



## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

---

please ask for: SARAH WESTWOOD  
direct line: 01200 414516  
e-mail: sarah.westwood@ribblevalley.gov.uk  
my ref: SW/EL/RV/2012/ENQ/00113  
your ref:  
date: 4 September 2012

Council Offices  
Church Walk  
CLITHEROE  
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111  
Fax: 01200 414487  
[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

Dear Ms Dickman

### LAND AT WADDOW VIEW, CLITHEROE

I write with regard to the above pre-application advice which requests this Council's view on proposals for the use of land as described above for residential development. We met on 31 July and as promised here are our detailed observations on this matter which for ease of reference are broken down into headings.

#### **Principle of Development and Relevant Planning Policy**

To begin, it is important to note that we would encourage a site of this scale to be promoted through the Local Development Framework (LDF), work on which is currently underway. The scheme you are proposing is described in the originally submitted details as a residential development for 325 dwellings on a site of approximately 8.4 hectares. On the originally submitted plan vehicular access was shown onto Waddington Road via Milton Avenue and also access onto Bawdlands via Kirkmoor Road. A subsequent email from you dated 13 August 2012 makes reference to discussions with a landowner to secure direct vehicular access onto Waddington Road, with no through route onto Kirkmoor Road, and from the resubmitted illustrative layout it would appear that the total number of dwellings now proposed on site will increase from the 325 originally suggested by yourself, as indeed will the site area, as an additional development block has been shown in the field adjacent to Waddington Road. However, given you have not confirmed the latter to me all comments are offered on the basis of the information originally submitted unless indicated otherwise.

As you will be aware work has been ongoing to produce a preferred Development Strategy option for the Core Strategy (and subsequently the LDF as a whole) and the Council is now moving towards submission stage. A report was presented to Planning and Development Committee on 16 August that outlined a proposed schedule of changes to the published Regulation 19 document. The report recommended to Members that the changes be formally published for 6 weeks public consultation and that subject to confirmation by full council, and having prepared the necessary submission documents in accordance with the relevant regulations, to submit the Core Strategy as amended to the Secretary of State for formal examination as soon as possible. That document has subsequently been presented to Full Council on 28 August and they have agreed that it be submitted at the same time as going out for consultation on the schedule of changes. On the basis of the current timetable that colleagues in the Regeneration and Housing Team are working to it is envisaged that an Examination could take place in late 2012 and subject to the Inspector's Report adoption of the Core Strategy is anticipated early next year. Given the timetable of events it is acknowledged that the current situation and policies of the adopted saved Districtwide Local Plan must be considered at this stage to assist with this current request for pre-application advice. I would,

from Kirkmoor Road across towards the back of dwellings on Brungerley Avenue and could therefore be argued related to a service centre where the predominance of services and local facilities are to be found.

Para 52 of the NPPF recognises that the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extension to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. As you are aware the Regulation 19 Document referred to above identifies a single Strategic Site for growth in the Borough located at Standen on the edge of Clitheroe. Para 55 of the NPPF comments that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The site is a large proposal that will bring a significant scale of development to this part of Clitheroe. The Council's current strategic consideration for Clitheroe does not support the scale of growth proposed – a residual figure of 348 dwellings is apportioned to Clitheroe and there have been large scale approvals granted since that time and of course applications awaiting determination. Within that context, the proposed development would represent an over development of the area by virtue of its scale and setting and in particular, restrict the Council's choice of greenfield sites in developing the Local Development Framework. It would serve to pre-determine the emerging spatial vision for the area, leading to a lack of confidence in the planning system and the intentions of national policy with regard to community involvement as set out in the NPPF. The proposal would not comply with the spatial vision as set out in the saved policies of the Districtwide Local Plan and I would thus 'in principle' seek to resist such a proposal having regard to development plan policy as expressed in the Ribblesdale Districtwide Local Plan and NPPF.

Notwithstanding the 'in principle' objection to the development as outlined I shall provide you with detailed comments on a range of other matters should you decide to take this scheme forward to a formal submission.

### **Affordable Housing**

In relation to the level of affordable housing required on the site, a percentage of housing on the site would have to meet an identified housing need. The Council's document entitled 'Addressing Housing Needs' (Adopted January 2012) is a material planning consideration in this matter and is intended to be both complementary with and supplemental to the relevant policies contained within the Districtwide Local Plan - the latter clearly placing the site within open countryside where policy G5 would require development to be 100% affordable. However, as stated, given your site's relationship to the settlement boundary in such an instance, having regard to the requirements of NPPF, the Council would adopt the approach outlined in paragraph 3.1 of the Housing Policy, i.e. *in Longridge and Clitheroe on housing developments of 10 or more dwellings (or sites of 0.5 hectares or more, irrespective of the number of dwellings) the Council will seek 30% affordable units on the site.* This approach is taken because of the particular location of the site in relation to the identified settlement boundary and not because it is a qualifying development under the saved settlement strategy of the Districtwide Local Plan. The Council would therefore require a minimum of 30% of the site (under current proposals) to be for affordable housing which meets an identified local need. 15% of the site would need to be for elderly persons (of these a 50/50 split between market units and affordable units). Rachael Stott who is the Council's Housing Strategy Officer has advised that the Clitheroe Housing Needs Survey has been re-done with the results soon to be published and she would not wish to provide any specific detailed comments in respect of tenure mix until the results of that survey are available. It is anticipated that will be in the coming weeks and so I would advise that you contact Rachael direct for an update on this matter in order to inform any subsequent planning application.

### **Trees/Ecology/Biodiversity**

In this respect I have sought advice from David Hewitt, the Council's Countryside Officer.

The site is greenfield and the fields included in the outline proposal are improved grassland areas. The general area is undulating lowland farmland [Lower Ribblesdale Clitheroe to Gisburn] one of the key features being hedgerows and hedgerow trees defining the field patterns,

In both instances, the scale of development would have very dramatic impacts on the existing traffic movements in the immediate vicinity.

At access (1), the Illustrative Masterplan shows the internal highway layout of a development site presently under consideration as an outline application (3/11/0892) for a discrete site of 50 residential dwellings, being extended to serve the larger site.

In providing my highway comments of 30 January 2012 regarding 3/11/0892, I noted that,

*"Furthermore, the site plan indicates at Point 10, a "possible link into adjacent site". The layout shown, in terms of carriageway width and footway provisions, would not be suitable as a means of access to an additional area of development."*

The distribution of journeys to and from the suggested development of 325 units would have to be discussed in much greater detail, but it is reasonable to suppose that a very significant number of journeys would be directed via Milton Avenue and Waddington Road.

This would introduce very significant flows onto the "new" development (3/11/0892), Milton Avenue and its junction with Waddington Road, the rail bridge and the junction of Railway View Road and Waddington Road.

In addition to vehicles from the larger development, the creation of a route through to Waddington Road via Milton Avenue would also attract journeys from residents presently served by Castle View and Kirkmoor Road. This may be viewed as a more attractive alternative than negotiating the junction from Castle View onto Bawdlands.

There are particular highway issues concerning the introduction of significant new traffic flows on Waddington Road at its junction with Railway View Road.

The rail overbridge at this junction introduces clear physical limits to the movement of traffic at this location. The existing footway widths are substandard and previous attempts (the provision of a yellow box marking) have been made to assist the movement of larger vehicles.

This is a prescribed route for large vehicles heading to/from A59 to Waddington Fell for quarrying and beyond for timber production. Any highway improvements must include provision to accommodate this traffic.

In addition, this location has historically been prone to flooding and, on occasion, traffic has been diverted via Chester Avenue. This is not an ideal situation and should not be relied on should additional activity be introduced onto Waddington Road.

At access (2), the Illustrative Masterplan shows access to the site from Kirkmoor Road, from where access extends to Castle View and to Bawdlands.

The distribution of journeys to and from the suggested development of 325 units would have to be discussed in much greater detail, but it is reasonable to suppose that a very significant number of journeys would be directed via Kirkmoor Road and Castle View.

This would introduce very significant flows that would alter the existing pattern of traffic movements enjoyed by existing residents and have a direct impact on through movements and on the operation of the junction of Castle View and Bawdlands.

In addition to vehicles from the larger development, the creation of a route through to Bawdlands that avoided the low bridge on Waddington Road and possible congestion at the junction of Waddington Road and Railway View Road could attract additional movements.

The proximity of the rail bridge structure limits the extent of possible physical mitigation works on Bawdlands. Anticipating an increase of more than 50% over the present movements to/from this junction, the safe and efficient operation of the junction would be in question.

- a. A potential delay for emerging traffic from neighbouring residential streets; Brungerley Avenue, Milton Avenue and Eastham Street, and Kirkmoor Road, Buccleuch Avenue, Albemarle Street, Montague Street and De Lacy Street.
- b. Queuing and delays at the junctions of Milton Avenue and Waddington Road; Waddington Road and Railway View Road; Castle View and Bawdlands; Corporation Street and Bawdlands; Thorn Street and Corporation Street; Eshton Terrace and Woone Lane.
- c. The capacity of the roundabouts at Pimlico Road and Station Road.

In view of the one way operation on Parson Brow, the route from Castle View to A59 and other Principal Routes may be via Eshton Terrace rather than back towards Waddington Road. For similar reasons, the preference for some motorists leaving the site may be to access Waddington Road as a route to Chatburn Road/Pendle Drive and thence to the A59.

These initial comments could change or be added to in great degree following subsequent discussions which will need to be undertaken between your highway consultant and LCC in light of the latest revision to the layout which details a direct access onto Waddington Road and from what I can see removes the vehicular access onto Kirkmoor Road. There is also the issue of access onto Milton Avenue and through to Waddington Road which needs to be addressed having regard to previous comments on the suitability of this and recent refusal by Planning and Development Committee of the smaller residential scheme.

It is also important to consider the potential impact of this level of development on the town's Air Quality Management Area as it is anticipated that a substantial number of vehicle movements will pass through that as people leave the town using Whalley Road. Reference will need to be made to this in any planning submission and an assessment made of the development's impacts and any mitigation measures necessary. Should you require more details on this then I suggest you contact James Russell Head of Environmental Health on 01200 414466.

#### **Public Open Space**

On a development of this size there will be a requirement for public open space under Policy RT8 of the DWLP. The Council do not have a set formula for working out the size of such an area and this would be dictated to a degree by the type of accommodation to be provided on site. Ultimately the decision would be yours with a justification to be given for the approach taken in any submission. It is not the Council's intention to take on any future management/maintenance responsibilities associated with such areas and you would have to work out how this would happen. What I would say is that given the size of site the Council may look for a variety of types of provision ranging from toddler play to kick about areas and possibly offsite contributions towards the more strategic level of provision offered within the Town Centre. For further details I would suggest you contact Chris Hughes Head of Cultural and Leisure Services on 01200 414479.

#### **Design/Layout/Visual Amenity**

This is a substantial development outside the settlement boundary of Clitheroe and it will be visible in the wider area. I do have some reservations about the visual impact of a scheme of this size and would advise that any future submission be accompanied by a landscape visual appraisal to examine the impact on the character of this part of Clitheroe and its surroundings environs. I consider this would be advantageous and enable officers and Members of the Council to reach an informed decision on the potential visual implications of a development of this scale on greenfield land that would extend the urban edge of the settlement in a fragmented manner.

I have asked for comments from the Planning Officer (archaeology) at LCC who has advised that the proposal site has been identified in the ALSF Aggregate Extraction in the Lower Ribble Valley Final Report (Oxford Archaeology North/University of Liverpool, 2007) as being considered to have a high/medium potential for archaeological deposits dating to the prehistoric period with a medium/low potential for the Roman and Medieval periods.

## **Education Assessment 19<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

Development details: 325 dwellings

Primary place requirement: 114 places

Secondary place requirement: 81 places

### **Local primary schools within 2 miles of development:**

ST MICHAEL AND ST JOHN'S RC PRIMARY CLITHEROE

CLITHEROE PENDLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

CLITHEROE EDISFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL

ST JAMES' CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY CLITHEROE

CLITHEROE BROOKSIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL

WADDINGTON & WEST BRADFORD COFE VA PRIMARY

Projected places in 5 years: 4

### **Local Secondary schools within 3 miles of the development:**

CLITHEROE GRAMMAR ACADEMY

RIBBLESDALE HIGH SCHOOL/TECHNOLOGY COLLEGE

Projected places in 5 years: 92

### **Education requirement:**

#### **Primary**

*Latest projections*<sup>1</sup> for the local primary schools showing there to be a shortfall of 4 places in 5 years' time, the shortfall will occur without the impact from this development. These projections take into account the current numbers of pupils in the schools, the expected take up of pupils in future years based on the local births, the expected levels of inward and outward migration based upon what is already occurring in the schools and the housing development within the local 5 year Housing Land Supply document, which has already had planning permission.

However a number of planning applications have already been approved in this area and these have an effect upon the places available.

These developments are:

- Barkers Garden Centre

Therefore, the number of remaining places would be 4 less 9 = -5 places. With an expected pupil yield of 114 pupils from this development, it is expected that there would be a shortage of 119 places.

Therefore, we would be seeking a contribution from the developer in respect of the pupil yield required to support this development, i.e. 114 places.

#### **Secondary**

*Latest projections*<sup>1</sup> for the local secondary schools show there to be approximately 92 places available in 5 years' time. These projections take into account the current numbers of pupils in the schools, the expected take up of pupils in future years based on the local births, the expected levels of inward and outward migration based upon what is already occurring in the schools and the housing development within the local 5 year Housing Land Supply document, which has already had planning permission.

However a number of planning applications have already been approved in this area and these have an effect upon the places available.

These developments are:

- Bakers Garden Centre
- Victoria Mill
- Former Cobden Mill

### **United Utilities**

Have commented that looking at this site in isolation from other proposed developments in the catchment; they can confirm that such a development would pose an issue to United Utilities wastewater assets both on the network and at the treatment works.

The site is located around the midpoint of the Clitheroe wastewater network which is predominantly made up of combined sewers that were not designed to take flows from such a significant additional development. Reinforcements & upgrades to the network would be required to accommodate the proposed development, the extent of which would have to be determined when considering this and other development proposals within the immediate vicinity.

The WWTW is currently sized to accommodate all existing discharges and does have some limited spare capacity for future development but due to the size of the proposed development we may have to look at upgrading the works.

To help reduce the impact to the network & receiving WWTW we would ask that when the developer is preparing a drainage strategy they must assume that all surface water has to be drained either to soakaway or directly to nearby watercourses.

### **Miscellaneous**

We have a new Pennine Architectural Liaison Officer covering our area who may take a more proactive role in passing comment on secure by design matters. Her contact details are Barbara Thornber Tel: 01282 472554 email [barbara.thornber@lancashire.pnn.police](mailto:barbara.thornber@lancashire.pnn.police).

The Council's position on wheeled bins is that we impose a standard charge of £90 per unit to developers to cover the administration and delivery costs in providing the standard three 140 litre wheeled bins to each household within new build developments.

To summarise I would comment that the scale of development proposed conflicts with the emerging core strategy and would pre determine the outcome of the plan making process. I also have concerns over the visual impact of the development in terms of its relationship with the main settlement area. It would form an unrestricted extension to the development edge of the town and lead to a fragmented pattern of urbanisation of the countryside.

The views given in this letter represent officer opinions only given without prejudice to the final determination of any application submitted. They are a reflection of our views at the time of writing this response and may be subject to change as matters progress on the LDF.

Yours sincerely

SARAH WESTWOOD  
SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

Ms J Dickman  
Dickman Associates LTD  
PO BOX 97  
BOLTON  
Lancashire  
BL1 9PT