

[REDACTED]  
Director of Economic Development and Planning  
Ribble Valley Borough Council  
Church Walk  
Clitheroe  
Lancashire  
BB7 2RA

29<sup>th</sup> April 2022

MW/21-1101

[REDACTED]  
**RE: APPLICATION 3/2021/0556.**

**APPLICATION FOR RESERVED MATTERS CONSENT (APPEARANCE, SCALE, LANDSCAPING AND LAYOUT) PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING CONSENT (REF 3/2016/1082) FOR THE DEMOLITION OF 74 HIGHER ROAD AND CONSTRUCTION OF UP TO 123 HOUSES ON LAND TO THE REAR.  
74 HIGHER ROAD, LONGRIDGE, PR3 3SY AND LAND TO THE REAR.**

I write in connection with the above application for reserved matters and further to our previous correspondence. I have pleasure in enclosing a suite of updated plans and responses technical matters that have been raised by the Council's statutory consultees.

For ease of reference, the complete list of plans and documents presented for determination is as follows. Plans which have been updated or are new are in red text.

**Architectural Details:**

20126_00_A	Site Location Plan
20126_01_P6	Proposed Site Layout
20126_02_P6	Illustrative Site Layout
20126_03_B	Boundary Treatment layout
20126_04_A	Boundary Treatment Details
20126_05_B	Illustrative Street Scenes

20126\_06\_C  
20126\_07\_B  
20126\_08\_B  
20126\_09\_A  
20126\_DJS\_01

Illustrative Site Sections Sheet 1 of 2  
Affordable Housing Location Plan  
Waste Management Plan  
Illustrative Site Sections Sheet 2 of 2  
Design Statement

### **House Types:**

20126\_HT\_01\_A  
20126\_HT\_02\_A  
20126\_HT\_03\_A  
20126\_HT\_04  
20126\_HT\_05\_A  
20126\_HT\_06\_A  
20126\_HT\_07\_A  
20126\_HT\_08\_A  
20126\_HT\_09\_A  
20126\_HT\_10\_A  
20126\_HT\_11\_A  
20126\_HT\_12  
20126\_HT\_13  
  
20126\_HT\_14\_A  
  
20126\_HT\_15\_A  
  
20126\_HT\_16\_A  
  
20126\_HT\_17

Type A – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type B – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type C – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type E – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type F / E – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type G – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type H1 – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type H2 – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type J – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type K – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type L (Semi-detached) – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type L (Detached) – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)  
Type A1 (Semi-Detached Bungalow) – Floor Plans and Elevations  
(Shared Ownership / Affordable Rent / Discounted Market Sales)  
Type A1 (Detached Bungalow) – Floor Plans and Elevations (Discount  
Market Sales)  
Type C1 (Semi-Detached) – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale /  
Affordable Rent / Discounted Market Sales)  
Type D1 (Semi-Detached) – Floor Plans and Elevations (Shared  
Ownership / Affordable Rent)  
Type D (Semi-Detached) – Floor Plans and Elevations (Open Sale)

### **Engineering / Drainage:**

HIG-AJP-ZZ-00-DR-C-1400-P07  
220-248  
220-248  
HIG-AJP-XX-RP-C-3000-P01  
HIG-AJP-ZZ-00-DR-C-1000-P05  
HIG-AJP-ZZ-00-DR-C-1001-P02  
HIG-AJP-ZZ-00-DR-C-1040-P02  
HIG-AJP-ZZ-00-DR-C-1070-P02  
HIG-AJP-ZZ-00-DR-C-1071-P02  
21\_0556\_LLFA  
HIG-AJP-ZZ-XX-RP-C-3000-P01

Outline Finished Levels Plan  
Proposed Surface Water Network detail  
Existing Greenfield Runoff Details  
Maintenance Strategy Report  
Drainage layout (1 of 2)  
Drainage layout (1 of 2)  
Surface Water Catchment Plan  
Suds Basin Details 1 of 2  
Suds Basin Details 2 of 2  
LLFA Correspondence  
Drainage Strategy Statement

## Highways:

J1401/SIGHTLINE/FIG1	Proposed Site Layout Site Lines
J1401/TRAFFIC CALMING/FIG2	Proposed Site Layout Traffic Calming
J1401/TRACKING/FIG3	Proposed Site Layout Tracking
J1401/TRACKING/FIG4	Proposed Site Layout Tracking
2022/S/1579	Vehicle Restraint Risk Assessment
J1401-TN1	Transport Technical Note

## Landscaping:

P21-1399_001D	Detailed Landscape Plan 1 of 3
P21-1399_002D	Detailed Landscape Plan 2 of 3
P21-1399_003D	Detailed Landscape Plan 3 of 3
P21-1399_004C	POS and Play Area
P21-1399_005B	Ecological Mitigation Plan

## Delivery Timescales

S2002-01-03-001A	Delivery Timescales Strategy
------------------	------------------------------

Whilst I believe that most amendments and updates have been explained in previous e-mails, I considered that it would be helpful to set these out in a covering e-mail. I trust that this will be of use in your assessment of the application. Further detail on design matters is also included within the updated Design Statement by MPSL.

## Relationship between Proposed Site and Existing Dwellings on Higher Road

Cross sections have been prepared to show the relationships between the proposed dwellings and those existing on Higher Road. In addition, amendments have been made to the retaining wall adjacent to no. 54 Higher Road (which has the longest shared boundary with the site) such that this now returns through 90 degrees to follow the site boundary. The designs work with and respects levels along the existing boundary to ensure that impacts on neighbours are negligible.

Generous spacing distances exist between the proposed and existing and thus, when also considering the change in levels between the site and Higher Road, it is deemed that the proposals promote excellent levels of amenity.

## Levels and Separation Distances within the Site

Having assessed previous concerns raised by the LPA, the Applicants deem that the most appropriate solution to the changes in levels across the site is to provide tiered garden spaces within those areas which have the greatest level changes. The realignment of the southern loop road has generated a significant reduction in the maximum retaining wall height and hence will minimise impacts for future residents, whilst still ensuring optimum separation distances and no intervisibility issues.

The amendments furthermore help to maintain the layout and the levels across the site in accordance with the outline consent (which has an essential requirement for development to come forward in accordance with the design principles and parameters referred to in Condition 4). It also ensures that the scheme can deliver appropriate internal highway arrangements and landscaping etc.

The revised scheme has increased as far as possible the back-to-back separation distances to optimise the useability of the rear gardens of properties, particularly within that part of the site with the greatest natural slope. These are marked on the submitted layout plan for ease of reference, whilst there is no adopted policy requirement for minimum distances and the Development Plan allows for the consideration of amenity on a site-by-site basis, we have worked closely with the LPA to provide quality private amenity space. The site sections have nevertheless been updated to show lines of sights and in our opinion, demonstrate that future occupants will benefit from a good standard of amenity.

Indeed, as mentioned above, increasing the facing distances between the dwellings would undermine the masterplan, which was insisted upon by the LPA at the outline stage. Furthermore, this would not actually improve amenity levels as the difference in levels between the homes would in turn be greater, increasing the extent of overlooking from dwellings positioned higher in the topography. The Applicants consequently perceive that the scheme works with the levels to ensure good design and it is trusted that Officer support will be secured on this matter.

#### **Finished appearance of retaining structures**

Officers had previously requested that retaining structures be constructed in natural facing materials to reduce their impact. However, as the final engineered solution has not yet been calculated and will need to be informed by additional on-site assessments, it is trusted that the approval of the final design details of the retaining walls can be subject to a suitably worded condition, tied to the reserved matters consent.

#### **Affordable Housing and Over 55 Housing**

The submitted layout plan indicates the location and type of the affordable homes that will be provided as part of the development, with an accommodation schedule provided to the top left-hand corner for ease of reference. The includes details of the house-types, number of beds and the proposed tenure.

Further to correspondence with the LPA over the course of the determination period, the proposed mix has been updated from the originally submitted details to 16 x 2 bed bungalows and 11 x 2 bed and 10 x 3 bed two-storey units. The 4 additional 3-beds will be affordable rented accommodation, as requested.

It is considered that the mix is consistent with the requirements of the outline consent and associated s.106 agreement, which requires a 30% contribution overall. Furthermore, it is deemed to meet current local needs. It should be noted that all the affordable units meet the required space standards.

The location of dwellings to be specifically allocated for over 55s are also indicated clearly on the site layout plan and referred to on the key (on the right of the plan). As requested by the LPA, the vast majority of the over 55s units are positioned towards the northern part of the site, nearer the access.

### **Public Open Space**

The proposed landscaping and ecological mitigation plans have been updated to reflect the amendments to the layout.

The design of the play area has also been updated to take on-board the comments from the Council's Head of Leisure Services. The amendments to the play area now accommodates toddler equipment and moved the majority of these towards the north-western area of the land.

### **Car Parking**

The amended site layout makes clear the amount of car parking for each proposed unit, which is in accordance with the Council's adopted standards. This includes 3 spaces for each of the 4 bed units. I can confirm that all double-length driveways are a minimum of 11m long.

Plot 115 still has double-length parking which although situated to the side of the dwelling, is within curtilage. I am content that sufficient levels of natural surveillance are provided from Plots 116 and 117 to promote a safe environment. I trust that the LPA would be willing to support this, given the context of surrounding dwellings and as this type of parking is not a theme throughout the design. Furthermore, the Applicants feel that the design shown at Plot 115 would be preferable from a landscaping point of view as it limits the amount of fencing that would be visible from the Internal road (which if the parking was brought into the curtilage would be central located between the parking area for Plots 115 and 116).

The parking arrangements for Plots 11 – 12, 13 – 14 and 113 have also been reconsidered from the originally submitted layout, considering comments received from the LPA. It is trusted that the amended design is now deemed acceptable and promotes softer landscaping.

The Applicants would prefer a condition to confirm the precise location and details of EV charging points. However, they would like to assure that the LPA of their intention to provide these features as standard on all homes.

### **LCC Highways**

Whilst LCC Highways have raised no objection, additional details have now been provided as per the request in the consultation responses dated 17<sup>th</sup> March 22 and 29<sup>th</sup> July 2021. These include the provision of a Transport Technical Note, Vehicle Restraint Risk Assessment and a series of plans setting out sight lines, vehicle tracking / swept path analysis and traffic calming measures. Matters in relation to car parking provision are detailed above.

LCC Highways has also queried whether the proposed footpath links from the site are being put forward for adoption. This is not the case, as all footpaths and grass verges will remain private, with maintenance being undertaken by an appointed Management Company.

The layout has also been updated to make the footpath links clearer considering the comments from LCC Highways. The hedge referred to by LCC is on third party land and outside of the red edge. The Applicant is

happy to agree to a condition relating to the removal and extension of the footway into the adjacent residential development. The comments regarding the need for bollards is also noted and we feel that this is not necessary given that the footpath is not intended for vehicles. However, they would also be willing to agree to a condition requiring the approval of details of bollards, should the LPA deem this necessary.

#### **Lead Local Flood Authority**

In response to the comments from the LLFA, dated 30<sup>th</sup> July 21, the drainage engineers have produced a Drainage Strategy Statement which addresses these. This demonstrates how the proposed drainage system will comply with the drainage hierarchy as set out in the NPPF. It is trusted that the LLFA will respond positively to any formal consultation. However, the authors of the Statement are also willing to liaise directly with the consultee should this be necessary. They have already contacted the LLFA directly on 31<sup>st</sup> March but await a response.

Additionally, details of the drainage design, surface water catchment and attenuation basins have been updated in accordance with the proposed layout. It is trusted that these will not cause any concerns for the LLFA.

#### **Determination**

I trust that the above provides sufficient detail on all outstanding matters. However, please do not hesitate to contact me in the first instance if you have any remaining queries.

I must stress the importance to the Applicants that the application is put before the next available Meeting of Planning Committee, which is understood to be scheduled for the 19<sup>th</sup> May. I would welcome your assurance that this is achievable.

I shall look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

