

Planning Committee Minutes

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of Wyre Borough Council held on Wednesday, 11 January 2023 at the Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Poulton-le-Fylde.

Planning Committee members present:

Councillors Lady D Atkins, Ballard, Catterall, Kay, Le Marinel, Moon, Orme, Raynor, Rendell and D Walmsley

Apologies for absence:

Councillors I Amos, Ingham, O'Neill and Stirzaker

Failed to attend or tender apologies for absence

None.

Other councillors present:

Councillor E Ellison

Officers present:

Karl Glover, Planning Development Manager
Daphne Courtenage, Assistant Democratic Services Officer
Carmel White, Solicitor
Steve Smith, Head of Planning and Regeneration

Twenty four members of the public attended the meeting.

PA.40 Declarations of interest

Councillor Kay declared that she had facilitated a community meeting to supply residents with the site plans. She said that she had not commented at the meeting and she had not predetermined herself. She also told the committee that she was the ward and county councillor.

PA.41 Confirmation of minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 7 December 2022 were **approved** as a correct record.

PA.42 Appeals

The committee noted the Schedule of Appeals lodged and decided between 15 November – 15 December 2022, as set out on pages 3-8 of the agenda pack. Any member requiring any further details or clarification on any appeal was invited to contact the relevant case officer.

PA.43 Planning applications

PA.44 Application A - Land North of Bourne Way Fleetwood Road North Thornton-Cleveleys (22/00762/FULMAJ)

The application was before members for determination as the application site fell within an allocated site in the Wyre Local Plan and was of strategic importance. The application had also been called in by Councillor Kay.

A site visit occurred to enable members to understand the site context beyond the plans submitted and site photographs taken by the case officer.

An update sheet was published on the council's website, the information only having become available after the original agenda was published. The committee considered the update sheet, which contained an additional consultation response from Natural England with no objections, and a policy update with the emerging Partial Local Plan which was to be approved at Full Council on the 26 January 2023; it also contained amendments to condition 2 (approved plans) following a colour layout plan and sectional drawing being provided.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration gave a verbal update to the committee prior to the presentation on the application. He informed the meeting that within the hour prior to the start of the meeting, the Education Authority (Lancashire County Council) had amended their financial contribution requirements from £0 to £247,530. He therefore recommended to the committee that they approved the application with the amended requirements for the Section 106 agreement that would result in consequential changes to the officer report at paragraphs 6.3, 9.31 and 12.1.

The Planning Development Manager introduced the application. He stated that the site had been identified within the Local Plan for housing development of a minimum of 153 dwellings. He addressed many of the concerns raised by councillors and residents during the consultation period. He also explained the proposed drainage plan for the site, specifically the pumping station and addressed the concerns raised by residents' objections. He reiterated the financial contributions proposed to be secured through planning obligations, with Green Infrastructure (GI - £55,929), contributions towards health services (£97,915) and contributions towards highways (£162,000) and education (£247,530).

The Chair asked for clarification on the dwelling allocation for the site as part of the Local Plan. The Planning Development Manager clarified that the 153 dwellings proposed in the Local Plan was a minimum capacity figure, with an increase being acceptable as long as other considerations were met.

The Chair opened the public speaking portion of the meeting.

Kevin Barker spoke in objection to the application.

Wayne Weight spoke in objection to the application.

Sheryl Corcoran spoke in objection to the application.

Trudi Daniels spoke in objection to the application.

Owing to the exceptional nature of the item, the Chair moved to allow Councillor E Ellison, ward councillor for Bourne ward and adjoining ward councillor for the application, to speak at the meeting. She read out an objection letter from Thornton Action Group.

John Matthews, the Design Manager for Eccleston Homes, spoke in favour of the application.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration addressed the points raised during the public speaking item.

In relation to the pumping station, there were approved plans for this submitted alongside the application for residents and councillors to inspect, and would have to comply with proposed condition 4.

In relation to flooding, the Local Flood Authority (LCC) had not made any objections to the development, and would also have to comply with condition 4.

In relation to infrastructure, it was an allocated site as part of the Local Plan, with the infrastructure requirements being set out in the plan. The development would mitigate its impact either through conditions or the S106 contributions, but would only be required to mitigate its own impact, and not solve pre-existing issues with infrastructure.

In relation to car parking, the car parking standards were set out in Appendix B to the Local Plan.

In relation to highways, he reiterated that they had not received any objections from the Highways Authority (LCC). He said that all the roads would be adopted, and therefore responsibility would fall with the Highway Authority once constructed. He also said that one of the documents provided by the Highways Authority was their response to concerns raised by local action groups and the local MP, stating how they had considered the scope of the assessments and that they had fully mitigated this by requesting the S106 contribution.

He told the committee that should this be a potential reason for deferral, the Highway Authority had fully considered this as well as wider highway impacts in the area.

Councillor Kay informed the committee that she was considering proposing a deferral on the following grounds:

- Impact on amenity of neighbourhood properties
- The site layout, in respect of road 8 and the pumping station
- Highway safety and parking
- Impacts arising from flooding and drainage
- Education – but she stated that she was pleased with the late request for contributions

Councillor Ballard said that he would second the deferral if proposed, in agreement with Councillor Kay's reasons but stated that he would wish to keep education as a reason for deferral as the applicant had not yet responded to the late request for contributions from LCC. He also asked to see the report from the Manchester Ecology Unit, as referred to at para 6.2.1 of the report. He mentioned that significant weight had been put on the partial review of the council's Local Plan, which had reduced the housing need within the borough and that this should be included; and also stated that he was not happy that a masterplan had not been submitted to the Planning Policy Working Group. He stated that he would want to review specific costings for the highways contributions from the Highways Authority.

Councillor Lady Atkins reiterated concerns about the pumping station and whether it would cope with the drainage in the area. She also asked about house type variations, and was concerned about the access from Fleetwood Road North and highway safety.

Councillor Le Marinel referred to the National Planning Policy Framework in his comments to the committee. He reiterated the call for a deferral under the following grounds:

- The travel plan and transport assessment was far too narrow in its scope.
- The cumulative impact on the Highways from past, current, and proposed future developments had not been properly considered.
- Road safety mitigation structures had not been considered, planned, or properly costed.
- The number of accidents and injuries had been missed, because the scope of the travel plan and transport assessment was too narrow.
- Asked for a new full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to be undertaken by LCC Highways and the developer.

Councillor Orme thanked the planning officers for responding to his queries. He however stated that three concerns had not been addressed; he wished that the proposed number of dwellings be reduced to the minimum capacity of 153; he reiterated concerns over road safety and wished that improvements to the road would include the whole of Fleetwood Road North; and reiterated concerns over drainage on the western boundary of the site.

The Chair commented on the pumping station, informing the meeting that they were very popular and mostly underground with little noise and issues with smells.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration addressed the concerns raised by members. There was a masterplan within the submission documents, and said that in-line with the council's Masterplan Guidance document some sites could approve a masterplan through the Planning Committee when the development would only be for housing with little or no other options for development location with the site. He mentioned the update on the Partial Local Plan, which had been included in the committee's update sheet published the previous day; it did alter the housing requirement for the

borough but would not impact this decision. He clarified that the pumping station would only be used for foul water, not surface water to alleviate concerns over drainage.

In relation to the updated financial requirements for education, he stated that the Education Authority were only asking for contributions for secondary education.

He told the committee that if they were looking to defer the application, then they would have to identify the harms they were concerned with, specifically in terms of information they felt they did not have before them to make a decision.

He summarised the points raised by members:

- Highways, specifically further information on highway matters and road safety and those concerns raised by Councillors Kay and Le Marinel
- Seeking further information and consideration around the layout and lessening the impact of harms around the existing housing estate in Pheasants Wood
- Education, with further consideration and understanding of the education contributions and the applicant's position on this

Following clarification on the reasons, Councillor Kay proposed and Councillor Ballard seconded that the application be deferred to allow for further information and consideration on the issues of highways, layout and education by both Lancashire County Council and the applicant. It was resolved that the application be deferred to a future meeting of the committee, and for officers to liaise with the applicant and consultees to give further consideration to:

- **Site Layout** – Further consideration required as to the relationship and siting of plots 89 to 95 due to the impacts upon neighboring residents at Bluebell Close (either amendments or reduction in units)
- Clarification and confirmation as to why the pumping station has to be within that location. Confirmation that there would be no vibrations, noise or odor
- **Education** – Confirmation from the applicant as to whether or not they agree to pay the financial contributions towards education (secondary school places) and to liaise with Lancashire County Council to seek understanding as to the justification for the contribution
- **Highways** – To seek clarification from LCC Highways on the following matters:
 - Whether or not the scope of the travel plan (TP) and transport assessment (TA) was sufficient (should it be wider)
 - Whether or not the TA should consider the cumulative impacts on the highways from past current and proposed future developments and had this been considered by LCC
 - A full break down of the road safety mitigation measures including the costing of such works

- Clarification as to the number of accidents and injuries, does this need to be reassessed if the scope of the TA was incorrect
- Could LCC undertake their own TA and TP
- Was parking within the site sufficient

The meeting started at 1.59 pm and finished at 3.09 pm.

Date of Publication: 16 January 2023