

APPLICATION NO: 3/2010/0719/P (GRID REF: SD 372930 441082)
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 270 DWELLINGS, DOCTOR'S
SURGERY, LANDSCAPE, OPEN SPACE, HIGHWAYS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND
OFF HENTHORN ROAD, CLITHEROE

TOWN COUNCIL:

Object on the following grounds:

1. It contradicts Policy G2 which states that:
 - (a) Within the plan area developments will be mainly directed towards land within the main settlement boundaries.
 - (b) Clitheroe – consolidation and expansion of development and rounding off development. In all cases this must be on sites wholly within the settlement.
 - (c) Expansion – for the purposes of this plan it must be development which is in scale and keeping with the existing town.
2. The 1998 District Plan also excludes land off Henthorn Road from development under Policy ENV3.
3. Concerns regarding effects on the town's infrastructure as whilst the developer can be forced to take action regarding school places the geography of the town means that traffic is a major issue.
4. The site was not identified as one of RVBC's preferred options for development in its current LDF draft document.
5. Given the physical insularity of the site, it is unlikely to mix well with the rest of the community.

In response to the revision to incorporate a doctor's surgery, retain their objection and comments that this will be out on a limb from the Health Centre. Nor do they feel that this will have any effect on the provision of low cost property or starter homes.

ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE
(COUNTY SURVEYOR):

I refer to our previous correspondence, meetings and discussions concerning this application.

Further to our most recent meeting with representatives of Ashley Helme, I can confirm that I have no objections in principle to this proposal on highway grounds. However, this view is subject to the provision of a number of improvements to the highway infrastructure, deemed necessary and appropriate to facilitate the additional pedestrian and vehicular activity generated by the proposed development.

1. Bus Service Provision

The detailed Public Transport provisions will be resolved as part of a formal Legal Agreement. The provision of a new service will draw on the existing C1 service. However, while it may vary in detail, frequency and route, the agreed service will always serve the development site and Clitheroe Interchange. The bus service must be operating prior to the occupation of the 51st dwelling.

During construction and until such time as a permanent stop can be established, a temporary stop will operate from Henthorn Road at a location to be agreed.

The agreed funding measures will secure the service for a minimum five-year period, with additional measures being pursued that will require all fares collected during this period being reinvested into extending the service.

The formal Legal Agreement will detail the specific financial arrangements required to secure this additional provision.

2. Pedestrian/Cycle Link to Caravan and Camping access road

The proposed site requires a secondary pedestrian and cycle access to achieve a basic level of sustainability. The creation of such a route is proposed to tie in with an existing access from Edisford Road. This route is presently controlled by Ribble Valley Borough Council and offers access to the Edisford Caravan and Camping site.

Given the scale of the proposed development it is inappropriate to have all vehicular and pedestrian access available from a single point. This would be unsafe, impracticable or unsustainable.

Should it transpire that a formal agreement cannot be reached prior the granting of the formal planning consent, I have no objection to establishing a specific Condition, as part of such consent, requiring the completion of a shared pedestrian and cycle access.

3. Cycle Provisions

The developer will provide parking stands (2 sets for 4 cycles) within the development play area and in Clitheroe Town Centre, at location to be determined by the LCC Cycling Officer.

4. Traffic Measures on Woone Lane

Measures to improve the management of traffic flows on Woone Lane are necessary in order to minimise the detrimental impact of the anticipated additional movements directly attributable to the development. In considering the means available to achieve a successful outcome, an agreed scheme involving priority working and protected parking bays has been developed in discussion with Ashley Helme Associates.

I am satisfied that this proposal, as detailed on drawings (Drawing Numbers 1222/23 and 1222/SP/02), addresses the direct impact of the additional traffic generated by the proposed development, meets the existing demand for on street parking provisions, defines measures to secure managed speeds and secures accessible footways for pedestrians.

5. Off-Site Highway Works.

The provision of the following off site highway works can be achieved without reference to an Order making process and their introduction will be agreed and scheduled by means of the Section 278 Agreement.

- a. The provision of Toucan measures at the upgraded signal controlled crossing on Whalley Road, close to Turner Street. This will assist in managing vehicle speeds and will be of specific benefit to both cyclists and pedestrians.
- b. The provision of a zebra crossing on Henthorn Road, along the frontage with Henthorn Park to the north east of Siddows Avenue. Subject to agreeing a definitive position for the crossing, this may also involve some minor footway reconstruction at Siddows Avenue and Whipp Avenue. This will assist in managing vehicle speeds and will provide a safe pedestrian route to the various facilities within the town centre.

- c. In order to maximise pedestrian access between the proposed development site and the town centre, the provision of drop kerbs along the main pedestrian desire lines, improved surface materials and pedestrian signing to the town shall be reviewed.
- d. Lancashire County Council is pursuing a 20mph Speed Limit proposal that includes the Henthorn Road area. If successful, the extent of the measures will be altered to include the proposed development.

As this matter is being dealt with directly by LCC, there will be no obligation placed on the developer to contribute toward the costs of this scheme.

- e. The provision of new red surfacing measures at a number of junctions along Henthorn Road has been discussed. I refer to Drawing 1222/21 of December 2010. With the proposed introduction of the 20mph Speed Limit, these additional measures will not be required. However, the renewal of the existing junction measures should proceed.

6. Summary and Conditions

A. The Public Transport improvements and funding arrangements, along with the funding of subsequent cycle measures shall be secured through a Legal Agreement.

B. Subject to consent being granted for this development, a condition would be imposed such that no part of the approved development would commence until a scheme for the construction of the site access and the off-site works of highway improvement had been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. This is to satisfy the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority that the final details of the highway scheme/works are acceptable before work commences on site.

C. The new estate road between the site and Henthorn Road shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level before any development takes place within the site. This is to ensure that satisfactory access is provided to the site before the development hereby permitted becomes operative.

D. Before the development hereby permitted is brought into operation facilities shall be provided within the site by which means the wheels of vehicles may be cleaned before leaving the site. This is to avoid the possibility of the public highway being affected by the deposit of mud and/or loose materials thus creating a potential hazard to road users.

COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGY: The archaeological assessment which accompanies the application has identified that the site lies within an area considered to have a high potential to contain archaeological deposits. Consequently LCAS would recommend that the site be subject to detailed archaeological investigation and that work should be secured by means of an appropriately worded planning condition.

COUNTY ECOLOGIST: The main ecological issues arising from the proposal include potential impacts on:

- non-statutory sites (River Ribble Biological Heritage Site);
- habitats of principal importance (hedgerows, grassland);
- species of principal importance and protected species (bats, otters, water voles, badgers, white clawed crayfish, breeding birds);

Provided mitigation and compensation can be secured through planning condition the proposals should be in accordance with the requirements of biodiversity planning policy, guidance and legislation.

LANCASHIRE COUNTY
COUNCIL PLANNING
CONTRIBUTIONS:

Based upon the Policy Paper Planning Obligations in Lancashire the contribution request is as follows:

Transport

Based on the pre-application advice, and an accessibility score of 25, a sum of £1,550 was identified for each unit. Therefore, for 270 properties a highway contribution in the region of £418,500 would be sought.

Education

Using the LCC Planning Obligations Policy Paper, a yield of 0.35 primary and 0.25 secondary pupils per house has been used. Therefore, there is a possible yield of 95 primary and 68 secondary aged pupils.

Primary School Places

Whilst there are projected to be sufficient places in this area for the next 5 years, this does not take into account other developments which have been applied for but not yet received planning permission in the area.

Therefore the number of available places would be 102 less 33 = 69 places. Given that this development could yield 95 pupils, we would be seeking to make a claim in respect of the shortfall, ie 26 pupils.

Using the DCSF cost multiplier (£12,257 x 0.9) x 1.0733 per place = £307,837.

Secondary School Places

Whilst there are projected to be approximately 173 available places in 5 years, without the added impact of new housing developments coming forward, a number of recent housing developments seeking planning permission will already impact upon these schools. These developments (Victoria Mill, Primrose Mill, Former Cobden Mill, Calderstones, Barkers Garden Centre and Barrow Brook) are estimated to yield approximately 91 additional secondary pupils. The approval of all these sites will leave 82 places. Therefore, as this site is expected to yield approximately 68 pupils, we would not be seeking a contribution towards secondary places.

Please note that the number of school places in this area are under pressure from increased numbers of housing developments. If we are unable to secure this contribution for school places, Lancashire County Council will be unable to guarantee that children in this area will be able to secure a school place within a reasonable distance from their home.

Waste Management

The County Council makes vital major investments in waste management infrastructure for reasons of environmental protection and sustainability. Every district in the County is being provided with advanced treatment facilities to treat waste prior to landfilling, either directly or via purpose designed transfer stations. Since each and every new house, wherever it is in the County, has to be provided with this basic service and the Council has to comply with significant new requirements relating to the management of waste, it is considered that the Council is justified in requesting a contribution towards waste management. Based upon the Policy Paper methodology for Waste Management, the request is £129,600.

By way of summary, the likely planning contribution request for Lancashire County Council services is as follows:

Transport	£418,500
Education	£307,837
Waste Management	£129,600
Grand Total	£855,937

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY:

The application is accompanied by a flood risk assessment. This has been reviewed and as submitted we are satisfied that the proposed development would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. We recommend that any subsequent approval is conditioned appropriately.

UNITED UTILITIES:

Have no objections to the proposal.

**ADDITIONAL
REPRESENTATIONS:**

A total of 164 letters of objection (including one with 10 signatures and a representation made on behalf of the Henthorn Housing Action Group) have been received to the application as originally submitted and revised to incorporate a doctor's surgery and off site highway works. Members are referred to the file for full details of these which can be summarised as follows:

1. Concerns over the application's relationship to the wider planning process. The application was submitted ten days before the beginning of the consultation period for the Ribble Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy. The Core Strategy suggests three broad options for development in different proportions across Ribble Valley with an open fourth possible option for alternate suggestions. Because of the size of Gladman's proposed development (which is not a preferred option) to allow outline planning permission at this stage would pre-empt the community consultation taking place on the core strategy.
2. Landowners are attempting to by-pass the Core Strategy/LDF process by submitting planning applications for individual schemes which may result in uncoordinated and poorly planned development in Ribble Valley.
3. Although the application site has been included in the SHLAA it is important to note that this does not infer that this land will ever be developed even if it complied with all current or future plan policies. As stated in the SHLAA *"the SHLAA is not a statement of Council policy, nor does it allocate land or grant planning permission."*

4. The Regional Spatial Strategy was revoked on 6 July and no longer forms part of the development plan.
5. Concerns over the inadequacy of the Gladman consultation process for the public exhibition prior to submission of the application.
6. PPS3 'Housing' requires housing developments to be built in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. The site is not in a location which allows good access to the range of services referred to in the PPS. It also requires developments to be well integrated with neighbouring buildings and develop a mixed, sustainable community. The development will be located outside of the settlement boundary and not incorporated into any of the existing residential areas. It fails to meet essential sustainability criteria for schools, shops, health (doctors and dentists).
7. The site is outside the settlement boundary where Policy G5 states planning consent will only be granted for small scale developments. This site at 15.7 hectare cannot be considered small scale. Policy G5 recognises the need to protect the countryside from inappropriate development and therefore this large scale development should not be given planning consent.
8. The Districtwide Local Plan Section 2.1.6 states - *major expansion is not envisaged for the area, as it would not be consistent with the regional and local need to minimise unnecessary travel and protect the quality of the countryside.*

This development should be considered major expansion due to its size and scale. The Local Plan also states - *development should be directed to those parts of the area most capable of accommodating it on the basis of the need to redevelop/reclaim unused, unattractive or derelict land, the availability of public transport, the availability of existing infrastructure and services and the absence of environmental harm.* The proposed site is on greenfield land, the availability of public transport is unsatisfactory and environmental harm will be caused with loss of wildlife. Therefore as the development is not located in a suitable area an alternative should be sought.

9. Policy G8 and PPS7 seek to concentrate new housing on brownfield sites in preference to greenfield land. There are plenty of brownfield areas to build on.
10. The site lies beyond the urban boundary and will create urban sprawl.
11. It is important to retain the open spaces between the present town and river.
12. The development would detrimentally alter the area's character.
13. Policies G1, G2, G5, G8, H2, H8, H19, H21, ENV3, ENV6, ENV7, ENV9, T1 and T2 of the Districtwide Local Plan would preclude development of this site. The scheme is also contrary to the provisions of PPS1, PPS3, PPS7, PPS9, PPS13.
14. The area is Green Belt.
15. If housing is really needed then there are more appropriate sites such as the Grammar school land by Clitheroe Hospital and also opposite giving good access to the A59.
16. Building 270 houses on this site is excessive.
17. No plans to build shops or community facilities as part of the scheme.
18. There are many houses for sale so why do we need more.
19. Should we wait until the findings of the review into Government targets for housing are published.
20. Paragraph 3.2.7 of the Districtwide Local Plan states that proposals on sites covering open land in excess of 1 hectare will not be considered appropriate.
21. No information has been submitted in respect of a full survey of the extent of housing need and methods by which the accommodation shall be let/sold or managed and retained as suitable for its original purposes has been provided.
22. The majority of homes are three and four bed so not affordable.

23. The proposal amounts to 34% of the identified housing need in Ribble Valley for the next five years which is disproportionate.
24. There is no provision for the elderly or those with mobility problems.
25. The area is not sensible relative to the town's size and form, ie access to and from the site – only road is a cul-de-sac.
26. The site is remote from the A59 which is the main route across the Borough. A significant proportion of the road journeys to and from the site would involve the use of the A59 and access to the A59 from the site is extremely torturous via the town centre or the residential areas to the south and east of the town. This road network cannot cope with additional traffic.
27. The site is on the western side of the Ribble Valley railway line which is crossed by a level crossing at Thorn Street/Eshton Terrace which already causes bottlenecks on the road network when the gates/barriers are down.
28. 500 plus extra vehicles would add to existing traffic congestion.
29. Any public transport would have to travel back and forth along a road which, at present, causes problems for bus drivers.
30. The additional traffic would be dangerous for school children crossing the road near the park.
31. The only sensible highway option would be to build a branch road from Whalley Road straight across to Henthorn cutting out Greenacre Street and Woone Lane completely.
32. The proposed exit from the site onto the lane is not wide enough to take the extra traffic which will start to use the verges.
33. Traffic calming measures are needed on Henthorn Road.
34. The findings of the Traffic Assessment submitted in support of the application are questioned.

35. The traffic situation will be worsened by the closing of Petre Recycling Centre for which Henthorn is the recommended alternative.
36. The Travel Plan has no chance of working.
37. The development will lead to more congestion on the roads.
38. Henthorn Road is a popular route for dog walkers.
39. Pollution from the increased traffic levels.
40. The site is too far away from the railway station and primary bus stops.
41. The local bus service is not certain.
42. The proposed phased delivery of the site means that residents and construction traffic will be in conflict.
43. Increasing the housing stock without any increase in employment would in no way reduce the need to travel, quite the reverse – are we becoming a commuter town or have jobless people claiming benefit?
44. The cycle ways serve no useful purpose and are there to conform with a policy of national sustainable development.
45. The community park would not be accessible to all (as Gladmans claim) as those on Fairfield Estate would have to walk a mile to access it.
46. The community park and open space are to be sold to the Council and maintained by them. Is this not a heavy burden and unfair expense on ratepayers. This cost should be borne by the developer.
47. The play area is situated near the kennels and cattery and the dogs will be subject to noise disturbance which means they will bark and it will become more difficult for the owners of the kennels to keep within prescribed limited.
48. One of the play areas will result in noise disturbance – especially likely as it features a kick about area which is unnecessary as it is sited a matter of yards from current existing facilities.

49. The plans show a footpath to the football pitches and track to the caravan site – how soon before they build a road there instead?
50. No form of cycle path to the town.
51. Question whether the ecological appraisal is fully representative of the main varieties of wildlife supported within the site area throughout a yearly cycle.
52. The plan fails to adequately address the impact on the bat roost to the rear of Henthorn Farm and the colony of bats which can be seen every day behind Fairfield Drive – the developer has failed to commission a bat survey.
53. Newts are living in the waters on the proposed site.
54. Developing close to the river will have an adverse impact on its nature conservation value and effect the recreational area by it.
55. There will be a flood risk from developing close to the river.
56. The wildlife in the area would disappear.
57. The developers say they will retain hedges and trees but there will be some destruction for making way for roadways and access onto Henthorn Road with a disturbance of the root system of the trees some of which are over 100 years old.
58. Opening up the watercourse and creating ponds – will this not expose the site to potential flooding? The land already gets waterlogged after heavy rain and is slow to drain.
59. Open ponds – does this not expose children to enhanced dangers?
60. The agricultural land is not Grade 4 or 5 as Gladman's state but 3.
61. Building close to the river may cause health problems to future residents.
62. Consideration should be given to the farmer who currently uses the field and impact on his business.
63. Told that Radon gas might be in the area.

64. The developer outlined how additional funding would be directed to local schools but fails to provide sufficient consideration for medium to longer term. All the schools (5 primary and 2 secondary) are at capacity.
65. Object to the planned destruction and artificial channelling of culverts and the construction of a new culvert.
66. Question the Utilities Appraisal Report in terms of capacity issues to cope with this development – water supplies, sewage treatment, gas and electric services are at maximum capacity.
67. Hospitals are miles away placing a strain on the Ambulance service as well as Fire Brigade and Police.
68. We ought to be preserving our farmland and green countryside for future generations.
69. Daylight, sunlight and privacy concerns of adjacent residents.
70. Noise pollution.
71. Dust pollution.
72. Loss of views.
73. The campsite would be overlooked by houses which would discourage visitors.
74. Set a dangerous precedent.
75. Increase in pet numbers could impact on local wildlife.
76. The only people to benefit will be the builders with no benefit to the local community.
77. If land is needed why not use the desolated land near Primrose Lodge.
78. This is a moneymaking opportunity for people who have no regard for the area.
79. Although we need affordable housing, this is not the right place to build.
80. Concerns that the developer had modified the plans without public consultation.

81. With a doctor's surgery and pharmacy, it would become a mixed use site with different effects on existing communities.
82. The revised illustrative masterplan differs greatly from the original masterplan with an increase from 9 landmark buildings to at least 21 buildings of 2.5 storey height. Furthermore the majority of these are not proposed for the central part of the site inside the main road link as stated.
83. Questions over the doctor's surgery in terms of staffing and relationship with existing health centre. It is considered contrary to the provisions of PPS13.
84. Are Gladman's proposing to finance the cost of doctors/nurses/fitting out and maintain the building?
85. If planning permission is granted the developer will change the building dimensions to maximise their profit.
86. The Design and Access Statement does not take into account a non-residential use.
87. There do not appear to be any garages on the plans.
88. Reference to an application in 1979 to develop land on the southern side of Henthorn Road and reason for refusal was single access and exit into the development. Another reason was that development would constitute an undesirable extension of the built up area into the surrounding countryside to the detriment of the landscape amenity of that countryside. Surely this still applies.
89. The new location of the Spar shop changes the developer's assertion that a convenience store is within easy walking distance. The existing shop/newsagents on Henthorn Road is too small to be looked upon as a meaningful convenience store.
90. The late proposal for a doctors surgery/pharmacy has now been modified to just a surgery. It is noted that there appears to be no response from the PCT or other NHS body regarding the suitability of basing a single satellite facility on the site when a highly efficient comprehensive facility already exists within the town.
91. The revised site plan deletes the proposed access onto the playing field but it is still shown on the revised Design and Access Statement (pages 20, 29, 36, 38, 40 and 50).

92. Query the accuracy of the application form responses to questions 18, 19 and 20.
93. The creation of 2m parking bays instead of the agreed standard 2.4m bays would encourage parking on footways thus causing obstructions to pedestrians on Woone Lane. It is not acceptable for Mr Nugent to agree to a derogation of the agreed standard.
94. The creation of passing points on the modified two-way road would remove a significant number of parking places which are currently well used throughout the day. Their removal would incur the wrath of many local workers. A one way system would allow most parking to remain, without the need to park partly on the pavement as at present.
95. Question the swept path analysis of the non TRO proposal.
96. Given the uncertainty of obtaining a TRO this should be secured before the application be determined.
97. Even if a pedestrian/cycle link were created to reach Edisford Road the development would still only have a single vehicular access. If there was a blockage on the highway all vehicular access would be blocked.
98. The timing of highway provisions within the legal agreement by the time the 51st dwelling is occupied would not mitigate the effects created from the start of the development. Earlier provision of these contributions should be sought.
99. The highway scheme now put forward along Woone Lane does not address Martin Nugent's previous concern and will lead to longer delays, detours affecting other areas of the road network and potentially affecting emergency vehicle response times.
100. If 2 large vehicles meet at the passing places it will be very difficult to pass each other resulting in long delays.
101. The fallback position does not have any provision for cyclists.

Proposal

This is an outline application to develop a site for residential use including landscaped areas, open space, highways and associated works and as amended incorporates a doctor's surgery.

The site is greenfield and has an overall site area of approximately 15.7 hectare. Matters of access are being applied for at this time. The component parts of the application are as follows:

Residential (8.27 hectare)

The proposed development will comprise up to 270 dwellings on approximately 8.27 hectare of the overall site. With regards to a mix of dwellings, this had not been fixed at this stage but the Design and Access Statement submitted in support of the application, proposes a mix of dwelling types from 2 to 5 bedroom units, comprising a range of house types with predominantly semi detached and detached properties and also some terrace/linked mews cottages which would offer a mix of market housing from first time homes to larger family homes.

The proposed layout is a reserved matter for consideration at a later stage. However an illustrative layout has been provided which indicates the principle of the urban structure (ie the framework and the layout of the streets and routes) and the urban grain (ie the location, arrangement and design of the development blocks, plot arrangement and the green infrastructure). The plan provides an approximate location of buildings within the residential zone and how the built form could relate to the streets and the public realm. It shows vehicular access to the site via a realignment of Henthorn Road (details discussed under highway section) with this one primary access point looping around the core of the site. A lower density arrangement of Lanes will extend outwards from the loop to serve the north and northwestern sections of the overall site. The central loop has been designed to provide a strong sense of place with landmark (2.5 storey) buildings located at key junctions and arrival points. The layout of streets throughout would provide a well overlooked network of public spaces. The submitted Design and Access Statement refers to the indicative layout as a distorted grid which will allow for some block and building variation to create visual relief and variety within the street network.

The approach to site layout means that there will be a range of block densities from 30 to 40 dwellings per hectare. The average net density across the site is stated as 32.6 dwellings per hectare.

The scale of the built development would vary around the site. In general the lower density areas of the site's new properties would be two storeys in height (up to 9m maximum height) with some focal buildings of 2.5 storey (up to 10m maximum height) fronting a traditional street layout. The lower density areas would occupy the periphery of the site backing onto the existing residential edge and fronting onto peripheral landscape buffers and public open space. The principle is that both wide and narrow plan forms will be used to give variety to the streetscene. Wide plan dwellings are defined as having a wide frontage onto the street with a shallow depth. These will be between 7-15m in length with a building width (depth) of around 6-10m. Narrow plan dwellings are defined as having a narrow frontage onto streets. They will have a frontage which is between 4-6m in length with a building depth of around 11-15m.

Affordable Housing

In respect of the affordable housing element the overall housing mix will include up to 30% affordable housing which will be accommodated in small clusters and evenly distributed around the development.

The affordable units will comprise the following and be provided on a phased basis in relation to occupancy of the market dwellings on site.

Social rented housing 27 units	(6x2 bedroom dwellings) (6x3 bedroom dwellings) (5x4 bedroom dwellings) (10 bungalows)
Affordable rented housing 27 units	(9x2 bedroom dwellings) (9x3 bedroom dwellings) (9x4 bedroom dwellings)
Shared ownership 27 units	(6x2 bedroom dwellings) (6x3 bedroom dwellings) (5x4 bedroom dwellings) (10 bungalows)

Green Infrastructure/Community Park/Equipped Children's Play Space (7.33 hectare)

The illustrative masterplan shows a strong green framework of structural landscape and habitat areas on approximately 7.33 hectare of the overall site. As originally submitted the draft Legal Agreement made provision for this land to be transferred to Ribble Valley Borough Council with an ongoing maintenance contribution paid. However, this option has now been deleted from the Agreement with all green infrastructure/community parkland and equipped children's play space to be maintained by a management company. The details of this aspect of the proposal are as follows:

Community Park

Given the settlement edge character and existing playing field provision adjacent to the site no formal sports facilities are proposed for the development. Instead a new informal rural edge community park is proposed at the site's western extreme which will incorporate new footway connections to the riverside recreational areas. It would be a parkland with meadow and tree/woodland planting. There would be two water features for ecological enhancement and a balancing pond as part of the sustainable urban drainage proposals for the overall site.

Equipped Children's Play Space

Two local equipped areas of play are proposed offering toddler, child and teenage play provision. One of these is at the point where the community park meets the residential zone of the proposed development with the other to the northern tip of the site where it abuts a kennels and cattery facility and playing fields.

Green Infrastructure and Landscaping

The plans show strengthened landscape planting at the site boundaries and a green corridor running north/south through the central core of the site with ecological enhancement including a reinstated watercourse. There is to be another watercourse running north/south at the western extreme where the site borders a caravan site. In addition to the landscape buffer planting, there are small areas of general landscaped areas within the overall site and street scene that include both planting and balancing pond (4 in total) for the sustainable urban drainage system proposals.

Acoustic Measures

There is a kennels and cattery to the north of one of the proposed play areas and in order to mitigate any noise an acoustic fence is shown on the illustrative masterplan. At this outline stage, no precise details of this have been submitted.

Highways

Vehicular

It is proposed that vehicular access to the site is via a realignment of Henthorn Road south of the property named White House. The new alignment will provide a route into the application site and is to be designated a priority route. The existing length of Henthorn Road south west of the new site access alignment is to be realigned to form a priority (give way) control 'T' junction with the new site access road alignment. The internal road layout for the outline application is to be the subject of reserved matters application(s).

Pedestrian

Improvements to local pedestrian infrastructure are identified to be implemented with the underlying principle and objective being to achieve improvements to assist pedestrians at crossing desire lines from the site along the walk route of:

- Henthorn Road; and
- Garnett Road/Lancaster Drive (to Edisford Road).

Pedestrian improvement works will comprise:

- Reduce corner radii at junctions to reduce pedestrian crossing width.
- Introduce dropped kerbs on pedestrian desire line, ie shortest walk distance instead of expecting pedestrians to walk longer distance around corners, diverting from the crossing desire line.
- Introduce pedestrian refuges on roundabout arms.

In addition to these measures, further discussions between the applicant's highway consultants and the County Surveyor have led to the addition of funding for the introduction of improvements to assist pedestrian crossing movements as follows:

- Henthorn Road: pedestrian crossing assistance near the park entrance (zebra crossing) complimented by cycle signage. The precise location and details will be confirmed by LCC at the time when this is to be introduced.
- Whalley Road: existing pedestrian crossing just south of Greenacre Street to be upgraded to a Toucan crossing (ie pedestrians and cyclists).

The requirement of the developer in respect of these would be fully discharged by the entering into the appropriate legal agreement to make the required funding available. The responsibility for introducing the measures would rest with LCC.

Bus Service Provision

It is proposed that, as part of the proposed residential development, a new bus stop is introduced within the site, the detailed location to be agreed as part of the reserved matters application for the internal site road layout.

The applicants have undertaken investigations and made enquiries of various parties in respect of bus service provision. This included formal approaches to three bus companies with all three expressing interest in operating a replacement/extended C1 service. On the basis of this, the applicants undertake to make the following commitments:

- To fully fund for five years of operation a bus service based on the current C1 service, extended to serve the development with access via Henthorn Road.
- The details of the routing of the bus service will be determined by LCC, with the provisos that the service route must include the development's bus stop on every scheduled run, and that the route must operate between the site and Clitheroe town centre including a stop at the rail station.
- The bus service will operate through the day and in the evenings on Monday to Saturday and additionally a Sunday service at reduced frequency.
- The bus service must be operating prior to occupation of the 51st dwelling.
- 100% of the fare box revenues from the bus service funded by the developer are to be placed in a fund to be ring-fenced and retained solely for the purpose of providing further funding for the bus service to continue to operate when the five years funding provided by the developer ends. For the avoidance of doubt the developer commits to retaining none of the fare box revenue.
- A bus stop is to be provided on the development's internal road network prior to the occupation of the 51st dwelling. This is to be to the LCC bus stop quality standard, and the location is to be agreed with LCC.
- The carriageway width of the internal road layout, that remains to be approved as reserved matters, must be adequate to accommodate the bus service along the length of development road that it is to be routed.
- In the interim period between the occupation of the first dwelling and until the occupation of the 51st dwelling, a temporary additional bus stop, of a flag and pole type, is to be introduced on Henthorn Road near the development site access, the detailed location to be as required by LCC.

The applicant's traffic consultant concludes that the developer bus service is 100% guaranteed into the future for in excess of five years, for at least 7 or 8 years or perhaps even more.

Pedestrian/Cycle Link to Caravan Road

As stated the scheme provides cycleways and pedestrian links to the Ribble Way long distance footpath. Negotiations between the applicant's Highway Engineer and the County Surveyor have led to the submission of a detailed plan to indicate a 3m wide pedestrian/cycle link between the site and Caravan Road. Thence pedestrians and cyclists can traverse the tarmac surface of the Caravan Road to make their way to/from Edisford Road and various amenities.

Cycle Parking

Following negotiations, it is proposed to introduce cycle parking at the following locations:

- Development play area - parking stand to accommodate 4 cycles (developer to provide).
- Clitheroe town centre - parking stand to accommodate 4 cycles, location to be determined by LCC (developer responsibility fully discharged by entering into the appropriate legal agreement to make the required funding available). The responsibility for introducing the cycle parking resting with LCC.

Henthorn Road Traffic Management and Road Marking Scheme

The applicant will provide funding for a 20mph sign only scheme with complimentary road markings on Henthorn Road. A zebra crossing (referred to under 'pedestrian' sub heading) forms part of the Henthorn Road Traffic Management and road marking scheme. This has been secured through negotiations with the County Surveyor.

Woone Lane Traffic Management

As a result of extensive discussions between the applicant's traffic consultant and the County Surveyor it is proposed to introduce traffic management measures on Woone Lane.

The preferred option would be to introduce one-way operation on Woone Lane in an easterly direction from Eshton Terrace towards Moor Lane. Should planning consent be forthcoming LCC would pursue this, including consultations, Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process and if the TRO is successful then implementation of the scheme. The funding for this would be secured fully from the applicant.

However, if the TRO process is not successful LCC will implement an alternative scheme which does not require any TRO and can be implemented within the powers of the highway authority. This scheme includes priority working on Woone Lane with the formation of kerbed build outs and raised tables. A 3.1m carriageway width will be formed along the length of Woone Lane with protected parking bays created.

Doctor's Surgery

The scheme has been amended since first submission to incorporate a doctor's surgery (PCT facility). This would be positioned within the central core of the development site as outlined on the illustrative masterplan and be a single storey building with pitched roof and approximately 125m² gross floor area. The draft Legal Agreement outlines that land for this facility would be reserved for a period of three years with a sum of £156,250 as a contribution towards the costs of constructing the PCT facility.

Phasing

It is proposed that the scheme be developed in three phases with an indicative plan submitted that roughly splits the site down as follows:

Phase 1 – 100 dwellings.

Phase 2 – 70 dwellings.

Phase 3 – 100 dwellings.

The provision of affordable housing would be incorporated into each phase with not more than 50% of the market dwellings of any phase being occupied until the affordable element for that phase has been completed ready for occupation (see separate section on Legal Agreement content under the issues section).

The provision of open space (formal laid out and informal incidental) will also be subject to phasing and this would be specified in a Legal Agreement.

The delivery of the community woodland would also be phased in accordance with details to be set out in a Legal Agreement.

Site Location

The site is located to the northwest of Henthorn Road. Rear gardens of properties fronting Fairfield Drive abut its north-eastern extreme; directly to the north are a kennels and cattery and playing fields; to the west Clitheroe Caravan and Camping Club and the Ribble Way long distance footpath alongside the river and to the south by Siddows Hall and agricultural land. The eastern boundary of the site to Henthorn Road dog-legs around the rear of Henthorn Farmhouse (a Grade II listed building), the White House and other properties fronting Henthorn Road.

The site is approximately 15.7 hectare in size, is greenfield and in agricultural use. It lies outside the settlement limit within land designated Open Countryside with the settlement boundary immediately abutting the rear garden boundaries of properties fronting Fairfield Drive ie the north eastern boundary of the site.

The site is roughly 'L' shaped in appearance. Its topography varies throughout with land rising away from Henthorn Road with the western field descending towards the river.

Relevant History

None.

Relevant Policies

Policy G1 - Development Control.

Policy G5 - Settlement Strategy.

Policy G11 - Crime Prevention.

Policy ENV3 - Development in Open Countryside.

Policy ENV6 - Development Involving Agricultural Land.

Policy ENV7 - Species Protection.

Policy ENV9 - Important Wildlife Site

Policy ENV10 - Development Affecting Nature Conservation.
 Policy ENV13 - Landscape Protection.
 Policy ENV14 - Ancient Monuments and Other Important Archaeological Remains.
 Policy ENV19 - Listed Buildings.
 Policy H2 - Dwellings in the Open Countryside.
 Policy H20 - Affordable Housing - Villages and Countryside.
 Policy H21 - Affordable Housing - Information Needed.
 Policy RT8 - Open Space Provision.
 Policy RT18 - Footpaths and Bridleways - Improvements.
 Policy RT19 - Development Which Prejudices Footpaths.
 Policy T1 - Development Proposals - Transport Implications.
 Policy T7 - Parking Provision.
 Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding.
 Policy DP1 – Spatial Principles – North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021.
 Policy DP2 – Promote Sustainable Communities - North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021.
 Policy DP7 – Promote Environmental Quality - North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021.
 Policy L1 – Health, Sport, Recreation, Cultural and Education Services Provision - North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021.
 Policy L4 – Regional Housing Provision - North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021.
 Policy L5 – Affordable Housing - North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021.
 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development.
 PPS3 – Housing.
 PPS5 – Planning for the Historic Environment.
 PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.
 PPS9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.
 PPG13 – Transport.
 PPG17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation.
 PPS22 – Renewable Energy.
 PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk.

Environmental, AONB, Human Rights and Other Issues

The matters for consideration in the determination of this application are the principle of development, highway safety, infrastructure provision, ecological considerations, visual and residential amenity. For ease of reference these are broken down into the following sub-headings for discussion:

Establishing Whether the Principle of Residential Development is Acceptable on this Site/Prematurity/Applicability of RSS Housing Figures

The policy basis against which this scheme should be appraised is set out in the context of national, regional and local development plan policies. The site lies to the west of Clitheroe and is outside the existing defined settlement boundary as shown in the Districtwide Local Plan. The proposal represents a relatively significant amount of new development and the preference of the Council's Head of Regeneration and Housing would always be for schemes of this nature to be addressed through the current LDF process. The Council is at present seeking to progress its Core Strategy that will establish patterns of growth and locations where developments should be directed. It is anticipated that a preferred strategy will be published in

Autumn 2011 following the consultation undertaken. It is recognised however that the Council has to determine this application, taking account of existing policy provisions and that prematurity measured against the emerging LDF is not a reason in itself to refuse the application.

The current development plan comprises both the saved policies of the Districtwide Local Plan and the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Whilst Government has stated its intention to abolish the RSS, formal revocation has not yet occurred, regard must therefore be given to the RSS policies as part of the assessment process. The Council has determined in June 2010 to continue to use RSS housing requirements for both determining planning applications and progressing the Core Strategy. As Members are aware work is being undertaken on a review of housing requirements but at present there is no alternative, evidenced and tested requirement, consequently the RSS position prevails.

It is important to bear in mind however that the Adopted Saved Local Plan was prepared in the 1990's against previous Lancashire Structure Plan policies that have been superseded by Policies of the RSS. RSS policies promote different levels of growth and planned for a period beyond that of the 2006 end date for the current Local Plan. Whilst policies have been saved, there have been no revisions of the old policies to reflect new growth and the need as a result to review settlement boundaries.

In relation to the current proposal, it should be judged in the first instance against requirements of Planning Policy Statement 3 – 'Housing'. It is also important to note that the provisions within PPS3 explicitly provide for its policies to supersede existing development plan provisions. The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply as it is required to do therefore the tests of paragraph 69 must be applied. The main element of principle therefore becomes one of whether the site is a suitable site for residential development. PPS3 creates a presumption in favour of residential development where the tests set out in the Statement are met.

The site would be an extension to the existing settlement – Clitheroe is the main settlement in the borough in the location where growth would be expected to be directed and that would ultimately require the change to the existing settlement boundary.

Whilst there are issues of infrastructure delivery to consider as in any such large scheme from such viewpoints as highway, education, health provisions and wider impact on the town centre, overall the Council's Head of Regeneration and Housing views the site as acceptable as a land use principle. He supports the proposal's inclusion of open space and recreational enhancement of the riverside and would want to ensure that infrastructure matters generated by the scheme were capable of being delivered in a timely manner. He has also commented that in his opinion it is a pre-requisite to any approval to have a robust mechanism incorporated into any approval to ensure any infrastructure delivery is both programmed and capable of being brought forward at the appropriate time. These matters are discussed elsewhere within this report.

Affordable Housing

In considering the affordable housing element of the proposal, it is important to have regard to Policies H20 and H21 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and the Council's Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding (AHMU). Policy H20 of the Plan identifies that on sites outside defined settlement limits, schemes should provide for 100% affordable needs. However, having regard to material considerations, namely PPS3 as outlined above, I am of the

opinion that as the scheme immediately abuts the saved settlement limit of Clitheroe a more relaxed approach is in order and that it is the requirements of the AHMU and Policy H21 that the affordable elements of the scheme should be assessed against.

In terms of assessing the development under the requirements of the AHMU a scheme outside defined settlement limits for three or more dwellings (or sites of 0.1 hectare or more) should provide 30% of the site for affordable provision. Policy H21 sets out the information to be submitted in support of affordable schemes in terms of who the accommodation is intended to be provided for and details of the methods by which the accommodation will be sold, let, managed and retained a suitable for its original purpose.

The scheme is made in outline for a maximum of 270 units. A draft Legal Agreement was submitted with the application and has been the subject of negotiations with the Council's Housing Strategy Officer in order to ensure that the scheme matches identified needs. Given the scheme is within the Clitheroe area, the approach taken is that development in this key service centre should meet housing needs expressed throughout the borough and not just those specific to the parish as is the case in the villages. The negotiations have secured revisions to the originally submitted agreement with the Legal Agreement content sub-heading later within this report providing specific details of the clauses covering the affordable elements. Given the overall scale of this development at 270 dwellings, it is likely that it will be sometime before the whole development is complete if undertaken by a single house builder. Indeed it has become apparent through discussions whilst progressing this application, that it is envisaged the scheme would be developed in three phases. Due to the amount of time it may take to bring the entire scheme forward, a wording is to be incorporated into the Legal Agreement that would mean the split of dwellings referred to earlier, that reflects current housing needs, is not specifically fixed but could, if agreed in writing, be revised subject to the proviso that it still consists of not less than 30% of the residential units. Details of the 'affordable housing scheme' would be required for further submission in terms of number, type, mix, tenure and location prior to occupation of the first market dwelling. Such an approach recognises that housing needs may change over the period of time that would be involved in the implementation of such a major scheme. This approach and the content of the draft Legal Agreement have been discussed by the Strategic Housing Working Group. Originally the Group had asked that the affordable units be delivered in advance of the market units on site. However, following the submission of an independent report focussing on the merit and feasibility of this option the Group have accepted the contents of the report which clearly demonstrate that such an approach would be unviable. The general phasing agreements as outlined are acceptable with a request that as part of the details of the 'affordable housing scheme' certainty is given as to which registered provider is to be used with copies of any agreements with registered providers provided to the Council.

Highway Safety

As Members will note from the description of the various aspects of the scheme, matters surrounding highway safety have been the subject of extensive discussions between the County Surveyor and the applicant's highway consultants in order to address concerns over pedestrian and vehicular movements. The revisions to the scheme as outlined earlier within this report are considered by the County Surveyor to satisfactorily address those concerns in relation to the bus service provision, pedestrian and cycle assistance, pedestrian crossings, pedestrian/cycle link to the caravan and camping access road, cycle parking and traffic impact on both Henthorn Road and Woone Lane. In reaching this conclusion he was made aware of the comprehensive highways objection received to the development by another highways consultant (Dennis

Wilson) but is satisfied that the approach and methodology adopted in assessing this scheme is reasonable in nature and robust in detail.

It is evident from the detailed observations submitted in response to the application and its amendments, that any concerns over highway safety matters that the County Surveyor may have originally expressed have now been addressed in an appropriate manner by the applicants. Members will note that reference is made under the proposals section of this report to the potential for one-way operation on Woone Lane but that the response from the County Surveyor focuses on the scheme for priority working arrangements along Woone Lane. The reason for this is that there is no certainty that a TRO can be secured for the one-way operation - it is subject to a process outside of the remit of planning. That process is subject to public consultation with no guarantee of the outcome. Thus the County Surveyor was focussed on securing a highway scheme that can be carried out without such consultation and can be appropriately conditioned under the scope of this planning application. Therefore, for clarity, when considering the highway safety implications of this development it is the scheme for the priority working, formation of kerbed build outs and protected parking that the County Surveyor has deemed acceptable in highway safety terms. Should Committee be minded to approve the application there is a suggested condition that requires submission of off-site highway works and in the event that a TRO was successful then either details of that or the priority arrangements outlined could be submitted to comply with the requirements of that condition.

Thus, on the basis of the detailed observations of the County Surveyor, it is concluded that the scheme in its revised form with the additional off site highway works would not prove significantly detrimental to highway safety.

Further details in relation to the additional survey relating to the impact on the Henthorn Road railway crossing will be reported verbally.

Play/Open Space/Community Woodland/Parkland

Policy RT8 of the Districtwide Local Plan requires residential sites over 1 hectare to provide adequate and useable public open space. The supporting text notes that community open space within new residential areas provides a useful informal recreational facility for residents of the neighbourhood and a particular requirement will be the provision of children's play areas.

The illustrative masterplan provides for both formal and informal areas of play/open space via the two designated play areas, green corridor and informal landscaped verges throughout the site and proposed parkland area. As stated previously, the submitted draft Legal Agreement originally had clauses to allow for the transference of the aforementioned areas to the Council with maintenance/management contributions. This was discussed with the Director of Community Services and the clauses were subsequently removed from the agreement. Thus responsibility for the management/maintenance of these areas will not sit with the Local Authority but suitable conditions can be imposed on any consent granted to ensure that the formal play areas are equipped in an appropriate manner with an appropriate maintenance regime.

It would be important to ensure that should consent be forthcoming the delivery of these areas was phased with the development of the overall site and this is a consideration for inclusion in any Legal Agreement. Indeed the applicants have suggested appropriate phasing and this is discussed later within this report under the Legal Agreement heading.

Whilst Policy RT8 does not set specific quotas for establishing the level of provision, I am satisfied that the details submitted would accord with the requirement for adequate and useable space.

In terms of the community parkland area, this is an informal area of open space and would again be phased with the delivery of housing on site. The Legal Agreement will have triggers at which point temporary footpaths, layout specification, landscaping and management plans will need to be submitted/provided with the park being laid out prior to occupation of the 151st residential unit. A new area of woodland planting is welcomed as part of this overall development.

Education

This is a subject raised by objectors to the development. As Members will see from the consultation response from the Planning Contributions Team at Lancashire County Council a sum of £307,837 is sought towards primary provision. They have commented that if this contribution were not secured they would be unable to guarantee that children in this area will be able to secure a school place within reasonable distance of their home. The applicant is aware of the contribution and has included provision for this within the draft Legal Agreement – the wording is specified later in this report and has been the subject of discussions with officers at LCC. In their opinion a financial contribution is the appropriate way forward to provide enhanced primary provision and Members should be satisfied that due consideration has been given to this matter in reaching that conclusion. Thus notwithstanding the concerns expressed regarding education provision an appropriate mechanism can be inserted into any Legal Agreement to ensure a financial contribution.

Flooding/Drainage/Water Supply

There have been objections on the grounds that there will be a flood risk from developing close to the river and questions raised over the utilities appraisal report in terms of capacity issues.

The application has been submitted with a flood risk assessment. The main area of the site where the development is proposed lies within flood zone 1 which is defined as having a low probability of flooding and the Environment Agency are satisfied with the details submitted. They have requested a condition to require the submission of a scheme for surface water drainage and attenuation for the site which is standard practice. Comments have also been made regarding land contamination with a request for a condition to specify that a desk top study to identify all previous site uses and potential contaminants prior to commencement of development be imposed should consent be forthcoming.

United Utilities were consulted on the application and as Members can see from their response, no objections are raised to the development.

Members will note that under the additional representation section of this report, objections have been raised to the planned destruction and artificial channelling of culverts and construction of a new culvert. The Environment Agency have commented in their response to the scheme that they support the proposals for de-culverting the watercourse that runs across the site. They have also commented that due to the overall size of the site and location in relation to the River Ribble, prior to commencement of development, they would visit the site and carry out pollution prevention advice with the developer/contractor.

Nature Conservation – Protected Species/Landscape/Trees

This is a greenfield site and there are trees and hedgerows that align the site's established field boundaries. As part of the application an arboricultural report has been submitted which was carried out to help inform initial design and sign layout considerations. The survey focuses on the major trees within the site and those adjacent to it which may be directly affected by the proposed development. A total of 25 individual trees and 3 groups of trees were surveyed as part of the assessment including several specimens located directly adjacent to the site boundary yet outside the ownership of the site. Trees present across the site are predominantly Common Ash with a small number of other species represented including Sycamore, Common Alder and English Oak. One specimen was assessed as needing to be removed and this is outside the site boundary within the grounds of the adjacent caravan park. The remaining trees in the main were classed as either low quality or moderate quality with two trees and one group of trees considered of high quality.

Construction of the development as per the illustrative masterplan would not result in the direct loss of trees. The layout for the residential parcels has been designed around the natural features of the site thereby maintaining the key hedgerows and trees contained within them.

The application is also accompanied by an ecological report with the findings of this assessed by not only the Council's Countryside Officer but an ecologist from LCC and the Environment Agency. Comments received confirm that the development has been designed to retain features of biodiversity value (trees, grassland, hedgerows) and that there is sufficient space within the proposed development to deliver effective mitigation/compensation for impacts on biodiversity. The River Ribble is designated as a County Biological Heritage Site and although the proposed housing development will not impact directly upon it (the community parkland being closest to it) it will be important that it is adequately protected during construction. In respect of protected species statutory consultees confirmed that significant impacts seem reasonably unlikely. According to the assessment, ponds in and adjacent to the application site are not suitable to support Great Crested Newts, surveys did not find evidence of roosting bats and it is recommended that should consent be forthcoming, conditions are imposed requiring repeat surveys or compensatory/mitigation measures. Subject to these safeguards it is considered that there is no justifiable reason to withhold consent on ecological grounds.

Noise

Reference has been made by objectors to potential noise issues associated with the play area that is adjacent to an existing kennels/cattery facility to the north of the site. In particular concern is expressed about noise from a kick about area and the relationship with the aforementioned commercial property. This relationship has been discussed with the Head of Environmental Health Services and whilst he has expressed some concern it is considered that the impact can be mitigated by the combination of the acoustic fence as shown on the illustrative masterplan and careful siting and choice of play equipment on this area. The draft Legal Agreement has clauses to ensure submission of details of on the on-site play areas and it can be ensured that no noise generating play equipment be permitted eg metal play walls in the area immediately adjacent to the kennels/cattery to the north and residential properties to the north east.

Layout/Scale/Visual Amenity

As stated previously, this is an outline application with the only detailed matter being applied for

at this time being the means of access. However there is a requirement for submissions to provide a basic level of information in respect of use, amount of development, indicative layout and scale parameters in order for a Local Planning Authority to make detailed consideration on the use and amount of development proposed.

An illustrative masterplan has been submitted to show how the scheme would fit into the immediate surroundings with built development along its north eastern boundary, a caravan site and river to its west and playing fields to it north. In visual terms, I am of the opinion that, notwithstanding comments received about the need to retain the open spaces between the present town and river, no significant detriment would be caused were the development to be approved. Reference has been made to urban sprawl and this scheme would extend the development edge of the town by approximately 250m beyond that of Fairfield Drive and 350m at the point that the residential development would join the caravan site. Clitheroe has grown incrementally over the years and I do not consider that the level of growth proposed here would be disproportionate in visual terms. The roughly 'L' shaped appearance of the site means that the housing is limited to a band that runs roughly parallel to the existing settlement limit following established field boundaries with the dog leg being part of the site that extends westwards towards the river. It is the latter that is to form the community park, thereby maintaining an open setting between the town's development edge and the riverside. The site rises and the parkland is on the ridgeline as viewed from Henthorn Road and such a use would not I consider significantly compromise the visual amenities of the area.

In respect of scale parameters the height limits of 9m and 10m would not I consider appear over-dominant. Committee should remember these are an indication of the upper height limits for 2 and 2.5m storey properties and further information will then be submitted at reserved matters stage to provide precise details of each unit in terms of scale and appearance. The site would be predominantly two storey in nature with the 2.5 storey units detailed at key junctions within the site (21 in total).

Objectors have commented that the plans show a footpath to the football pitches and track to the caravan site and question how soon it is before a road is built there instead. For Committee's information the footway link between the northern most play area and adjacent football pitches has been deleted from the scheme following discussions with the Director of Community Services. As for the footway link to the track leading to the caravan site, this has been the subject of negotiation with the County Surveyor in order to increase the accessibility of the site with plans to make this a cycleway. Committee should consider the scheme before them in its own merits and not speculate as to what may or may not come forward at a future date.

Comments have been made that building 270 houses on this site is excessive but PPS3 remarks that using land efficiently is a key consideration in planning for housing. Should 270 units be developed on this land that would represent a density of 32.6 dwellings per hectare and I do not consider that this would be out of keeping with the character of the immediately surrounding areas.

Residential Amenity

In considering residential amenity it is important to assess the relationship with properties outside of the site as well as that between units proposed as part of this scheme. To the east are properties that front Fairfield Drive and Fairfield Close with properties fronting Henthorn Road to the south east boundary.

Properties on Fairfield Drive would back onto the development with the illustrative masterplan denoting the rear elevation of properties facing onto these units at a distance of approximately 10m from the rear garden boundary. Given that the Fairfield Drive properties are set between 15m and 30m away from the site boundary I consider the relationship between built forms would be acceptable. The two end of cul-de-sac properties on Fairfield Close have their gables to this site boundary and whilst distance between properties here would be reduced this is still considered an appropriate relationship. Having regard to the properties that front Henthorn Road, again I consider the relationship shown on the illustrative master plan to be acceptable.

In terms of the actual scale of development on the areas of the site that abut existing residential areas, these dwellings would be two storey in nature at a maximum height of 9m. Notwithstanding concerns expressed about daylight, sunlight and privacy, I do not consider this would prove significantly detrimental to the residential amenities of properties bordering the site.

In respect of the internal relationship of the development site, the illustrative layout shows properties facing onto internal access roads or landscaped areas. From the submitted plan it would appear that the separation distance between facing blocks of development may be less than the 21m advocated in the Council's SPG on extensions and alterations to dwellings (distances of approximately 15m to 20m). However, it is important to remember that this is a new development and that potential purchasers will be fully aware of the relationship between various residential blocks prior to buying a certain property. It is also important to remember that this is an outline scheme with matters of layout reserved for future submission. Whilst details submitted set the broad parameters of development there would be scope for a minor repositioning of the blocks to achieve a greater separation distance.

Renewable Energy

Whilst this is an application made in outline, it is important to set out at this stage that the Local Planning Authority will be seeking a commitment towards renewable energy in line with Central Government guidance offered in PPS1 and PPS22. Indeed the applicants have submitted a Renewable Energy and Sustainable Resources Strategy and Building for Life Evaluation in response to the Council's requirement of a minimum of 10% of the energy requirements generated by the development to be achieved by renewable energy production methods. It is very difficult to demonstrate definitive compliance against such policy objectives at outline stage as meeting the standards concerned is inherently bound up with detailed design specification issues. Thus an appropriately worded condition should be imposed on any consent granted to require further submission of such details.

Doctor's Surgery (PCT Facility)

This was not included in the original submission but the applicant chose to engage in dialogue with the Primary Care Trust to assess the likely impact of this development on health services in the locality. It was following these discussions that the illustrative masterplan was revised to indicate a proposed PCT facility. It is not the intention that the applicant would built this facility (see Legal Agreement sub-heading within this report) and the offer made as part of this submission has been discussed with the PCT. They requested some revisions to the drafting of the Legal Agreement which have been secured.

Miscellaneous

There are a number of points raised by objectors that do not sit easily within the headings given to consider the main issues associated with this scheme. Some of the points raised are matters of opinion eg the consultation process for the public exhibition prior to submission of the application and that it is a money making opportunity for the people who have no regard for the area which are not matters for the Local Planning Authority to pass comment on. However, I shall attempt to address the other issues raised.

Objectors have questioned the need to develop the site for housing given the number of dwellings for sale in the area but the Council are required to have a five-year land supply. Thus new land for development within the borough needs to be sought out and permission granted should the scheme comply with plan policies that are in place at the time of determination.

In respect of the suitability of other sites for housing, Committee needs to treat each application on its own merits. It may be that the sites objectors consider to be more suitable may not be held to comply with policy.

The issue of loss of view has been raised but as Members are aware this is not a material planning consideration. As stated earlier the site lies within land designated open countryside and not green belt as some objectors believe. In respect of Radon gas, I have spoken to the Council's Head of Environmental Health who has raised no concerns on those grounds. He has considered potential air quality issues from both the construction of the houses and associated traffic and concludes that any impact would be small and thus does not raise any objections.

I am mindful that Henthorn farmhouse is a Grade II listed building and that regard should be had to paragraph 66(i) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy HE10 of PPS5. I am of the opinion that there would not be any significant harm to the setting of that building were this development to proceed.

Reference has been made to an application 1979 to develop land on the southern side of Henthorn Road for residential development which was refused on grounds of highways ie a single access/exit and that the scheme would constitute an undesirable extension of the built up area. There have been a number of development plans in place covering Clitheroe in that time and planning policies at both a local and national level have evolved over the intervening years. Whilst the site is outside the settlement boundary and would lead to an extension of the built up area, the planning policy and visual amenity issues associated with this have already been discussed. It is also evident that extensive negotiations have been ongoing to explore highway issues and that under current guidance the scheme is deemed to be acceptable.

Legal Agreement Content

The application has been submitted with a draft Legal Agreement to cover matters of affordable housing, open space, on-site play equipment, PCT facility, public transport improvements and education contribution. This report has outlined in detail these aspects and taken account of comments from respective consultees/officers of this Council who are responsible for those matters. To clarify for Members, the Legal Agreement will stipulate the following:

1. *Affordable Housing*
 - The total number of affordable units shall consist of not less than 30% of the residential units on site.

- 27 of the units shall be social rented housing (which shall be made up of 6x2 bedroom dwellings, 6x3 bedroom dwellings, 5x4 bedroom dwellings and 10 bungalows).
- 27 of the units shall be shared ownership (which shall be made up of 6x2 bedroom dwellings, 6x3 bedroom dwellings, 5x4 bedroom dwellings and 10 bungalows) to be occupied in accordance with the order of priority set out in the shared ownership occupancy criteria.
- 27 of the units shall be affordable rented housing (which shall be made up of 9 x 2 bedroom dwellings, 9 x 3 bedroom dwellings and 9 x 4 bedroom dwellings) to be allocated in accordance with the Council's prevailing allocations policy.
- Delivery of the affordable units to be phased with the provision of market units to ensure that not more than 50% of the market dwellings of any phase of development shall be occupied until the affordable units located at that phase of development have been completed ready for occupation and transferred to a social landlord.
- In terms of eligibility for the properties, this shall relate to a boroughwide connection.
- The specifics of the affordable housing scheme in terms of precise numbers, type, mix, tenure and location of the affordable units, in line with the general considerations outlined above, to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first market dwelling being occupied.

2. *Open Space*

This is defined in the draft Legal Agreement as structural landscaping and general amenity areas with the following clauses inserted:

- Not to commence development until the details and proposed location of the open space has been submitted to and approved by the Council in writing.
- Not more than 50% of the market dwellings on any phase of development shall be occupied until the open space in relation to that phase of development has been laid out and made available for use.
- The open space shall thereafter be maintained by the owner to the reasonable satisfaction of the Council until a scheme for the long term maintenance of the open space has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council and the approved scheme has been implemented to the satisfaction of the Council.

3. *On-site Play Areas*

- Not to commence development until details and the proposed location of the on-site play areas have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.
- Not more than 50% of the market dwellings on any phase of the development shall be occupied until the on-site play area in relation to that phase of development has been provided to the satisfaction of the Council in accordance with the approved details.

- Following provision of the on-site play areas the owner shall at its own cost maintain the same to the satisfaction of the Council until a scheme for securing the long-term repair, maintenance and renewal of the on-site play areas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council and the approved scheme has been implemented to the satisfaction of the Council.

4. *Community Park*

- Upon completion of the 25th residential unit to lay out a temporary footpath in accordance with details to be approved in writing by the Council to link the first phase of development to public footpath number 17 within the community park.
- Prior to the first occupation of the 101st residential unit to submit for the approval of the Council details of the proposed layout specification and landscaping of the community park together with details of a scheme for the long-term maintenance and management of the community park.
- Prior to the first occupation of the 151st residential unit to lay out the community park in accordance with the details approved.
- To maintain the community park to the satisfaction of the Council until a scheme for the long-term maintenance and management of the community park has been approved.

5. *PCT Facility*

This is defined in the draft Legal Agreement as meaning a building having 125m² gross internal floorspace for use for the provision of community health facilities, together with 8 car parking spaces and associated landscaping.

- To reserve the PCT facility area for a period of 3 years and 1 month after the date of commencement of development for use as the PCT facility.
- Upon the date of transfer of the PCT facility area (ie land) to the PCT, the PCT contribution (meaning a sum of £125,000 as a contribution towards the costs of constructing the PCT facility) shall be paid to the Council.

6. *Public Transport Improvements*

- Prior to the first occupation of the 51st residential unit to procure at the cost of the owner with a bus service provider a bus service between the development and Clitheroe town centre which will operate half hourly during the hours 0700 to 0930 and 1630 to 1830 Monday to Friday and hourly at other times Monday to Sunday for a period of 5 years. To have a first departure time from the development of no later than 0730 and a last arrival time of no earlier than 1900 Monday to Saturday (0930 and 1600 on a Sunday).
- In the event that the existing bus service has ceased to operate along Henthorn Road prior to occupation of the first residential unit, the owner shall procure the bus service for a period of 5 years from the date of occupation of the first residential unit.

- All fares generated by the bus service shall be retained by the provider of the bus service to be used towards the ongoing operating costs of the bus service beyond the initial 5 year period.
- Prior to occupation of the 51st residential unit to provide within the development a bus stop to the Lancashire County Council bus stop quality standard at such location and in accordance with such details as have been approved in writing by the County Council.
- Prior to occupation of the first residential unit to pay the bus stop contribution to the County Council.

7. *Education Contribution*

This is defined as £307,837 increased by the indexation factor as a contribution towards the costs of primary school provision to serve the development with the following clauses inserted into the agreement:

- Not to occupy nor permit the occupation of the 101st residential unit until 34% of education contribution has been paid to the County Council.
- Not to occupy nor permit the occupation of the 176th residential unit until a further 33% of the education contribution has been paid to the County Council.
- Not to occupy nor permit the occupation of the 251st residential unit until the balance of the education contribution has been paid to the County Council.

Members will note that it is not proposed to request the sum LCC requested in respect of waste management ie £129,600. The contribution sought by LCC is in accordance with their policy paper on 'Planning Obligations in Lancashire' which has not been formally adopted by this Council. A report presented to Planning and Development Committee on 18 December 2008 identified priorities for this Council when seeking contributions – namely affordable housing, transport safety, open space and education. However, given the scale of development Members may wish to include waste management in the contribution sought under the Legal Agreement. Members will also see that the request for £418,500 for the provision of additional highway safety measures is not being requested. As committee will see from the content of this report, there are numerous highway improvements being provided as part of this development and it is the view of the County Surveyor that because of this he would not be seeking the financial contribution indicated by the Planning Contributions Team at LCC.

8. *Other*

The developer is to find the administration and delivery cost totalling £29,160 in providing the appropriate number of wheeled bins.

There will also be the need for the applicant to enter into a separate Legal Agreement (S278) with LCC to secure some of the highway works as referred to in the consultation response from the County Surveyor.

Therefore, having carefully considered all the above, I am of the opinion that the scheme accords with plan policy and thus recommend accordingly.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has no significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity, nor would it have an adverse visual impact or be to the detriment of highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION: That the application be deferred and delegated to the Director of Community Services for approval following the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement as outlined in paragraphs numbered 1-7 under the Legal Agreement sub heading within this report and subject to the following objections:

1. Application for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than the expiration of 5 years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than whichever is the latter of the following dates:
 - (a) the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission; or
 - (b) the expiration of 2 years from final approval of the reserved matters, or in the case of approval of different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority shall be satisfied as to the details and because the application was made for outline permission and comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

2. Detailed plans indicating the design and external appearance of the buildings, landscape and boundary treatment, parking and manoeuvring arrangements of vehicles, including a contoured site plan showing existing features, the proposed slab floor level and road level (called the reserved matters) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.

REASON: To comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and in order that the Local Planning Authority should be satisfied as to the details and because the application was made for outline permission.

3. This outline planning permission shall be read in conjunction with the Legal Agreement dated ...

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as the application is subject of an agreement.

4. Prior to commencement of development a scheme identifying how a minimum of 10% of the energy requirements generated by the development will be achieved by renewable energy production methods, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development and thereafter retained.

REASON: In order to encourage renewable energy and to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

5. Development shall not begin until a scheme for surface water drainage and attenuation for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details of the maintenance and management of the scheme after completion shall be included. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan in order to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, to improve habitat and amenity and to ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

6. Development shall not begin until details of any works that will alter the existing ponds on site or details of any new ponds adjacent to them have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before development is completed.

REASON: In accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan to protect, restore and enhance the existing and/or proposed ponds within the site.

7. No development approved by this planning permission shall be commenced until:
- a) A desktop study has been undertaken to identify all previous site uses, potential contaminants that might reasonably be expected given those uses and other relevant information. Using this information and diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors has been produced.
 - b) A site investigation has been designed for the site using the information obtained from (a) above. This should be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on the site.
 - c) The site investigation and associated risk assessment have been undertaken in accordance with details approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - d) A Method Statement and Remediation Strategy, based on the information obtained from c) above has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved. Work shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the approved Method Statement and Remediation Strategy referred to in d) above, and to a timescale agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority: unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

If during development, contamination not previously identified, is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an addendum to the Method

Statement. This addendum to the Method Statement must detail how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

Upon completion of the remediation detailed in the Method Statement a report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority that provides verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement(s). Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the report to demonstrate that the required remediation has been fully met. Future monitoring proposals and reporting shall also be detailed in the report.

REASON: In accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan to:

- a) identify all previous site uses, potential contaminants that might reasonably be expected to given those uses and the source of contamination, pathways and receptors.
 - b) enable:
 - a risk assessment to be undertaken;
 - Refinement of the conceptual model; and
 - the development of a Method Statement and Remediation Strategy.
 - c) & d) ensure that the proposed site investigation and remediation strategy will not cause pollution of ground and surface waters both on and off site.
8. Any application for the approval of reserved matters shall include specific details of the provision of a suitable noise barrier along the northern and eastern boundaries of the play area situated in the northeastern corner of the site adjacent to an existing kennels/cattery. The measures so submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall then be fully implemented to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained in perpetuity.

REASON: In accordance with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan to prevent noise intrusion from normal activities on the adjacent Highways Council Depot and commercial units on The Sidings Business Park.

9. The submission of reserved matters in respect of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping and implementation of development shall be carried out in substantial accordance with the Design and Access Statement and illustrative masterplan 4370-P-02rev1 as amended dated 13 April 2011.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt to define the scope of this permission.

10. The new estate road/access between the site and Henthorn Road shall be constructed in accordance with the Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level before any development takes place within the site.

REASON: To comply with Policies G1 and T1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and to ensure that satisfactory access is provided to the site before the development hereby permitted becomes operative.

11. Prior to commencement of construction works, facilities shall be provided within the site by which means the wheels of vehicles may be cleaned before leaving the site, the wheel cleaning facilities shall be retained throughout the life of the development.

REASON: To comply with Policy G1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and to avoid the possibility of the public highway being affected by the deposit of mud and/or loose materials thus creating a potential hazard to road users.

12. No part of the development, hereby approved, shall commence until a scheme for the construction of the site access, a bollard or similar barrier arrangement on the pedestrian/cycle link at its junction with the caravan track and the off-site works of highway improvements has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

REASON: To comply with Policies G1 and T1 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan and in order to satisfy the Local Planning Authority and the Highway Authority that the final details of the highway scheme/works are acceptable before work commences on site.

13. No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure and safeguard the recording of any archaeological deposits in accordance with Policies G1 and ENV14 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

14. Prior to any works taking place in proximity to habitat suitable for use by otters (*Lutra lutra*), a survey for the presence of otters shall be carried out. The survey, together with proposals for mitigation/compensation (if required) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing in consultation with specialist advisors. Any necessary and approved measures for the protection of otters shall thereafter be implemented in full.

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7 and ENV10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

15. No site clearance, site preparation or development work shall take place within 5m of the riverbank top unless a water vole (*Arvicola terrestris*) survey has been carried out in advance. The report of the survey (together with a scheme for mitigation/compensation, if required) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing in consultation with specialist advisors. Any necessary and approved measures for the protection of water voles shall thereafter be implemented in full.

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7 and ENV10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

16. Prior to the commencement of any works to the watercourse there shall be a survey for whiteclawed crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes*). The report of the survey (together with proposals for mitigation/compensation, if required) shall be submitted to the Local

Planning Authority for approval in writing in consultation with specialist advisors. Any necessary and approved measures for the protection of white-clawed crayfish shall thereafter be implemented in full.

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7 and ENV10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

17. Prior to the commencement of works there shall be a repeat survey for the presence of badgers. The report of the survey (together with proposals for mitigation/compensation, if required) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing in consultation with specialist advisors. Any necessary and approved measures for the protection of badgers shall thereafter be implemented in full.

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7 and ENV10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

18. Tree felling, vegetation clearance works, demolition work or other works that may affect nesting birds shall be avoided between March and July inclusive. In the event that works are carried out during the nesting period a comprehensive risk assessment in order to establish the absence/presence of nesting birds shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to any works taking place for approval in writing and any mitigation measures outlined therein shall be carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7 and ENV10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

19. All trees and hedgerows (and the Biological Heritage Site) being retained in or adjacent to the application site shall be protected during construction, in accordance with existing guidelines (e.g. *BS5837: 2005 Trees in relation to construction - Recommendations*).

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7, ENV9, ENV10 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

20. No site clearance, site preparation or development work shall take place until a habitat creation/enhancement and management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with specialist advisors. The approved management plan shall thereafter be implemented in full. The plan shall include (but not be limited to) further details of measures for: the maintenance and enhancement of retained hedgerows, compensation for hedgerow losses; retention and enhancement of species-rich/neutral grassland (and measures for mitigation/compensation, if retention in situ is not possible); enhancement of the stream and associated habitat; native scrub and tree planting; maintenance and enhancement of part of the River Ribble BHS.

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7, ENV9, ENV10 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

21. Himalayan Balsam (*Impatiens glandulifera*) shall be eradicated from the site and working methods shall be adopted to prevent the spread of this species.

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1, ENV7, ENV9, ENV10 and ENV13 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

22. Prior to the commencement of works, details of lighting shall be submitted to and approved by Ribble Valley Borough Council in writing. The lighting scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme. The scheme shall demonstrate avoidance of artificial illumination of important wildlife habitats (the River Ribble and its banks, trees with bat roost potential, hedgerows used by foraging and commuting bats).

REASON: In the interests of protecting nature and conservation issues in accordance with Policies G1 and ENV7 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan.

NOTE(S):

1. This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under the Highways Act 1980 Section 184 the County Council as Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works and therefore before any access works can start you must contact the Environment Directorate for further information by telephoning Area Surveyor East 01254 823831 or writing to the Area Surveyor East, Lancashire County Council, Area Office, Riddings Lane, Whalley, Clitheroe BB7 9RW quoting the planning application number.
2. The grant of planning permission will require the applicant to enter into an appropriate Legal Agreement with the County Council as Highway Authority. The Highway Authority may also wish to implement their right to design all works within the highway related to this proposal. The applicant should be advised to contact the Environment Director at PO Box 9, Guild House, Cross Street, Preston, PR1 8RD in the first instance to ascertain the details of such an agreement and the information to be provided.

