

Wyre Borough Council
Please ask for : Marianne Unwin
Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 01253 887326

Planning Committee Supplement

**Planning Committee meeting on Wednesday, 6 January 2021 at 2.00 pm
in the Council Chamber - Civic Centre and via WebEx.**

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| (a) | <p>Application A- Land South Of Blackpool Road, Poulton-Le-Fylde (19/00615/OULMAJ)</p> <p>Outline application for the erection of up to 330 dwellings and associated infrastructure (all matters reserved).</p> | (Pages 3 - 4) |
| (b) | <p>Application B- Land South Of B5269 Preston Road And East Of St Peter's Church Of England School, Inskip (20/00383/REMAJ)</p> <p>Reserved matters application for access off Preston Road together with matters of appearance, scale, layout and landscaping for the erection of 30 dwellings following outline approval 19/00348/OUTMAJ.</p> | (Pages 5 - 6) |
| (c) | <p>Application C- Land South Of B5269 Preston Road, Inskip (20/00381/FUL)</p> <p>Creation of an area of open space with associated operational development including pond and boundary fencing, in lieu of on-site provision in association with development approved by outline permission 19/00348/OUTMAJ for up to 30 dwellings.</p> | (Pages 5 - 6) |
| (d) | <p>Application D- Land At Bourne Road, Thornton Cleveleys, FY5 4QA (20/00405/LMAJ)</p> <p>Erection of 210 residential dwellings with vehicular access from Bourne Road and associated public open space and infrastructure.</p> | (Pages 7 - 8) |

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE SHEET

COMMITTEE DATE: 6th January 2021

APPLICATION NO.	TEAM LEADER	ITEM NO.	PAGE NOS.
19/00615/OULMAJ	Lyndsey Hayes	01	43-78

Clarification in Paragraph 1.3

A word was omitted from this paragraph. The third sentence should say: “It predicts an increase of up to **2** additional vehicles per minute at this junction; and a further 5 vehicle movements each time the barrier is activated in the AM and PM peak hour periods.”

Updated Consultee Response

Since the publication of the committee report Lancashire County Council (LCC) have provided a revised indicative Education Contribution Assessment (Dated 15th December 2020) which identifies that at this particular point in time and assuming a development of 4 bedroom dwellings (as is standard practice where housing mix is unknown at outline stage), then a financial contribution towards 78 primary school places is required. This equates to a contribution of £1,551,635.28 on the basis these places would be provided at the proposed new primary school (indicated on the approved Blackpool Road masterplan). If the places were to be provided through school expansion then a revised formula would be used.

The response also confirms that in the event a new school site is needed to accommodate the number of housing developments coming forward in Poulton then applicants may be required to provide a contribution towards the costs of the school site land. LCC would seek to work with the Council to ensure such equalisation arrangements are established prior to the approval of any of the developments affected.

Officer Response:

The applicant has agreed to the contribution being requested. Members are advised that this would not change how the Section 106 agreement was drafted, which would impose a mechanism for the precise contribution to be calculated at the time of any approval on the reserved matters application(s) when bedroom mix is known. In terms of a contribution towards the costs of the school site land, no such equalisation arrangements are in place and the Council does not consider this additional contribution request as being reasonable or in conformity with the CIL Regulations.

Call-in request to the Secretary of State

Further to the publication of the agenda the Secretary of State (SoS) has received a request to call the application in for their determination. This means that should Members resolve to grant outline permission then

following committee the application will be formally referred to the SoS under the Consultation Direction to allow the SoS to assess the request to call the application in and formally notify the Council of their opinion.

Officers Response:

Paragraph 2.1 (12.1 on original report) is therefore amended to read

12.1 Grant outline planning permission subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement to secure on-site Affordable Housing and Green Infrastructure provision, financial contributions towards local education, health care, sustainable travel and highway improvements, and to secure the provision and future management of land to the south of the site for ecological enhancement; and subject to the Secretary of State deciding not to call-in the application. In the event of no call-in being made by the Secretary of State, that the Head of Planning Services be authorised to issue the decision upon the satisfactory completion of the S106 agreement

PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE SHEET

COMMITTEE DATE: 6th January 2021

APPLICATION NO.	TEAM LEADER	ITEM NO.	PAGE NOS.
20/00383/REMAJ and 20/00381/FUL	Lyndsey Hayes	02 and 03	79-115

Additional neighbour representations

Since the publication of the committee report a further 35 letters of objection have been received. The concerns are summarised below:

- The planned development on the west side is too close to Inskip school.
- The amended proposal shows 2-storey properties on the western boundary.
- The proposal infringes upon the privacy, well-being, and safety of the children and the safeguarding responsibilities of the school itself.
- Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council and the Governors of Inskip St Peter's School have objected to these plans, and their concerns are shared by parents. Alternative proposals have been suggested by the school governors and the parish council that would avoid the issues but have not been considered by the developer. There are numerous alternatives that could have been designed to satisfy concerns.
- The two storey dwellings adjacent to the school would allow residents to overlook the school drive with a full view of the school frontage and entrance and also a view of the playground.
- These properties will look ugly with the backs of properties as a 'slab' of development when approaching the Village from the west.
- The two storey dwellings (overlooking the School from the rear elevations) and on the front boundary will be a blot on the landscape of the Village
- Revised proposals with bungalows would be more aesthetically pleasing.
- Noise will be a concern for residents of the properties, not just the school
- The proposal will result in overdevelopment by its layout and density
- The design of the properties will not be in keeping with other new build properties in the area.
- The green space is in the wrong place and should be moved to the western boundary to create a green buffer with the school. This would also improve air quality for the children.
- Land should be provided for pick up and drop off of children to the school.
- A driveway, car park and village shop would be a much better advantage to the village and a huge benefit to the community.
- There is no consideration for additional families needing primary school places, and the school is also ready oversubscribed with no places for current residents.
- Having more bungalows on the site would resolve the issue of further oversubscription of the school.
- Bungalows would be better as there are large number of elderly people living at present in 3/4 bedroom houses which could be sold.
- Families have made a conscious decision to live in a rural village, and this proposal will negatively impact upon this.

- The developers have not engaged with the community or considered the difficulties their plans bring, and have not adjusted their plans to provide mitigation.
- The area is a farming area so it is queried why housing is being encouraged.
- Building on a green field would add to flooding in the village.
- Concerns about the proposal adding to existing foul drainage problems in the area as existing pipes and systems have not been upgraded. The site should therefore have its own system or pumping station.

Officer Response: The concerns about impact on the school, visual impact, design, layout and density are already dealt with in the main committee report. Impacts on capacity of existing schools, loss of greenfield site, flooding and foul drainage concerns raised are matters relating to principle of the development that were considered as part of the outline application and are not matters that can be revisited at reserved matters stage.

PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE SHEET

COMMITTEE DATE: 6th January 2021

APPLICATION NO.	TEAM LEADER	ITEM NO.	PAGE NOS.
20/00405/LMAJ	Lyndsey Hayes	02	117-150

Additional Neighbour Representations

Following the publication of the committee report 3 additional neighbour objection letters have been received. This includes a response from Thornton Action Group (TAG) and Thornton Flood Action Group. The primary reasons for opposition are:

- Lack of green space in the local area and within the site
- Highway Safety
- Schools already at capacity
- Highway Improvements as part of application 10/00215/FULMAJ (Barratts site adjacent) have not been completed
- Use of culverts should not be allowed
- Culverting the watercourse on this site could have adverse impacts upon the development at Hawley Gardens
- Riparian drainage systems are not being maintained in the locality

Officer Response:

The observations are acknowledged and the points raised are addressed within the relevant sections of the committee report. In addition officers would add that the alleged failure of riparian owners to not maintain drainage systems in the locality does not make the drainage scheme proposal for this development unacceptable.

This page is intentionally left blank