIC AND CAR PARKING IMPLICATIONS.
- 2. ENSURE SAFE ACCESS CAN BE PROVIDED WHICH IS SUITABLE TO ACCOMMODATE THE SCALE AND TYPE OF TRAFFIC LIKELY TO BE GENERATED.
- 3. CONSIDER THE PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY AND ACCESS.

AMENITY

- 1. NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE AMENITIES OF THE SURROUNDING AREA.
- 2. PROVIDE ADEQUATE DAY LIGHTING AND PRIVACY DISTANCES.
- 3. HAVE REGARD TO PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURED BY DESIGN PRINCIPLES.
- 4. CONSIDER AIR QUALITY AND MITIGATE ADVERSE IMPACTS WHERE POSSIBLE.

ENVIRONMENT

- 1. CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS SUCH AS SSSIS, COUNTY HERITAGE SITES, LOCAL NATURE RESERVES, BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLAN (BAP) HABITATS AND SPECIES, SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION AND SPECIAL PROTECTED AREAS, PROTECTED SPECIES, GREEN CORRIDORS AND OTHER SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION.

 2. WITH REGARDS TO POSSIBLE EFFECTS UPON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, THE COUNCIL PROPOSE THAT THE PRINCIPLES OF THE MITIGATION HIERARCHY BE FOLLOWED. THIS GIVES SEQUENTIAL PREFERENCE TO THE FOLLOWING: 1) ENHANCE THE ENVIRONMENT 2) AVOID THE IMPACT 3) MINIMISE THE IMPACT 4) RESTORE THE DAMAGE 5) COMPENSATE FOR THE DAMAGE 6) OFFSET THE DAMAGE.
- 3. ALL DEVELOPMENT MUST PROTECT AND ENHANCE HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS.
- 4. ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE RISKS ARISING FROM FORMER COAL MINING AND, WHERE NECESSARY, INCORPORATE SUITABLE MITIGATION MEASURES TO ADDRESS THEM.
- 5. ACHIEVE EFFICIENT LAND USE AND THE REUSE AND REMEDIATION OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES WHERE POSSIBLE. PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES SHOULD ALWAYS BE USED INSTEAD OF GREENFIELD SITES WHERE POSSIBLE

INFRASTRUCTURE

- 1. NOT RESULT IN THE NET LOSS OF IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE, INCLUDING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PLAYING FIELDS WITHOUT A ROBUST ASSESSMENT THAT THE SITES ARE SURPLUS TO NEED. IN ASSESSING THIS, REGARD MUST BE HAD TO THE LEVEL OF PROVISION AND STANDARD OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE IN THE AREA, THE IMPORTANCE OF PLAYING FIELDS AND THE NEED TO PROTECT SCHOOL PLAYING FIELDS TO MEET FUTURE NEEDS. REGARD WILL ALSO BE HAD TO THE LANDSCAPE OR TOWNSCAPE OF AN AREA AND THE IMPORTANCE THE OPEN SPACE HAS ON THIS.

 2. HAVE REGARD TO THE AVAILABILITY TO KEY INFRASTRUCTURE WITH CAPACITY. WHERE KEY INFRASTRUCTURE WITH CAPACITY IS NOT AVAILABLE IT MAY BE NECESSARY TO PHASE DEVELOPMENT TO ALLOW INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENTS TO TAKE PLACE.
- 3. CONSIDER THE POTENTIAL IMPACT ON SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION.

OTHER

1. NOT PREJUDICE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL AND AMENITY IMPROVEMENTS.

Discussion

The application site lies within the settlement boundary of Clitheroe which is identified in RVCS as a principal settlement and sustainable location to focus new housing development. It therefore complies with national and local policy

The proposal is for 6 flats one of with is DDA adapted. The applicant has confirmed that this flat and 1 of the 2 bed units could be affordable in line with policy H3. Furthermore, the applicant would also be prepared to include these as homes for the elderly, even though the number of proposed units falls below the trigger figure of 10. Again, an offer that exceeds RVCS requirements.

There are very few schemes in Clitheroe or indeed RVBC area that offer apartment living so this proposal will achieve a mix of unit sizes and mix of tenures in a type of home that is not widely available in the area. Thus, it meets H2 of the RVCS.

The design of the former scheme was the reason for refusal under policy DMG1. Hence the architects had a pre-app discussion with Rachel Horton and following that amendments have been made to the scheme which address those concerns and respond by also providing the additional surveys and reports that were requested.

The scale of the building is not dissimilar from Rockmount nor Garden House. The current proposal reduces the overall height and mass of the building. The top floor flat is now basically in the roof space and apart from the main living area has rooflights rather than windows. The overall height is further reduced relative to the neighbouring properties as the ground level has been graded and lowered to enable level access from the car parking area. The wall and trees fronting the back of pavement on Pimlico Rd remain and further planting added. The building is set into the site and set back from the road to reduce its impact on the street scene.

The orientation and internal arrangements of the flats have been changed so the main living area in each face west toward Pimlico Rd. The northern side of the building has no windows and those to the east are bathroom windows on ground, first and second floor only and will be obscure glazed.

The stairwell windows face south and can be obscure glazed as necessary

The existing walls on site have been surveyed and the Structural Engineer's report is included. The walls are largely retained, and the recommendations of the report will be followed. Where the wall is being removed then the existing tree planting fronting the highway will continue to provide screening so the building being set back from the road will not have visual prominence.

Existing planting is mainly to be kept with new planting also being incorporated as part of the proposal. They will provide screening to the site from the adjacent properties and also to the car park area fronting Pimlico Rd.

The internal redesign, the alterations to the height, window/roof lights and the additional planting will address concerns of neighbours overlooking so there is no detrimental impact on residential amenity.

The proposed materials of stone masonry, slate roof tiles and timber frame windows are in keeping with the existing residential buildings in the area.

There is secure cycle parking included in the scheme and also the bin store is located to enable ease of access by the bin lorry.

Conclusions

This is a scheme for residential development on previously developed land within the settlement boundary of Clitheroe one of the principal settlements in RVBC area identified in the RVCS. It is a sustainable location within a mile of Clitheroe town centre with a bus stop directly outside the site and provision for car and cycle parking within the scheme.

The proposal offers a dwelling type the will widened the mix and housing offer and is inclusive as there is a DDA compliant flat as well as affordable flats which if required could be for the over 55 age group.

The scheme therefore complies with RVCS policies DS1, DS2, H1, H2, H3.

The previous refusal was concerned more for the detail of the proposal than the principal of development. It referred specifically to the design and amenity elements of RVCS policy DMG1. This revised scheme now addresses those design details.

The proposal complies with both national and local policies and should be approved without delay.

Please confirm receipt of this application and we await your letter confirming the application has been validated.

Dickman Associates Ltd	

Yours faithfully