


Pre-Application Response			Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin
Description:	Phase 2 Lawsonsteads			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Application Ref:	2018/ENQ/0002	Case Officer:	S.K	
Response Ref:	2018/ENQ/0002/UD/01	Issue Date:	22/08/17	

General Observations:	
1.1	<p>The observations contained within this response are made in relation to the following submitted information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-Planning Application Document • Proposed Site Layout AA7403 1002 Rev: G • AA7403/SK/04 Site Layout (Plot Numbers) received 22/08/18
Highways Issues:	
2.1	<p>LCC Highways may require a contribution towards off-site highways improvements. I have previously advised that you approach the Highways service separately as they operate an independent pre-application process, they will also provide feedback on the adoptability of the proposed highways arrangements and any concerns in respect of the highway operation of the development upon request.</p>
2.2	<p>I note that the eastern A671 link road has been partially realigned to take account of topographical conditions at the eastern extents of the site. I have no specific concerns/observations in relation to this matter provided such arrangements are agreed by LCC Highways.</p>
2.3	<p>Precise details of the interface with the A671 (and any related off-site highways works) should be provided in support of any subsequently submitted application.</p>
2.4	<p>You will note that condition 11 of the previous outline consent (3/2013/0137) required the following:</p> <p><i>No more than 55 dwellings shall be constructed until the access to/from the A671 (Drawing Ref: 10/228/TR/024 Rev A) has been constructed to binder course level in accordance with the approved details pursuant to Condition [7]. Following construction of this access, no construction traffic shall enter or leave the site using the Clitheroe Road access.</i></p>

Given it is likely there will be a continued need to meet this requirement I would strongly urge that you engage with LCC Highways at the earliest possible opportunity to seek clarification on this matter particularly in relation to any impacts it may have in respect of construction methodology.

Matters of Design

- 3.1** I note that no specific details have been provided in respect of proposed housetypes other than those indicative elevations as contained within the submitted 'Pre-Application Document'. It is also noted at our previous meeting you outlined the intention to provide a suite of housetypes, as part of the pre-application process, to enable detailed comments to be provided prior to submission.
- 3.2** I have no specific reservations in respect of the supplied brick samples but query the appropriateness of the 'Lava' brick-stock, I would need to see a larger sample panel to ascertain how the brick would appear when used on a larger scale. If you can provide images of such an application I will be able to provide a more definitive view.
- 3.3** As discussed at our meeting of the 25th of July it is likely a number of the dwellings along the primary frontage will be read in context with existing dwellings that are faced in buff stone. To ensure a level of visual continuity and coherence I would suggest that a number of plots along this frontage potentially employ a similar or complimentary facing material.
- 3.4** In respect of the above point I do accept a number of the proposed brick types may be read as complimentary but would require an indicative streetscene that illustrates the proposed frontage plots in context with the existing dwellings. This would allow for the synergy between the existing and that which is proposed to be assessed fully, particularly in respect of the success of the visual transition from Phase 01 to Phase 02.

Layout

- 4.1** In relation to the proposed layout (AA7403 1002 Rev G) I have a number of plot specific observations/concerns as follows:
- A number of the dwellings on site fail to meet the required 21m back to back interface distance that will be required by the authority.
 - There are a number of arrangements whereby dwellings are orientated 90 degrees from one

another that would result in direct overlooking of private residential curtilage from adjacent dwellings within a proximity which would not be considered acceptable. For example (but not exclusively) the interface distances between plots 102-103 and the residential curtilage of plot 100. Similar arrangements exist in relation to the following plots 174-175 to plot 171, plots 153-157 to plots 159 and 160, Plots 18-20 and plot 23, plots 6-8 to plots 2 and 3 and plot 115 to plots 116 and 117.

- Please note the aforementioned plot references are not exhaustive and would request that the entirety of the layout be revised to ensure such relationships are omitted.
- Plots 25 and 26 are likely to be afforded a direct outlook into the adjacent existing residential curtilage associated with 29 Deer Park Crescent that would be of significant detriment to residential amenity.
- The proximity of plots 27 and 28 to number 29 Deer Park Crescent and resultant direct overlooking would be of clear detriment to existing residential amenity.
- Plots 159-160 do not appear to benefit from any significant meaningful level of private amenity space.
- The depths of the residential curtilages associated with a large number of the proposed dwellings falls significantly short of the required 10.5m. Particularly those backing on to the eastern extents of the southern development parcel.
- The proximity of plots 135-138 with the existing properties to the south is likely to result in direct overlooking of existing private residential curtilage at a distance of less than 10.5m.
- Where properties are orientated that would result in a rear elevation facing a side elevation (rear to flank), the interface distance should be no less than 13.5m to take account of the potential for an overbearing and over-dominant impact.
- No details of the site/curtilage arrangements associated with plots 57-66 have been provided.
- I query the rationale behind the orientation of plots 141-142 and 139-140 in that they appear anomalous when taking account of the surrounding pattern of proposed development. I also consider the orientation may allow for direct overlooking of existing private residential curtilage albeit at an oblique angle.
- The forward projection of plots 2-3, when taking account of the established geometry of the inherent building line established by Phase 01, may result in these dwellings appearing somewhat incongruous and anomalous in their orientation.
- I have concerns relating to the orientation and configuration of plots 151 and 152 – not only in respect of one another but also in respect of plot 151 and its relationship with the adjacent existing western boundary.

- The parking arrangement directly adjacent the southern link road associated with plot 115 is poorly conceived and is likely to be read as visually incongruous/anomalous when taking account of the arrangements of the remainder of the properties that will front on to or directly address the central linear country park.

- 4.2** The layout largely follows the overall arrangement of that which has gained previous approval. I do however note that in a number of locations the proposed layout encroaches outside of the previously approved development parcels. As stated at our meeting of the 25th of July, as you are submitting a full application and not a reserved matters application (pursuant to the original outline consent), you are not bound by the constraints imposed as part of the previously approved 'Parameters Plan' for the site.
- 4.3** Despite the above I do have concerns regarding the potential impact upon the existing residents of Woodlands Park whom back on to the site. As you will note, the previous consents on site provided a clear landscape mitigation buffer adjacent these properties to minimise the impact upon residential amenity through the recognition that existing receptors are more sensitive to the impacts of development. I am concerned that the submitted indicative layout fails to provide such mitigation however I do note that the back-to-back interface distances between the existing and proposed properties exceeds the minimum 21m interface requirement. Notwithstanding this matter I would request that you explore reinstating a buffer margin, perhaps of 5m that could be management/maintained by a third-party management company and accommodate native hedgerow/shrub and selective tree planting.
- 4.4** I note the intention to introduce a northern link-road to facilitate access to land associated with Oakhill College. Should this form part of the application, I would request that a justification for such a connection be provided in support of the proposal. I would also request that details of the highways direct interface with the land be provided, including details of the area of land that the access would serve.
- 4.5** There will be a requirement to continue the 3m Cycleway/Footway approved as part of phase 01 which should largely follow the arrangement as approved under the previous phase 02 reserved matters consent.
- 4.6** Footways should be provided on both sides of the southern link-road with one accommodating the cycleway as referred to in the above point.
- 4.7** Refuse storage and waste management will have to be considered. No details have been provided in

respect of how storage provision for refuse receptacles will be accommodated. Of particular concern are those dwellings that are mid-terrace, as such they will not benefit from a route to bring refuse storage receptacles from the rear curtilage of the property to the front for street side collection. You will note that a number of dwellings in Phase 01 adopt a ginnel arrangement to enable ease of access for occupiers and suggest that this arrangement also be implemented within phase 02.

- 4.8** A number of boundary treatments that delineate private residential curtilage appear to directly front the public realm and as such are afforded a high level of visibility. In such situations it is imperative that non-standard boundary treatments are implemented and proprietary products are avoided such as close board fencing. I would also suggest that where such boundary treatments are directly adjacent the footway, measures are implemented to ensure such boundary treatments are sufficiently animated or accompanied by a landscaped margin to soften their overall appearance. In such scenarios the Local Planning Authority actively encourages the use of living 'green-screen' boundary treatments, a number of which have been secured and implemented in a number of locations across the Borough with great success. I would therefore request that you explore the option of implementing them as part of the current proposals.
- 4.9** The use of such screening should also be considered where boundary treatments are outward facing, particularly at the developments extents, this will allow for a softer visual transition into the surrounding defined open countryside. The use of green-screens will counter the potentially anomalous appearance that would result from the use standard boundary treatments whilst contributing to overall ecological and biodiversity enhancement as required by Key Statement EN4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.
- 4.10** I would also request that all boundary treatments, both peripheral and internal, benefit from measures to maintain and enhance wildlife movement within and around the site by virtue of the inclusion of suitable sized gaps/corridors at ground level.
- 4.11** No details have been provided in respect of the proposed usable Public Open Space areas at this stage but do note that the 'trim trail' routes follow largely the route of that which was previously approved. Full details of these areas, including proposed street furnishing/equipment, will be required to be submitted at application stage.
- 4.12** You will note from our discussions that a current discharge of condition application (3/2018/0491) is currently before the Planning Authority which proposes a number of pedestrian/cycle routes, boundary treatments and play equipment being located directly adjacent the attenuation ponds that may also be located within the red edge of your application. Negotiations are currently underway in

respect of this application, I would therefore advise you familiarise yourself with the approved details when they are finalised. This will ensure any proposals brought forward by yourselves work in concert with that which may have been previously approved.

Landscape & Ecology

5.1 Key statement EN4 requires that all proposals should, as a principle, result in overall net enhancement in biodiversity. Due to the presence of linear landscape features in the area it is likely that the area may be used as foraging territory for bats/birds. In this respect the Authority will request the provision of integral bat/bird boxes to ensure that the proposal brings forward habitat opportunities for species of conservation concern/protected species and to minimise/mitigate the impact of the development. As a rule of thumb the LPA will expect no less than 75% coverage within the development.

5.2 No detailed landscaping proposals have been presented at this stage and would recommend that the site is considered holistically to ensure an overall green strategy for the entire site. In respect of green infrastructure I would recommend that the following be considered:

- Robust landscape buffer to the east of the northern 'Oakhill Link Road'. Such a buffer should include hedgerow and tree planting complimented with native shrub species. I would advise that any proposed landscaping be 'organic' in layout and form to counter the linear nature of the road.
- Significant landscape buffer/planting to the east of the road fronting plots 69-86. Such landscaping should assist in the visual transition from the linear built form to that of the adjacent greenfield open countryside land.
- Significant landscaping to the south of the eastern development parcel to soften the largely linear and abrupt termination of plots 111-116 and 86-88 and associated highway. Once again I would request that any such landscape visual mitigation be largely organic in its overall layout/plan-form.
- Landscaping/tree-planting adjacent the southern link road.
- Significant landscape buffer/mitigation to the northern extents of the southern development parcel adjacent the existing PROW.
- Explore the potential use of green screens to delineate the rear curtilages of plots 121-134. This will ensure a softer visual transition into the adjacent open land than that which would be achieved by proprietary or standard fencing products.
- Implement amenity landscaping on both sides of the eastern extents of the A671 link road.

- Implement amenity landscaping on the southern side of the central highway adjacent Phase 01.
- Portions of the proposed trim trail may come into close proximity to the highway serving the eastern most dwellings in the northern development parcel. Whilst it will be required that linkages from the development parcels are provided to the trim-trail, I would request that a margin of separation between the trail (or associated routes) and the proposed dwellings is created to preserve residential amenity and mitigate potential conflict. I would also request that such margins include the provision of significant landscaping to ensure they are adequately delineated.
- Clarify as to whether the north-eastern extents of the site will accommodate usable public open space.

5.3 Details of any improvements to be made to the existing PROW should be provided in support of the application to accord with Policy DMB5.

Affordable Housing Provision	
-------------------------------------	--

5.4 Following our discussion you will be aware that Key Statement H3 states the following:

Within the settlement boundaries of Clitheroe and Longridge, on housing developments of 10 units or more dwellings (or sites of 0.5 hectares or more, irrespective of the number of dwellings) an element of affordable, local needs housing will be required on all schemes. The Council will seek affordable housing provision at 30% of units on the site.

5.5 Further to the above you will be aware that Key Statement H3 states the following:

Providing housing for older people is a priority for the Council within the Housing Strategy. Within the negotiations for housing developments, 15% of the units will be sought to provide for older people on sites of 10 units or more. Within this 15% figure a minimum of 50% would be affordable and be included within the overall affordable housing threshold of 30%. The remaining 50% (i.e. the remaining 50% of the 15% older people's element) will be for market housing for older people.

As a result the Local Authority considers that there is still a requirement to provide 7.5% of the open market dwellings for occupation by older people (aged 55 and over) if the proposal is to be considered to be in accordance with the Adopted Development Plan.

- 5.6** For the avoidance of doubt the Local Planning Authority will require any such over 55 housing provision to meet the following definitions:

Bungalow accommodation solely for occupation by those over 55 years of age:

A unit of accommodation/dwelling that shall not be occupied by a person under the age of 55 years except that in circumstances of a married couple or civil partnership at least one person in the married couple or civil partnership is not less than 55 years of age.

The unit of accommodation/dwelling shall provide a principle bedroom and bathroom at ground floor, in addition to and without compromising kitchen/dining and living room provision, all of which shall be designed to meet national space standards. The internal and external arrangements of the unit of accommodation shall accord with the specifications and requirements of category 2 housing as defined in M4(2) of Approved Document M (volume 1 2015) of The Building regulations 201 (or any subsequent revisions).

For the avoidance of doubt the ground floor accommodation shall possess the ability to be habitable without necessitating the need for access to upper floor accommodation by the user.

Non-bungalow accommodation for occupation by those aged over 55:

A unit of accommodation/dwelling that shall not be occupied by a person under the age of 55 years except that in circumstances of a married couple or civil partnership at least one person in the married couple or civil partnership is not less than 55 years of age. The internal arrangements and external arrangements of the unit of accommodation shall accord with the specifications and requirements of category 2 housing as defined in M4(2) of Approved Document M (volume 1 2015) of The Building regulations 201 (or any subsequent revisions).

- 5.7** Should you wish to discuss the above requirements further or wish detailed advice in respect of affordable housing mix I would advise you contact our Strategic Housing Officer, Rachael Stott (Rachael.Stott@ribblevalley.gov.uk).

Financial Contributions	
--------------------------------	--

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 6.1 | A financial contribution will be sought by the Local Planning Authority in respect of a contribution |
|------------|--|

towards leisure/play facilities within Whalley. The contribution sought will be based on the following occupancy ratios at a rate of £216.90 cost per person:

- 1 bed unit - 1.3 people
- 2 bed unit - 1.8 people
- 3 bed unit - 2.5 people
- 4 bed unit - 3.1 people
- 5 + bed unit - 3.5 people

A commitment to meet such requirements should be contained within any Heads of Terms submitted with the application.

- 6.2** It is likely that LCC Contributions will seek a financial contribution towards educational places within the area (both primary and secondary). I would therefore advise you contact LCC Contributions Team (Schools.Planning@lancashire.gov.uk) to discuss whether at present there will be requirement to provide a contribution towards a shortfall in primary or secondary school places in the vicinity and the method of calculation to be used. Please note an accurate figure will only be made available when accurate bedroom information can be provided.

Application Requirements	
--------------------------	--

- 7.1** I would advise that the following information be submitted in support of any subsequent application to allow for an accurate determination of the proposal to be made and to limit the need for the imposition of pre-commencement conditions should consent be granted:

- Location plan identifying the extents of the site 1:500/1:1250
- Proposed Floorplans (Dimensioned) at scale of 1:100/1:50
- Proposed Elevations (Dimensioned) at a scale of 1:100/1:50
- Proposed Roof Plans at a scale of 1:100/1:50
- Proposed Site Plan (Dimensions to be shown between existing properties and those which are proposed) at a scale of 1:200/1:500
- Proposed Streetscenes at a scale of 1:100 or 1:200
- Details of proposed utility structures/pumping stations
- Proposed cross sections through the site (North to south and east to west)
- Existing and proposed cross sections through any additional proposed attenuation ponds

- Details of all boundary treatments - locational and elevational details (Elevational details to be at a scale of 1:100/1:50)
- Details of proposed materials (If possible at time of submission) including door/window framing materials
- Details of the extents of highway and footway to be adopted by LCC Highways
- Details of proposed landscaping including types and numbers of trees and shrubs to be planted, their distribution on site, those areas to be seeded, turfed, paved or hard landscaped, including details of any changes of level or landform. This matter may be conditioned but it would assist if a green infrastructure plan was submitted to outline a general approach.
- Details of the proposed usable public open spaces including types of routes and surfacing , street furnishing and play equipment
- Full details of existing and proposed ground levels and proposed building finished floor levels (all relative to ground levels adjoining the site) including the levels of the proposed roads. For the avoidance of doubt the submitted information should include existing and proposed sections through the site including details of the height, scale and location of proposed housing in relation to adjacent existing development/built form (where applicable)
- Details of refuse storage locations and routes for access by residents (where applicable)
- Details of parking provision allocation
- Arboricultural impact assessment including details of tree protection for trees to be retained that are directly affected or within influencing distance of the development.
- Bat Survey (Including precise details of mitigation/enhancement where appropriate)
- Habitat/Ecological Survey (Including precise details of mitigation/enhancement where appropriate)
- Design & Access Statement
- Heads of Terms
- Flood Risk Assessment (LLFA/EA) may wish to see an outline drainage strategy for the site at this stage. I would advise you contact both Statutory Consultees to confirm potential application requirements.
- Transport Assessment
- Planning Statement

7.2 Please note that this list is not exhaustive and there may be the need to provide additional or revised information during the determination of the application following consultation with internal/statutory consultees.

Concluding Observations:		
8.1	The above observations have been provided on the basis of the level of information submitted and the comments contained within this response represent officer opinion only, at the time of writing, without prejudice to the final determination of any application submitted.	
8.2	Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me.	
		Officer: Stephen Kilmartin