

<b>Agenda Item</b>	A5
<b>Application Number</b>	22/00342/FUL
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of 115 dwellings with associated access and landscaping
<b>Application site</b>	Land At Grid Reference E347900 N455890 Highland Brow Galgate Lancashire
<b>Applicant</b>	Wainhomes (North West) Limited
<b>Agent</b>	Mr Stephen Harris
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Eleanor Fawcett
<b>Departure</b>	No
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Refusal

## 1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The site is located on agricultural land to the north of the existing residential development on Meadow Park, which is at the northern edge of the large village of Galgate. It lies to the west of Highland Brow and to the east of the Lancaster Canal. There is a belt of mature trees along the western boundary, adjacent to the canal, which continues to the north and south of the of the site boundaries. The site has an area of approximately 4.8 hectares and mostly comprises two fields, which are separated by and bound by hedgerows to the north and east boundary. However, the site also extends slightly into the field to the north, beyond part of the existing hedgerow, and includes a pond which straddles two fields. The land rises significantly towards the northeast corner, and forms part of the slope of a drumlim feature. This and the adjacent agricultural land appear to have been most recently used for growing maize.
- 1.2 A small part of the site along the western edge is located within flood zones 2 and 3. There is also a watercourse in this location, Ou Beck, which is a Main River. This part of the site is also identified as being at risk from surface water flooding. The site is identified as being susceptible to groundwater flooding (50-75%) and just under half of the site is indicated as a mineral safeguarding area. The Galgate Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) is located approximately 600 metres to the southeast. The site is also located approximately 1.7 kilometres from the Lune Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is also covered by the Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site.

## 2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of 115 dwellings and includes the creation of an access from Highland Brow towards the southeast corner of the site. The proposed dwellings and associated gardens would be concentrated at the west of the site on the lower areas of land, with a row of dwellings along the southern boundary, extending up to Highland Brow. The dwellings would be arranged around a long, mostly straight road extending across the width of the site, with three cul-

de-sacs off this to the north. Most of the eastern portion of the site, which is the highest part, is proposed to remain mostly undeveloped and provide the open space for the development.

2.2 The proposed dwellings are a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced, and are all two storey, although one house type has a higher roof height with accommodation in the roof space. Amended plans were received during the course of the application as the originally submitted house types did not fully correspond to the proposed site plan. There are mixture of two, three and four bedroom units and the submission sets out that 35 affordable units would be provided, which equates to 30% on-site provision, although there is limited detail in relation to this. The proposed external finishes to the buildings are also unclear within the submitted documents.

### 3.0 Site History

3.1 The only relevant application relating to this site is a screening opinion which was carried out when the application was submitted.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
22/00714/EIR	Screening opinion for erection of 115 dwellings with associated access and landscaping	Not EIA development

### 4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and internal consultees:

Consultee	Response
Ellel Parish Council	<p><b>Object</b> for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flooding: The fields are known to be wet, and flooding occurs every year in normal weather conditions</li> <li>• Sewage: Capacity of the existing sewerage system</li> <li>• Traffic Flows/Issues: Salford Road is narrow and has speeding and parking issues, with restrictions from the viaduct arch and the effect of increased traffic has not been addressed; there are safety issues at the junction with Highland Brow given the location on a hill and the speed of vehicles towards Galgate; it appears that nothing has been done to accommodate trips generated to the north on Highland Brow at two sub-standard junctions with the A6 (Five Ashes Lane and Burrow Road).</li> </ul>
Planning Policy	<p><b>Comments.</b> The site is within the extensive area of the broad location for growth designated by the adopted Local Plan the Local Plan but there are no land allocations for development within this area. “Early delivery” of development in South Lancaster in advance of the Aera Action Plan (AAP) may be acceptable where compliance with the criteria set out in the policy is convincingly demonstrated. There are significant concerns that the following growth principles in policy SG1 have not been adequately addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involving local communities in pro-active consultation;</li> <li>• Securing high-quality urban design which promotes sustainable, attractive places to live;</li> <li>• Seeking modal shift in local transport movements;</li> <li>• The creation of sufficient areas of high-quality open spaces to provide a distinct sense of place and deliver a network of green corridors and walking and cycling routes across South Lancaster;</li> <li>• Taking proper account of the need to design new development to minimise its contribution to, and the impacts of, Climate Change;</li> <li>• Managing water and run-off to safeguard development, with active measures within new development to reduce flood risk downstream;</li> <li>• Addressing longstanding constraints and capacity issues in the strategic and local road network through improvements to traffic management and physical interventions to increase network capacity and advantage sustainable travel.</li> </ul>

	The application does not include information with regard to the house types proposed for the affordable units or the tenure mix. Further information is required from the applicant to determine whether the proposed provision meets the identified need. Concerns that not all the dwellings meet the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). Opportunities to support habitat enhancement and deliver biodiversity net gain are currently being investigated. The early loss of this site to development negates the ability of the Council to undertake this work and again prejudices decisions that have yet to be made.
Arboricultural Officer	<b>Object</b> due to the potential impact on important boundary trees and hedgerow and limited additional planting. There is a contradiction between the AIA and the landscape plan, with the landscape plan showing the retention of the northern boundary, hedgerow trees and much of the central hedgerow. Internal planting is currently limited to street trees, which appear to be planted within the small green spaces to the front of properties and no tree planting is shown along western boundary, which is important habitat and must be enhanced. There are conflicts with root protection areas which may put pressure on the removal of trees once the development is occupied.
Engineering Team	<b>No comments received.</b>
Waste and Recycling	<b>Comments.</b> A revision of the layout is required to reduce the length of shared driveways and distance occupants need to move bins for collection and provide shared collection points at the end of shared driveways.
Public Realm	<b>Comments.</b> 2284.1m <sup>2</sup> of amenity space is required on site which should be a mown informal space where young children could have a kick about. An equipped play area and young person provisions is required on site. Off-site contributions are required towards playing pitches ( <b>£138,514.35</b> ) and parks and gardens ( <b>£39,156</b> ).
Economic Development	<b>Comments.</b> The Employment Skills Plan (ESP) offers a positive commitment to the objectives of this policy but requires some revision.
Environmental Health	<b>Air Quality – Comments</b> Given the contributory air quality impacts on both the Galgate and Lancaster AQMAs, would expect to see a high level of mitigation. In addition to EV charging infrastructure for each dwelling, recommend the following be sought to facilitate the use of low emission approaches: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation of a low emissions car club at the development site;</li> <li>• Provision of facilities and infrastructure to promote cycling and walking.</li> <li>• Measures to promote the use of public transport e.g. free bus use for future development occupiers.</li> <li>• Any other measures to reduce polluting emissions, particularly associated with transport.</li> <li>• provision of a condition requiring a CEMP detailing method and measures to reduce emissions during the construction phase, including potentially the use of low emission NRMM and setting out clearly a complaints/monitoring response procedure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Noise and Vibration – No comments have been received.</b>  <b>Contaminated land – No comments have been received.</b></p>
County Highways	<b>Object.</b> The development is currently unacceptable in terms of the site access and internal layout, impact on the wider highway network and sustainable travel. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of plots have insufficient parking provision;</li> <li>• A 2 metre wide footway should be provided along the site's frontage with Highland Brow;</li> <li>• the internal road is not designed to adoptable standards;</li> <li>• The trip rates used with the submitted Transport Assessment are not acceptable;</li> <li>• The A6 Main Road / Salford Road / Stoney Lane signal-controlled junction currently has capacity issues at peak times and experiences high levels of</li> </ul>

	<p>congestion and the proposed increase in vehicle movements is therefore unacceptable. Parking on Salford Road also currently impacts on the operation of the junction;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of a suitable footway from the junction of Salford Road and Highland Brow to the junction of Salford Road and the A6 to access local facilities. Sections of the existing footway provision are less than 1m in width, therefore not suitable to support all footway users.</li> <li>• Suitable cycle storage needs to be provided for all dwellings</li> </ul>
Lead Local Flood Authority	<p><b>Object</b>, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitted site-specific flood risk assessment fails to fully assess the risk of surface water flooding to the site as there is known to have been a significant issue historically on the site, resulting in the creation of a flood embankment/drain (identified as a culvert by the applicant) to protect the adjacent properties on Meadow Park;</li> <li>• The proposal fails to locate the most vulnerable development in the areas of lowest risk;</li> <li>• The submission fails to demonstrate that the proposal will not result in a flood risk within or outside the site. A large area at low to high risk of surface water flooding exists on the site and it has not been assessed how displacement of this flood risk may increase flood risk both on and off-site, or how this flood risk will be mitigated post-development; and</li> <li>• The submission does not demonstrate that residual risks can be safely managed, specifically a surface water attenuation pond and tank is proposed upslope of the majority of the development.</li> </ul>
County Planning Policy	No comments received.
County School Planning Team	<p><b>Object</b> on lack of infrastructure provision grounds. The Local Plan specifies that education mitigation should be provided through the provision of primary and secondary school site on the Lancaster South broad location for growth. As planning applications have been submitted prior to Area Action Plan adoption there needs to be a clear position on school land provision. There is currently no detail provided in any application regarding how either school site will be secured and provided. Without confirmation of the mechanism for the provision of the required school land it is not clear that this development is sustainable. Also request contributions for 26 primary school places and 13 secondary school places.</p>
Public Rights of Way	<b>No comments received</b>
National Highways	<p><b>Holding objection.</b> Recommend that the application is not determined until at least 29 November 2022. There is insufficient information with the application to enable National Highways to form a final view on the proposal. In particular, the Transport Assessment does not provide details on the existing situation or collision data in relation to the Strategic Road Network, namely Junction 33 of the M6 or the future traffic flows.</p>
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	<p><b>Comments.</b> The site is within 1.8 km of the Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC). It is not considered that the site acts as functionally linked to the protected sites. The public open space may help to reduce the need for outdoor recreation away from the development but it is also recommend that new residents be provided with information about the importance of the coastline for birds, and the need to avoid disturbing birds on visits to the coastline. There is indirect hydrological connectivity between the site and the Bay, but there are well-established mitigation measures which could be employed to avoid any water pollution impacts. Recommend that a Construction Environmental Method Statement is required and include details of measures to be taken to avoid pollution of the Ou Brook and the Canal. Providing mitigation measures are delivered, it is considered that the development will not result in harmful impacts on the protected sites. In addition, the following measures are also</p>

	<p>recommended to avoid harm to ecological interests, or to mitigate harm;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preparation of a Method Statement giving details of measures to be taken to protect Amphibians and Reptiles</li> <li>• Preparation of a long-term Landscape and Ecology Management Plan</li> </ul> <p>However, there are errors in the submitted documents and would object to the removal of hedgerow 17H as it would provide a corridor for the movement of amphibians and reptiles, as well as other wildlife.</p>
Natural England	<p><b>Object.</b> Further information is required as currently there is insufficient information provided in the application to determine whether the likelihood of significant effects to the designated sites can be ruled out: A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration of water quality impacts</li> <li>• An assessment of the increase in recreational disturbance on the above designated sites</li> </ul>
RSPB	<p><b>Object.</b> Potential effect on the Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Morecambe Bay Ramsar site and Lune Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) particularly via potential pollution of Ou beck or species displacement. The adjacent canal is also a biological heritage site which requires protection. There is a variety of wildlife notably lapwing, that nest on this field each year. Lapwing are ground nesting birds and are easily disturbed. Other species have also been noted including curlew (also red listed), kestrel, heron, peregrine falcon, kingfisher, skylarks, sparrow hawks and owls. The reduction in the planned green area of Bailrigg Garden Village by this development will leave smaller and smaller amounts of land for them. Due to the presence of bats each tree that is intended to be felled needs to be surveyed to ensure this is not used as a bat roost. Also raise concerns about: surface water drainage; measures to address impacts from climate change; garden sizes; lack of sustainable transport; biodiversity enhancements; need to reduce impermeable surfaces; provision of a green corridor; protection to pond and protection of water ways during construction.</p>
Lancashire Wildlife Trust	<p><b>Comments.</b> Ask to consider impacts on bats, loss of flood plain, removal of migratory route to a pond, impact on nesting lapwings and owls, which has been raised by a local resident.</p>
Environment Agency	<p><b>Object,</b> in the absence of an acceptable flood risk assessment.</p>
NHS	<p><b>No objection</b> subject to a financial contribution of <b>£81,771</b> towards new infrastructure at Lancaster Medical Practice.</p>
Galgate Flood Action Group	<p><b>No comments received</b></p>
South Lancaster Flood Action Group	<p><b>No comments received</b></p>
United Utilities	<p><b>Comments.</b> whilst the proposals are acceptable in principle, there is insufficient information on the detail of the drainage design. Request condition in relation to a sustainable drainage scheme.</p>
Lancashire Fire and Rescue	<p><b>No comments received</b></p>
Network Rail	<p><b>Comments.</b> Request a condition requiring: details of surface and foul water drainage, directed away from the railway. Advise that the council and developer determine the most appropriate measures to mitigate noise and vibration from the existing operational railway to ensure that there will be no future issues for residents once they take up occupation of the dwellings.</p>
Lancaster Canal Trust	<p><b>No comments received</b></p>
Canal and River Trust	<p><b>Comments.</b> Ask the Council to seek amendments to increase the landscape planting along the canal boundary with native species and provide a knee high timber fence or similar along the edge of the access road. Also request conditions requiring: an assessment of the culvert to confirm that it has adequate capacity and to identify whether there is any need for improvements to facilitate increased flows; and a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) to protect the canal and Ou Beck from pollution/ run-off during construction.</p>

4.2 The following responses have been received from members of the public in relation to the original consultation: **398 representations** opposing the development (1 comment from Cat Smith MP, 2 comments from Councillors and 1 comment from CLOUD). A summary of the main reasons is as follows:

- **Flood risk:** the development land is in a flood zone and has history of flooding; area has poor drainage/sewers, regular surface water flooding and current flood defences cannot cope; more houses will exacerbate this further with increased flood risk; Soakaways are not sufficient; impact on the existing flood wall from proposed footpath onto Meadow Park; the present culvert under the canal on Leachfield Road will not be able to cope with extra water in Ou Beck and the culvert is currently kept clear by the work of 2 households
- **Highway Impacts:** Poor transport links, lack of accessibility on the roads, roads unsuitable for HGV's; lack of public transport means more cars on the road, buses are full for secondary school children; Salford Road cannot cope with more traffic; traffic already backs up from Pointer Roundabout; village traffic will increase and add to the existing traffic jams and hazards; proposed development junction is dangerous because the road is narrow with a blind summit and many drivers use the road to avoid the main road traffic; risk to pedestrians and cyclists due to narrow pavements and narrow bridge on Salford Road where cars already mount to park on them causing obstructions, the cycle lane on A6 is obstructed by parked cars; lack of parking causes cars to park on the neighbouring roads, parked cars obstruct the highway and restrict the width and cause a hazard and impact access for large emergency vehicles; Conder Green Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for increased traffic flow or HGV's; Highland Brow is restrictive to vehicles due to the road layout and the bridge width and unsuitable for HGV's; the Transport Assessment doesn't corroborate with the resident's current experiences
- **Residential amenity:** existing properties will lose views, lose privacy and be overlooked; increased stress, mental and physical health problems to local residents due to loss of green space.
- **Design and visual impact:** The 'Landscape and Visual Appraisal' does not consider views from the western half of the public road (Meadow Park) which will be blocked by the development; loss of countryside and natural beauty; poor construction and materials compared to existing houses; the proposed two story houses are not in keeping with the area and are too close to the existing bungalows/dormer bungalows on Meadow Park; affordable housing is all concentrated in one area and not spread out; over development; negative impact on the unspoilt section of the Lancaster Canal corridor
- **Policy:** Application fails to support parts 7 and 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework; The land is identified as a 'green buffer' and intended to be kept free from development to act as a separation between Galgate and Bailrigg Garden Village; incompatible with stated planning objectives and contradicts the Bailrigg Green village process and contrary to the land allocation.
- **Impacts on ecology:** Poor consideration of biodiversity; site is a migratory path for wildlife and loss of this will be particularly disruptive to the transient otters, bats, protected owls, woodpeckers, lapwing and great crested newts and red list species; loss of hedgerows and trees
- **Impact on existing infrastructure;** the local primary school is full, GP practice is stretched to capacity and current residents struggle to get appointments, Dentist practices are full, and Church (including graveyard) do not have the capacity to support another development; strain on utilities.
- **Increased pollution:** poor air quality from more vehicles, potentially causing respiratory health problems for residents; noise disruption; poor construction practices in vicinity of permeable surfaces, including management of soils and materials leading to silt/sediment contaminating the permeable surface
- **Heritage:** area has Roman and Saxon connections
- **Need:** Population has increased significantly in the last few years due to approx. 460 additional dwellings being built; Galgate is already overpopulated, there is no secure indication that the population of Lancaster is significantly increasing; no requirement for new

- large houses in this area; only 30% affordable housing offered; limited shops in the village
- **Railway Infrastructure:** increase the risk of interruption to the rail network due to damage to the rail infrastructure, i.e. damage to rail bridges
- Loss of boundary: Galgate will become an extended part of Lancaster and erode existing quiet village
- Lack of public engagement from developer
- Loss of agricultural land to grow crops
- Carbon Capture will be reduced from the loss of green space
- Building the houses so close to the existing children's play park is dangerous
- Impact on house prices

Cat Smith MP:

- Development would see housing built on land that regularly floods
- Sewer network on Meadow Park is over-taxed and struggles with high levels of discharge
- Existing serious safety issues along Highland Brow and Salford Road, the proposed T-Junction will worsen the problem
- More traffic congestion during construction period and speeding down Salford Road, concerns of the access via Salford Road;
- Removal of the 'green buffer' between Galgate and housing built in South Lancaster.

County Councillor M Maxwell-Scott

- Additional flood risk
- Negative impact on local traffic

Councillor Richard Austen-Baker

- Application runs contrary to the adopted Local Plan
- Increased flood risk
- Hinders the proper development of the proposed Bailrigg Garden Village
- Traffic problems in already existing pinch points

Comments from CLOUD

- Flood risk
- Removal of 'buffer zone'
- Impact of construction traffic and future residents traffic
- Impact on biodiversity
- Pressure on health care service and schools
- Pressure of drainage and sewage
- Concerns over maintenance of the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) once developers leave the development site
- Poor consideration of ecology, biodiversity and placemaking principles in design
- Poor construction practices in vicinity of permeable surfaces, including management of soils and materials leading to silt/sediment/granular material contaminating the permeable surface- this includes over-filling soil beds
- Poor landscaping design/detailing, resulting in un-sealed slopes draining downhill towards permeable surfaces, leading to silt/sediment contamination which reduces performance
- Lack of proactive maintenance of permeable surfaces, leading to silting/vegetation growth reducing performance

There were 19 petition leaflets completed with the following comments:

- Increase in flood risk
- Increased pressure on sewers and drainage
- Increase in traffic; more traffic jams, more hazard for pedestrians and cyclists
- Loss of 'green buffer'
- Loss of biodiversity, wildlife habitats and rare species
- Pressure on already struggling infrastructure; no spaces at local schools, doctors surgery
- Concerns of construction traffic damaging the train bridge
- Loss of village identity
- No employment opportunities so more people will drive
- Not enough car parking for current residents, currently lots of parking on pavements which

will increase further

- Transport routes are limited for construction traffic
- Impact on resident's mental health from the loss of green space
- Visual amenity lost for countryside, walking, cycling and horse-riding
- Development land is known for flooding
- New development is too close to existing properties
- Proposed development access will be a dangerous junction

An amended site plan and house types were submitted as the originally submitted house types did not fully correspond to the layout plan. As such, further consultation was undertaken. An additional 13 responses objecting to the application were received which raised similar concerns to those set out above in addition to those below:

- Contradicts the Council's climate emergency statement

## 5.0 Analysis

5.1 The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Traffic impacts, access, parking and sustainable travel
- Flood risk and drainage
- Layout, design and landscape impacts
- Impacts on residential amenity
- Biodiversity
- Affordable Housing and mix
- Air Quality
- Education and Health
- Climate Change
- Mineral Safeguarding

5.2 **Principle of Development** NPPF paragraphs: 7 – 12 (Achieving Sustainable Development), and 60-61 and 73-79 (Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), SP2 (Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy), SP3 (Development Strategy for Lancaster District), SP6 (The Delivery of New Homes); SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth), SG3 (Infrastructure Delivery for Growth in South Lancaster) EN3 (The Open Countryside; Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM1 (New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs) and DM4 (Residential Development Outside Main Urban Areas)

5.2.1 The site is located adjacent to the built up area of the village of Galgate, on its northern edge, and currently comprises agricultural land. Galgate is identified within policy SP2 of the SPLA DPD as a Sustainable Rural Settlement where growth will be focussed outside the main urban areas. Policy SP3 sets out that, in general, the scale of planned housing growth in rural areas will be managed to reflect existing population size, be proportionate to existing scale and character of the settlement and the availability of, or the opportunity to provide, infrastructure, services and facilities to serve the development and the extent to which development can be accommodated within the local area. However, the site is also located within the Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth (including Bailrigg Garden Village), covered by Policy SG1 of the SPLA DPD.

5.2.2 Policy SG1 is a designation of land, which promotes the strategic delivery of sustainable housing and employment growth in South Lancaster. The purpose of policy SG1 is to deliver a self-contained Garden Village, which focuses on high quality development that carefully balances housing and employment requirements, whilst maintaining strong and embedded environmental and high-quality design objectives. However, it is important to note that the policy makes no formal allocations for development, and merely designates this area for further investigation through the preparation of an Area Action Plan (AAP) DPD for the South Lancaster Area. Instead, it sets out a series of Key Growth Principles for development within this designated land. The AAP is currently being prepared by the City Council and is at an early stage, with adoption not expected until 2024. When adopted, it will identify allocations for both development and non-development purposes and



will set out detailed policies to guide development in this area. In advance of this, a Vision Masterplan has been prepared by external consultants and has been through several stages of community engagement and was reported to the Council's Cabinet on 6th February 2022 who endorsed this as the basis for the council's planning of the Garden Village.

5.2.3 There are 15 Key Growth Principles set out in policy SG1. A summary of these principles is set out below:

1. Pro-active community engagement.
2. Securing high-quality design and development with a sense of place.
3. Seeking modal shift away from traditional forms of private car usage (public transport and cycle infrastructure).
4. Delivering market and affordable housing to meet evidenced housing needs and to secure cohesive and balanced communities.
5. Ensuring necessary infrastructure is delivered to support the strategic growth of South Lancaster.
6. The delivery of high-quality open space and green corridors and securing distinct areas of separation between the BGV and the existing urban edge of Lancaster and Galgate.
7. Development to take account of the Heritage Impact Assessment for the area.
8. Safe, accessible and well-serviced development to create healthy and cohesive communities.
9. Master planning for growth of the University Campus and its wider estate.
10. Safeguarding the University Campus.
11. Design new development to minimise its contribution to, and the impacts of, climate change and to be resilient and adaptable to the effects of climate change.
12. Managing and reducing surface water and flood risk to existing and new residents and businesses.
13. Housebuilders to provide opportunities to work alongside local firms/suppliers during construction and opportunities for self/custom build properties.
14. Promotion of innovative design and use of technology for buildings, transport and energy.
15. Improvements to traffic management and physical interventions to increase network capacity and advantage sustainable travel.

5.2.4 The policy goes on to say that development within the broad location of growth will be supported in advance of the AAP assuming the following criteria can be met:

1. There would be no prejudice to the delivery of the wider garden village (including its infrastructure requirements) and would not undermine the integrated and co-ordinated approach to the wider development;
2. The development would conform with and further the Key Growth Principles described in SG1; and
3. That the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been fully considered and that the residual impacts on the transport network will not be severe.

5.2.5 The supporting text to policy SG1 is clear that the Council would only permit development within this area ahead of the AAP in exceptional circumstances. Given this it is critical that any application in this area can demonstrate, beyond any doubt, that these exceptional circumstances have been met in full. This is particularly the case in relation to ensuring that infrastructure matters, as set out in Policy SG3 of the SPLA and the key growth principles are fully considered and addressed to the satisfaction of the LPA. Whilst the AAP is at an early stage of preparation, Policy SG1 makes clear the ambitions of the Council with regard to development within the 'Broad Location for Growth' designation that it is seeking to achieve sustainable, high-quality development which is distinctly unique and separate to the surrounding settlements of Lancaster, Galgate and Bailrigg Village. Given the siting of this proposal, there are potential implications of achieving such separation should development be permitted in this location.

5.2.6 Most of the matters set out within the Key Growth Principles will be considered in detail in the separate sections below. However, there are concerns that a number of these principles have not been adequately addressed, in particularly relation to: involving communities; high quality design; seeking a modal shift; high quality open spaces and walking and cycling routes; minimising impacts on climate change; managing water and flood risk; and addressing constraints and capacity issues in the strategic and local road network. The principle of the development cannot therefore be supported as the proposal would be contrary to the aims and objectives of Policies SG1 and SG3 with regards

to the expectations of new housing development in this area in addition.

- 5.2.7 Regarding the principle of developing this site for housing, the loss of the agricultural land is also a consideration. The NPPF places support for maintaining agricultural land under Paragraph 174 and within footnote 58. The best and most versatile land is defined as Grades 1, 2 and 3a. Policy DM44 sets out that development should avoid use of the best and most versatile agricultural land and should, as far as possible, use the lowest grade of land suitable. The maps available from natural England identify the land as Grade 3 but do not distinguish between 3a and 3b. They are just a guide and do not provide detailed site specific assessments. As the land is currently used to grow crops, it is considered that a more detailed analysis is required of the land. At present, it is not clear if the proposal would result in the loss of the best and most versatile land so is a potential disbenefit of the development.
- 5.2.8 It is acknowledged that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and this can only be addressed by the approval of more residential proposals and the identification of further supply through the Land Allocations process. The most up to date housing land supply position for the council is contained within the 2021 Housing Land Supply Statement (September 2021) which identifies a 2.6-year supply of housing land. The council's lack of a five-year housing land supply is a material consideration in the determination of this application and also requires the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF. This means applying a tilted balance in favour of proposals for housing development and granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. As this requires consideration of all the impacts of the development, this will be fully considered within the conclusion.
- 5.3 **Traffic impacts, access, parking and sustainable travel** NPPF paragraphs: 104-106 and 110-113 (Promoting Sustainable Transport); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SP10 (Improving Transport Connectivity), SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth), SG3 (Infrastructure Delivery for Growth in South Lancaster) and T2 (Cycling and Walking Network); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM57 (Health and Well-being), DM58 (Infrastructure Delivery and Funding, DM60 (Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages), DM61 (Walking and Cycling), DM62 (Vehicle Parking Provision), DM63 (Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans), and DM64 (Lancaster District Highways and Transport Masterplan)
- 5.3.1 The Local Plan transport and accessibility policies seek to direct new development to sustainable locations and to ensure new development provides and encourages opportunities for a range of transport options and to reduce the overall need to travel. Policy requires development to make positive contributions to the walking and cycle network. As discussed above, Policy SG1 sets out a number of growth principles for the Broad Location for Growth which includes seeking a modal shift away from traditional forms of private car usage and addressing longstanding constraints and capacity issues in the strategic and local road network. Policy SG3 also sets out the requirement for necessary strategic infrastructure in order to deliver growth in South Lancaster, including highway infrastructure. It sets out that the Council will not permit piecemeal development that does not seek to address matters of strategic importance. Policy DM60 requires development proposals to be accessed safely during construction and operational phases of development. It equally requires development proposals to not adversely impact the local highway network and where highway capacity is insufficient to accommodate the impacts of the proposal, to secure appropriate mitigation. This aligns with paragraphs 110 of the NPPF. In accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF, development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 5.3.2 The site is proposed to be accessed off Highland Brow which links to the A6, via Salford Road approximately 600 metres to the south east, and continues to the north past the site. Lancashire County Council as the Highway Authority have raised a number of concerns regarding the proposed development. Firstly, in relation to the site access and internal layout of the scheme, there are concerns regarding the design of the junction to Highland Brow. The Highway Authority have advised that, to protect the sightlines for the proposed access and to support sustainable travel, a 2 metre wide footway should be provided along the site's full frontage with Highland Brow. A footway has been shown to the south, but would not extend beyond the access point to the north. It is acknowledged that it would not link to any other development to the north, and people are likely to

walk to services within the village, to the south. However, there is a public right of way on the opposite side of Highland Brow and by extending the footway slightly to the north would improve connectivity. Visibility splays have been identified on the plans measuring 2.4 metres by 90 metres, although these have been measured to a point 1 metre into the carriageway to the south. The Highway Authority have raised no concerns regarding the proposed visibility at the junction. The speed of the road is restricted to 30 mph to the front of most of the site, changing to 20 mph towards its southern end. It is not considered that a footway would be required to the whole of the north of the access to protect visibility splays. The submission appears to show the hedgerow set back or replanted with a verge to the front which would allow visibility to be maintained.

- 5.3.3 The Highway Authority have advised that the proposed internal road is not designed to an adoptable standard. In particular, they have set out that for a road to be considered for adoption, Lancashire County Council request that it should be at least 5.5 metres in width with a 2 metre footpath on both sides. The plans do seem to indicate that this would be provided throughout the majority of the scheme, with the exception of the western edge of the site and some of the ends of cul-de-sacs. As such, some clarification regarding this has been sought from County Highways. However, whilst it is desirable that the layout is designed to adoptable standards, it just needs to be ensured that the layout is safe, and there does appear to be sufficient space for turning within the site. It is noted that the plan showing the new junction with Highland Brow does not appear to be scaling correctly, although the annotation and the larger site plan do appear to show a 5.5 metre width and 2 metre footway.
- 5.3.4 The Highway Authority have also advised that a number of plots have insufficient parking provision and two to three bedroom properties should have two spaces and four to five bedroom properties should have three spaces. The minimum dimension for a parking bay needs to be 2.4m wide by 4.8m long. In addition, a private drive requires a minimum width of 3.2m where they are used for vehicular access and pedestrian access to the property and it is recommended that all private drives fronting garages should be a minimum of 6 metres long, reduced to 5.5 metres if roller shutters are fitted. The recommended minimum internal single garage size is 6 metres by 3 metres to be counted as a parking space. Having reviewed the plans, the integral garages appear to comply with the sizes set out above, as do the detached garages. The space sizes do appear to comply with the relevant standards and would provide sufficient parking, although some of the groups of parking bays may have slightly restricted turning. Some clarification has also been sought on this matter to ascertain if there are particular elements of the scheme where there are concerns.
- 5.3.5 In relation to the impact on surrounding highway network, the Highway Authority have raised concerns regarding the trip rates used in the submitted Transport Assessment and have advised that these are not acceptable. The Transport Assessment provides a table (8.2) regarding the A6/ Salford Road/ Stoney Lane junction showing how it would operate in 2027 with and without the development. As presented in the table 8.2 and paragraphs 8.10 and 8.11 of the Assessment, the signal-controlled junction will operate over its practical capacity. No additional information has been submitted on how the junction currently operates. National Highways have also advised that further information is required in relation to how this junction operates. The Highway Authority have set out that it is clear that the junction currently has capacity issues and experiences high levels of congestion. This has also been raised as a concerns from residents of Galgate who have experience of using this junction. There are proposals for a link road scheme at Junction 33 (secured through HIF) however there is still some uncertainty regarding this and therefore the application must be considered based on the current situation.
- 5.3.6 In addition to the above, parking currently takes place on the south side of Salford Road adjacent to the junction. This parking currently impacts on the operation of Salford Road and the junction with the A6. When vehicles are queuing to exit Salford Road, vehicles turning into the road are obstructed by the parked vehicles and therefore back up onto the A6 and cause an obstruction until the vehicles exiting Salford road have cleared the junction. On street parking also takes place along the remaining length of Salford Road from the junction of Salford Road and Highland Brow to the junction of Salford Road and the A6. This currently impacts on the free flow of traffic especially at peak times. Any additional vehicle movements from the proposed development would exacerbate the existing issues.
- 5.3.7 The delivery of significant development throughout the District will require extensive new highway changes and improvement to existing infrastructure. As such, it is anticipated that development of

this scale would provide financial contributions to help fund the projects. In addition, both Policy SG1 and SG3 are clear that development in this area should contribute to infrastructure requirements. Policy SG3 sets out that the forthcoming DPD will seek to address various infrastructure matters. Those specifically relating to highway matters are: the delivery of access into the Strategic Highways Network via a reconfiguration of Junction 33 of the M6; improvements to the local road network as appropriate to address recognised capacity issues and issues of highway safety; improvements to the public transport network; improving cycling and walking linkages to Lancaster City Centre and Galgate through the creation of a Cycling and Walking Superhighway in addition to improvements to walking and cycling links along the Lancaster Canal.

5.3.8 In relation to highway infrastructure projects, the Highway Authority have set out that the key measures being developed include:

- M6 J33 reconfiguration with link road (Central 1 option being assessed further);
- Infrastructure in and around the Garden Village area and connecting corridors supporting access both north and south;
- Lancaster wide sustainable transport improvements, including;
  - Cycle superhighway
  - High quality public transport route
  - Park and Ride
- Lancaster City Centre Movement and Public Realm Strategy;
- Traffic management measures to the north and south of the Lune; and
- Changes to other key corridors in the district.

5.3.9 The funding for the J33 link road scheme has been identified (HIF funding). However, the Highway Authority have set out that the remaining elements of the infrastructure required will need to be delivered through contributions secured from development. Given the scale of the measures necessary to support the local plan, it is appropriate that all development that comes forward should contribute in a fair and equitable manner towards the delivery of the infrastructure and associated measures. A wider strategy is being developed by the highway authority that incorporates the above, providing levels of contribution from all developments in Lancaster in an equitable and evidence based manner to support the Local Plan. The level of contribution required has not yet been provided by the Highway Authority. However, with regards to this development, it would not make the development acceptable in planning terms as it would not address the issues with regards to the existing highway constraints and issues highlighted above, and the development is therefore considered to have a severe impact on the local highway network.

5.3.10 In relation to sustainable travel, the Highway Authority has raised concerns regarding pedestrian linkage with the centre of Galgate. In particular, there is a lack of a suitable footway from the junction of Salford Road and Highland Brow to the junction of Salford Road and the A6. Sections of the existing footway provision are less than 1 metre in width and are therefore unsuitable to support all footway users. This footway is the only available route for pedestrians from the proposed development to access the local facilities, at a distance of approximately 1 km from the centre of the site, including shops, public house, primary school and bus stops. In addition, the Institute of Highways and Transportation guidance states that an 'acceptable' distance to schools and work is 1km, to town centres 400m and elsewhere 800m. With regard to public transport, the IHT advises that 400m is an acceptable walking distance to a bus stop. The site lies beyond acceptable walking distances to services, most notably bus services along the A6. The site layout has a single point of access on to Highland Brow for all modes and in effect prioritises vehicular traffic. It provides poor permeability for pedestrians within the site and to neighbouring residential areas. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF, which states development should prioritise walking and cycling, and to policy DM60, which seeks to ensure proposals can achieve sustainable travel patterns and policy DM6 which relates to the safety of pedestrians.

5.3.11 The cycling network in the vicinity of the site includes the on-road Sustrans route NCN 6. The route between the site and the services located within the village follows the line of NCN6 but is hazardous, particularly at the railway viaduct where on street parking exacerbates the issues of oncoming traffic and lack of road width. The canal towpath lies to the west of the site and is accessed via Ellet Hall Bridge. It is currently unsurfaced and is identified as an aspirational cycle route under Policy T2 of the SPLA DPD. The provision for cycling in the vicinity of the site is considered to be poor and the application does not propose any improvements to the local network as set out under Policy T2 and DM61 of the DM DPD. The Highway Authority have also advised that

suitable cycle storage needs to be provided for all dwellings in addition to electric vehicle changing points. The units which have garages would have sufficient space to store bicycles. Those without would need additional provision, such as a small shed and it is considered that this and the charging points could be covered by a condition. However, this does not overcome the concerns highlighted above regarding suitable sustainable travel links from the site, which is also one of the key growth principles for development in this area under policy SG1.

- 5.3.12 In relation to the Strategic Road Network, National Highways have advised that there is currently insufficient information to enable them to form a final view on the proposal. In particular, the Transport Assessment does not provide details on the existing situation or collision data in relation to the Strategic Road Network, namely Junction 33 of the M6 or the future traffic flows. They have advised that J33 of the M6 is a sensitive location and National Highways will need sufficient information to fully understand the impacts of the proposal given its proximity to the junction. The crossroads at Galgate experiences congestion at peak times that extends back towards the M6 J33 / A6 Hampson Green roundabout. They have requested evidence outlining the current conditions, for example site observations and traffic surveys including observed queues. In terms of safety, they have requested that the study area for collision analysis is updated to include the Preston Lancaster Road between the A6 / Stoney Lane / Salford Road junction and M6 J33. National Highways have also requested that the study area for Future Baseline Traffic Flows is updated to include J33 of the M6 and they have also advised that the capacity assessment years are not policy compliant and should cover a greater number of years. They have also set out that there are other committed developments within the area that have not been considered in the Transport Assessment that will add traffic to the A6.
- 5.3.13 National Highways originally raised a holding objection, requesting that the application was not determined until 29 September 2022 to allow for further information to be provided. This has now been extended until 29 November as no information has been provided. It is understood that further work is being prepared to address their comments, however there has been sufficient time since the original comments for this to be provided so it is considered appropriate to give a recommendation on the application, rather than delay it further to allow for the additional information when there are a number of other concerns regarding the proposal. Whilst National Highways have not raised an objection, that have been unable to reach a view on the impact on the Strategic Road Network. As such, this matter would also form part of the highway reason for refusal, as it is unclear at present if there would be a detrimental impact given the insufficient information. However, it is acknowledged that this element may be overcome through the submission of additional information. Clarification is being sought as to whether a formal notice needs to be served to the Secretary of State, given the holding objection, although it may not be necessary if the application is refused.
- 5.3.14 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would have a severe impact on the local highway network as a result in the increased traffic flows in an area that currently experiences capacity issues and high levels of congestion and is also constrained by on street parking. The scheme also provides poor permeability for pedestrians and fails to provide appropriate and safe cycle linkages to Galgate, in particular, or improvement to the wider cycle network. The submission also fails to provide sufficient information to allow the impact on the Strategic Road Network to be fully considered. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and the Development Plan, as discussed above. As set out above, some clarification has been sought from the Highway Authority about their particular concerns regarding the suitability of the proposed access, internal road and parking.
- 5.4 **Flood Risk and Drainage** NPPF paragraphs: 159-165, 167 and 169 (Planning and Flood Risk); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM35 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage); 152, 154, 159-167 and 169 (Flood Risk and Drainage); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment) and SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage) and DM35 (Water Supply and Waste Water)
- 5.4.1 A Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy have been submitted as part of the application. The site is located primarily in flood zone 1, and drains to the adjacent designated main river Ou Beck. However, the communities in this location were significantly affected by the flooding event on 22 November 2017 and development in this area may increase flood risk if not properly managed.

Paragraph 167 of the NPPF requires applicants to demonstrate, through a site-specific flood risk assessment, that:

- within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;
- the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;
- it incorporates sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
- any residual risk can be safely managed; and
- safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.

5.4.2 Both the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have raised an objection to the proposal and have advised that the FRA provided with the application is not acceptable and does not adequately assess the flood risks proposed by the development. The Environment Agency have advised that, in particular, the FRA fails to:

- Demonstrate how known flooding problems would be satisfactorily managed in order that risk of flooding is not exacerbated both on and off-site;
- Consider how a range of flooding events (including extreme events) will affect people and property and how people will be kept safe from the identified flood hazards, including consideration of safe access and egress routes.

5.4.3 The LLFA have set out that the FRA fails to: fully assess the risk of surface water flooding to the site; locate the most vulnerable development in the areas of lowest flood risk; demonstrate that the development proposal will not result in a flood risk within or outside the development; and demonstrate that residual risks can be safely managed. In relation to the first point, the submission states that *"the site is therefore not considered to be at significant risk of flooding from run-off from adjacent land"*. However, there is known to have been a significant issue historically on the site, resulting in the creation of a flood embankment/drain (identified as a culvert in the submission) to protect the adjacent properties on Meadow Park. This should be considered and fully assessed within the site-specific flood risk assessment.

5.4.4 The built development has been focussed on the low-lying area of the site, which is at high risk of surface water flooding, leaving the very low risk upper area as public open space. The current site-specific flood risk assessment does not provide overriding reasons to locate the most vulnerable development in this location, although it is likely that development has been avoided on the highest areas to reduce the overall landscape and visual impact. As set out in paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework, development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.

5.4.5 A large area at low to high risk of surface water flooding exists on the site. The submission has not assessed how displacement of this flood risk as a result of the proposed development may increase flood risk both on and off-site, nor has it been identified how this flood risk will be mitigated post-development. In addition, the submission states an intention to install a cut-off drain around the boundary of the site. The LLFA have advised that more information is needed with regards to this, to ensure that it is sized correctly to manage flows from outside the site boundary and to ensure that flows into Ou Beck are not increased. Currently, this drain has an unattenuated discharge to the beck, which may increase flood risk off-site.

5.4.6 In terms on managing residual risks, the submission proposes to locate the surface water attenuation (pond and storage tank) upslope of the majority of the development. This represents a significant residual risk should the capacity of these components be exceeded. These components should be located at the bottom of the site to reduce this risk, or an analysis of the exceedance of these components must be provided to show the flow paths, flood depths, velocities and extents for events exceeding the design 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Storm.

5.4.7 The LLFA have also raised several concerns with the proposed drainage strategy, in particular:

- The parameters used to calculate the greenfield runoff rate must be justified and the soil type of 0.45 (heavy clay) does not appear to be appropriate for the site, given the geologies identified through the site investigations as superficial sand/silt/gravel. Failure to select and

justify a parameter representative of the site may result in excessive discharge of surface water and may increase flood risk off-site.

- The proposed pond as part of the SuDS design needs to be clarified;
- The proposed SuDS does not provide multifunctional benefits, in line with the expectations set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Given the large, greenfield nature of the site and the discharge to a watercourse, a multifunctional SuDS, incorporating a treatment train for water quality and benefits for biodiversity and amenity would be expected;
- An urban creep allowance of 10% to be applied to all developments unless this will result in an impermeable area greater than 100%.
- Updated climate change allowances were published by the Environment Agency on 10 May 2022 to reflect the latest projections in UKCP Local (2.2km) and should be used in the assessment;
- A volumetric runoff coefficient of 1 should be applied when modelling impermeable areas. An appropriate contribution from permeable areas must also be considered and justified. The current contributing areas suggest that only impermeable areas will contribute to the drainage system, excluding the remaining permeable areas of the site. While these areas, such as gardens, roadside verges and areas of public open space, may not be positively drained, they may contribute indirectly to the drainage system.
- When modelling the SuDS, it must be ensured that a surcharged outfall is applied.

5.4.8 The submitted Flood Risk Assessment fails to comply with the requirements within the NPPF or the PPG. In addition to the above, neither the Flood Risk Assessment nor the Drainage Strategy refer to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) as required by policy DM33: Development and Flood Risk. The SFRA has recently been updated to address changes in flood modelling and the impacts of climate change as advised by the guidance. The Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 050 Reference ID: 7-050-20140306) states that local authorities and development should seek opportunities to reduce the overall flood risk in the area and beyond. Given the extensive recent flooding in this area, any development in this location should take the opportunity to incorporate measures to reduce flood risk both on and beyond the site. Overall, the submission fails to fully assess the flood risk at the site, demonstrate how known flooding problems would be satisfactorily managed and how the proposal would not result in a flood risk within or outside the development, locate the most vulnerable development in area at lowest flood risk, demonstrate that residual risks can be managed and consider how people will be kept safe from the identified flood hazards, including consideration of safe access and egress routes.

5.5 **Landscape Impact, Layout, Design and Open Space** NPPF paragraphs: 92-93, 98-100 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities including Open Space and Recreation), 126-134 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), 174 (Valued Landscapes and the Countryside); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD: SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment) and SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth) and EN3 (The Open Countryside); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM27 (Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities), DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM43 (Green Infrastructure), DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact) and DM57 (Health and Well-Being)

5.5.1 The site occupies a prominent location within the local area due to its elevated nature. The land rises significantly to the northeast corner of the site and forms part of a drumlin feature within the landscape. Following the commencement of the preparation of the AAP, the City Council commissioned landscape consultants to undertake a landscape assessment of the broad location for growth. A 'Bailrigg Garden Village Area Action Plan Landscape Sensitivity Assessment' study was completed in March 2021. This divided the broad location into compartments and considered the sensitivity of the landscape to both residential and commercial development. The application site is located in compartment LP5: Galgate South Western Fringe. The study concluded that the area had a low to moderate landscape sensitivity to residential development and noted that the parcel forms part of the wider drumlin landscape, characterised by two topographical high points at Highland Brow and Park Coppice. The location of these summits within the landscape parcel are viewed to be of increased sensitivity due to their localised visual prominence within the landscape. The study notes that any development in this location should be carefully designed to avoid the increased prominence of the built form and intervisibility as the topography rises towards the summit of Highland Brow.

5.5.2 In addition to the above study, a landscape and visual appraisal of the landscape masterplan

framework contained within the JTP Masterplan was also commissioned. This work was completed in September 2021. The report used the same compartments identified in the earlier sensitivity study. The study supported the conclusions of the Masterplan, noting that: the integration of a large tract of landscape buffer between the Garden Village and Galgate provides physical and visual separation from Galgate; the development proposals within in the Masterplan avoided the summit of Highland Brow to reduce intervisibility within the wider landscape; and that the proposed form and scale of agroforestry is consistent with the wider woodland blocks within the landscape parcel, including at Park Coppice. Whilst the exact boundaries of the green buffer between Galgate and the Garden Village are still to be defined, development at this location would clearly limit the extent of this buffer, the identification of which is supported by the AAP evidence base. Development at this location would as such be contrary to design principle 3 of the JTP Masterplan which seeks to secure large areas of landscape between the Garden Village and Galgate.

- 5.5.3 This is also consistent with the requirements of Policy SG1 and in particular, criteria 6 which sets out that the Council will look to create sufficient areas of high quality open spaces to provide a distinct sense of place and deliver a network of green corridors and walking and cycling routes across the South Lancaster area to the benefit of the local environment and residents. It goes on to state that the delivery of such spaces should make for distinct areas of separation between the new development and the urban edge of Lancaster, Bailrigg Village and Galgate and give the potential to bring forward a new country park.
- 5.5.4 The criteria for assessing landscape impacts are provided under Policy DM46 of the Development Management document which recognises that, in addition to nationally and locally designated landscapes, the district also has a range of landscapes and townscapes which are valued, unique and provide a direct sense of place, which the Council seeks to protect and enhance. The policy goes on to state that outside of protected and designated landscapes the Council will support development that is in scale and keeping with the landscape character and is appropriate to its surroundings in terms of siting, scale, massing, design, materials, external appearance and landscaping. The need to consider both the individual and cumulative impacts of a proposal are also noted.
- 5.5.5 The submitted layout for the proposed development has shown the highest areas of land proposed as public open space. It would appear that the site has been arranged in this way in order to reduce the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development. It is acknowledged that it will keep the built development off the highest area, although it is unclear how land levels are to be treated throughout the site. An existing topographical survey has been submitted but not proposed levels or sections and it is unclear at what level the dwellings to the east, in particular, will be located, in addition to the main road through the development and whether any retaining features are required.
- 5.5.6 By locating the majority of the dwellings to the west of the site, it has resulted in a cramped form of development with limited green and open space within the built form which leads to poor design and place making. On the entrance into the site the development is dominated by relatively closely spaced detached dwellings. Further into the site, the fronts of some properties are dominated by car parking, reducing any opportunity for green space and increased landscaping. The dwellings are also quite close to the site boundaries to the north and are two storey, whereas the adjacent dwellings are bungalows. Given the close proximity, it is likely that these will appear quite visually dominating in relation to the existing dwelling, particularly as there are some uncertainties regarding the finished floor levels. Whilst most of the garden spaces are 10 metres in length, or close to this, some of the smaller units would have quite narrow gardens (less than 50 square metres) which also gives the impression of a very cramped form of development. The development is also close to a belt of very tall trees along the canal and puts pressure on these as they will be quite dominating to the development.
- 5.5.7 In terms of the overall design of the dwellings, these are a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. The proposed materials are unclear in the submission, and clarification has been sought from the agent. However, as discussed above, the purpose of policy SG1 is to deliver a self-contained Garden Village, which focuses on high quality development that carefully balances housing and employment requirements, whilst maintaining strong and embedded environmental and high-quality design objectives. With the exception of one dwelling with a very steep pitch, the proposed housetypes are relatively simple with pitched roofs and projecting gables on some. However, these are quite bland and uninspiring and so not reflect the objective of achieving high-



quality urban design which promotes sustainable, attractive places to live, defining a sense of place and creates a sense of community for its new residents.

- 5.5.8 In terms of the open space, as set out above, this is focussed in the northeast corner of the site. Policy SC4 identifies a series of Green Space Networks that 'will be protected from development which would cause inappropriate harm and damage to their value and integrity'. The Lancaster Canal is one of the key Green Space Networks identified, which lies adjacent to the west of this site. Policy DM43 states that 'development proposals should seek to integrate green spaces and green corridors into development proposals and forge linkages with existing green space networks'. Policy T3 is specifically for development proposals which are adjacent to, or adjoining, the Lancaster Canal, in which a number of the issues highlighted relate to green and blue infrastructure. Given the proposal site is adjacent to the canal, the Council would expect development proposals to 'integrate the waterway, towpath and canal environment into the public realm in terms of design and management of the development' and 'enhance/improve the environmental quality and green infrastructure of the waterway corridor in that area, providing a net gain in biodiversity' in accordance with policy T3.
- 5.5.9 Policy DM27 sets out the planning policy position in relation to 'Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities' stating that 'development proposals located in areas of recognised open space, sports and recreational facility deficiency will be required to provide appropriate contributions toward open space, sports and recreational facility provision, either through provision on-site or a financial contribution toward the creation of new or the enhancement of existing open spaces, sports and recreational facilities off-site'. Whilst it is recognised that the development incorporates the provision of open space within its proposal, it is important that this is the type, amount and quality that is required. The detail on which is currently not clear within the proposal.
- 5.5.10 Some of the open space provision is likely to be required for ecological mitigation and so this needs to be carefully balanced alongside the recreational needs of the development. Whilst the Council actively encourage the value and benefits of multi-functional spaces, it is important that these are compatible. It appears that various reports in the submission are conflicting in how this land will be used or planted. It has been identified as meadow planting on the Landscaping Plan, but then the site plan within the Ecology Assessment refers to allotments and community gardens, whereas the Landscape Layout and Planning, Design and Access Statement indicate a proposed orchard. The Planning Advisory Note requires 2284.1m<sup>2</sup> of Amenity Space on site. This should be a mown informal space where young children could have a kick about Whilst the area of open space appears to significantly exceed this, as mentioned above, it is unclear how this land is intended to be used and more information is required to ascertain if it provides appropriate amenity space in addition to ecological mitigation and enhancements. The development is of an appropriate size that a play area and young person provisions would be required to be provided on site. Although there is a local area of play designated, this needs to be equipped and is lacking details.
- 5.5.11 All other requirements may require off site contribution. The maximum contribution possible would be £177,670.35 based on calculations using the Development Management DPD. The Lancaster Playing Pitch and Outdoor Strategy 2018 also identifies deficiencies as outlined below, which has been used to allocate the contributions:
- That two adult football pitches of standard quality which are available for community use. The pitches are currently overplayed and contribution would be used to improve pitch quality through more regular enhanced maintenance and remedial work in order to alleviate levels of overplay on the site.
  - The cricket square is of good quality, however there is a report for a need for fixed bay nets, a roll-on cage, another NTP and a bowling machine.
  - The bowling green requires improving from standard quality to good quality, requiring a contribution of £138,514.35
  - For the Parks and Gardens deficiency, a contribution of £39,156 towards Greaves Park which is within a 10 minute drive from the development is required. This would contribute towards tree planting and maintenance and improving and maintaining current assets

Policies DM43: Green Infrastructure and DM57: Health and Wellbeing set out the expectations that food growing spaces should be provided in new developments, as they are an important element of open space which provide a range of benefits for communities and the environment. The Council outlines expectations for food growing spaces which also include on-site composting as part of

PAN2—Encouraging the Growing of Food within New Development Planning Advisory Note. The Council would welcome sight of a complete planting plan and management plan in light of these conflicting proposals.

- 5.5.12 Overall it is considered that the proposal fails to create a high quality design, and overall sense of place, and would be contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and the Development Plan, and in particular the policies relating to the Broad Location of Growth. Whilst most of the development is located on the lower parts of the site, it is not fully clear how level changes will appearance of the site or how the open spec is proposed to be used. Therefore, it is considered that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the development would be appropriately integrated into the landscape and would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- 5.6 **Residential Amenity** NPPF paragraphs: 92 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities), 130 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), 183-189 (Noise and Pollution); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), and DM57 (Health and Well-Being).
- 5.6.1 The southern site boundary adjoins the rear gardens of a number of residential properties which front onto Meadow Park to the south. A row of dwellings is proposed along the southern boundary and the rear gardens will join those of the existing properties. The distance between the rear wall of the proposed dwellings and the boundary is between approximately 10 metres and 13 metres, with the distance from the rear wall of the existing properties between approximately 19.5 and 21 metres. The adjacent properties to the south comprise bungalows, with the exception of the one fronting Highland Brow, whereas the proposed dwellings are two storey. The land also rises quite quickly at the rear of some of the properties and it is not clear from the submission at what level the dwellings would be sited in relation to existing ground levels or the adjacent development.
- 5.6.2 Policy DM29 sets out that development should ensure that there is no significant detrimental impact to amenity in relation to overshadowing, visual amenity, privacy, overlooking, massing and pollution. The supporting text to this sets out that there should normally be at least 21 metres between dwellings where windows of habitable rooms face each other and for every half-metre change in levels between properties, a further 1 metre separation should be provided. It also sets out that rear gardens should look to achieve at least 10 metres in depth, unless there are overriding design reasons to justify a reduced depth, providing that neighbouring private amenity open space will not be overlooked. Given the proximity to the boundary and the neighbouring dwellings, it is considered that the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of these properties and result in a loss of privacy. The separation distance between the dwellings in many instances is too little to ensure that privacy is maintained and the development would also result in significant overlooking to rear garden areas, many of which currently appear to be very private at present. To overcome this, it would be expected that a significant gap is created in order to protect the existing amenity currently afforded by the occupiers. This would also help to retain the existing landscaping along the rear boundary of some of the residential properties.
- 5.6.3 In terms of the amenity of the future occupants, this is less likely to be overlooked from the existing dwellings as these are bungalows, although several do have dormer windows, so there is likely to be a degree of mutual overlooking. Separation distances within the site, between the proposed dwellings, appear to be acceptable and provide an acceptable level of amenity. Most gardens are 10 metres in depth, although some of the smaller units are below the 50 square metres which is set out in the supporting text to Policy DM29, although this has been considered above in terms of the overall design.
- 5.6.4 The site is relatively close to the railway line, approximately 45 metres at its closest point, and therefore there is potential for noise and vibration impacts to future occupants. A noise assessment has been submitted with the application. This sets out that, from the railway noise results in the report, the internal noise level criteria shown will be achieved with the fitting of standard thermal double glazing and standard non-acoustic trickle vents for the vast majority of dwellings on the site. It goes on to say that it is generally accepted that a partially open window will reduce the external noise level by 10-15dB(A) and therefore, for all living rooms and the majority of bedrooms on the development, the BS 8233 recommended noise levels will also be met with windows open. However, to ensure night-time maximum noise levels are not exceeded for dwellings closest to Highland Brow, acoustic vents are recommended. It also sets out that the low level of predicted daytime railway

noise of 46 dB LAeq,16h for the dwellings closest to Highland Brow and 39 dB LAeq,16h for the dwellings at the eastern boundary of the site means that noise in private rear gardens will be well within the BS 8233 criteria and therefore, no noise mitigation measures are necessary for gardens. It therefore appears that there would not be a detrimental impact on residential amenity as a result of railway noise provided that mitigation is secured. Comments are still awaited from Environmental Health, and should hopefully be provided in an update at the Committee meeting.

5.7 **Biodiversity and Trees (NPPF paragraphs: 174 and 179-182 (Habitats and biodiversity); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment, SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth) and EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM43 (Green Infrastructure), DM44 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity) and DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland).**

5.7.1 The site is located approximately 1.7 kilometres from the Lune Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is also covered by the Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site. Natural England has provided comments in relation to the designated sites and have advised that the LPA, as a competent authority under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations, should have regard for any potential impacts. It therefore needs to be determined whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the designated areas, proceeding to the Appropriate Assessment stage where significant effects cannot be ruled out.

5.7.2 Natural England have advised that there is currently insufficient information provided with the application to determine whether the likelihood of significant effects can be ruled out. They have advised that additional information is requested to help undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The submitted Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment sets out that surface water runoff will be discharged into Ou Beck via an existing watercourse. Natural England have identified a hydrological connection from the development site to Morecambe Bay and advise that further details are provided of how surface water drainage will be managed during the construction and operation phase, with mitigation suggested where any impacts are identified. This is to ensure there are no adverse effects via water quality on the above designated sites. They have also advised that the development is likely to result in increased recreational pressure on the Morecambe Bay designated sites (and potentially on functionally linked land), resulting in an increase in trampling, visual and noise disturbance and displacement effects. This impact should be assessed through the HRA and any mitigation measures identified and assessed within an Appropriate Assessment if required.

5.7.3 Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) provide ecological advice for the LPA and have included comments in relation to the designated sites. Whilst Natural England have not raised any concerns regarding the use of the site by birds associated with the SPA, this has been raised by other consultees and would be to be considered in the LPA's HRA. GMEU have advised that they have carried out extensive bird surveys of the site and the surrounding area over a number of years. While small numbers of notable bird species have been recorded on the site (most notably, Lapwing) both during the winter months and during the breeding season, it is considered that the application site does not act as functionally linked to the designated sites. That is, loss of the site will not affect the conservation status of the notable bird species associated with the protected sites.

5.7.4 In relation to potentially impact as a result of recreational disturbance, it is noted that the site is not directly connected to the Bay, but it does seem likely that new residents will be attracted to the nearby coastline for recreation, and therefore measures should be required to mitigate for this impact. The public open space provided as part of the development may help to reduce the need for outdoor recreation away from the development. However, it is recommended that new residents are provided with information about the importance of the coastline for birds, and the need to avoid disturbing birds on visits to the coastline. This can be in the form of homeowner packs and/ or information boards and covered by a condition. Therefore, with mitigation, this impact could be addressed.

5.7.5 In relation to the hydrological connectivity between the site and the Bay, GMEU have advised that there are well-established mitigation measures which could be employed to avoid any water pollution impacts. They have recommended that a Construction Environmental Method Statement is required to be prepared for the development which would include details of measures to be taken to avoid pollution of the Ou Brook and the Canal. However, this would not appear to address drainage during

the operation stage of the development. As discussed in the section above, in relation to flood risk and drainage, the submission is currently unacceptable. As such, there is not a scheme available that shows how the site would be appropriately drainage and, as such, a conclusion cannot currently be reached that there would not be likely significant effects to the designated sites at this stage.

- 5.7.6 The site is also immediately adjacent to the Lancaster Canal Biological Heritage Site (BHS), a locally designated nature conservation site. The proposed site layout shows a buffer zone of existing trees between the built development and the Canal which should mitigate for some disturbance effects during any construction period, and providing that measures are taken to avoid water pollution, it is considered that the development would not cause substantive harm to the BHS.
- 5.7.7 The response from GMEU sets out that the site is dominated by species-poor agricultural land, but there are some higher value locally important habitats on the site, including a pond, hedgerows, a watercourse and trees. The submitted ecology reports show that all or parts of these habitats will be retained on site, and/or replaced and enhanced. However, there do appear to be discrepancies between the recommendations made in the ecology reports, the outline Landscape plans and the Arboricultural assessment. In the Arboricultural assessment, hedgerows 11H and 17H are shown as being removed, however the Ecology report recommends that the hedgerows are retained to maintain connectivity through the site. The retention of 17H is particularly important because it would provide a corridor for the movement of amphibians and reptiles, as well as other wildlife. This is along the northern boundary and therefore there does not appear to be a strong justification for its removal. 11H Crosses the site in a north/south direction and most of this could not be retained in relation to the current proposal, although it would be possible to retain part of this and more if the layout was altered.
- 5.7.8 A section of the hedgerow along the boundary with Highland Brow would require removal to accommodate the access, visibility splays and single dwelling on the frontage. It is possible that more of the hedgerow along Highland Brow would need to be removed to allow for this than is currently shown in the plans. GMEU have advised that, if this is necessary, replanting of a hedgerow should be required further back into the site to retain as much of the habitat as possible. Proposals to retain and enhance the pond on the site and its surroundings, to plant more trees and shrubs and to create more species-rich grassland are supported. GMEU have advised that a long-term Landscape and Ecological Management Plan should be required to be prepared for the site.
- 5.7.9 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has also provided further advise in relation to trees and hedgerows. The woodland bordering Lancaster canal appears to be of notable age and is clearly shown on the OS map published in 1848 (OS Lancashire Sheet 24), surveyed between 1844 and 1845, indicating that the area has been wooded for over 170 years. The hedgerows, which are a prominent feature of the site, appear to have been developed later, with the field system modified between 1845 and 1890. Whilst this would suggest that the hedgerows are not 'important' historically, the ecological appraisal identifies the western boundary as 'important', as defined by the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, satisfying the wildlife/landscape criteria. The Arboricultural Implications Assessment identifies a total of 16 individual trees, seven groups and three hedgerows located around the perimeter of the two fields. The existing trees and hedgerows contribute to the rural character of the area, providing important habitat corridors across the site and the wider landscape. All are clearly visible to residents and those accessing the local area along Highland Brow and Lancaster canal.
- 5.7.10 To construct the development, the AIA states that two hedgerows (11H and 17H) will require complete removal along with the partial removal of 1H. In addition, the AIA recommends that three ash trees (18T-20T) require removal due to the presence of ash dieback. A conflict between the development and the RPA of one tree (16T) is also noted due to the proximity of the adjacent plot. Further, whilst ash dieback is present, it is not clear why all three ash trees require removal, 19T has minimal signs of ash dieback.
- 5.7.11 Details of landscaping are limited to indictive planting locations. The landscape layout plan shows that the north east of the site will remain undeveloped, with existing vegetation retained, a native hedgerow planted around the perimeter, and individual trees planted. A large orchard is also shown adjacent to the site entrance. The northern boundary is to be buffered with native woodland planting. Street trees are depicted along the main access road, with scattered roadside planting in the remainder of the site. Except for the street trees, no other hedgerow or tree planting is shown within

the site. No planting is shown along the western boundary with the existing woodland.

- 5.7.12 A high-quality landscaping plan is required which clearly shows how the current character of the site will be retained/enhanced. As noted in the ecological assessment, the scheme should maximise green infrastructure and green links through the site. Internal planting is currently limited to street trees which appear to be planted within the small green spaces to the front of properties. The internal layout should be landscape led, creating a place for people and wildlife rather than buildings. This links into concerns highlighted in the earlier section with regards to the overall design and layout of the scheme. As noted in the ecological assessment, and highlighted in the concerns from GMEU, existing trees and hedgerows should be retained, which includes the retention of the standard trees along the northern boundary. It is also considered that the important habitat along the western boundary should be enhanced, increasing its biodiversity value and buffering it from the development. This will require changes to the layout, moving the access road and drainage. These are particularly tall trees, and although there is a separation from the housing, there may be pressure for their removal in the future.
- 5.7.13 The most notable species associated with the site are birds, amphibians and reptiles. As set out above, a small number of Lapwing have been recorded on the site in both summer and winter. GMEU have also advised that, also present in the breeding season were Tree Sparrows, Lesser Redpoll, Starling and Dunnock. All of these latter species are associated with hedgerows and tree lines which will be retained or replaced, including the Ou Beck corridor and along the Canal. It will not be possible to mitigate for the loss of Lapwing habitats within the site, since this species requires open undisturbed grassland. The fields to the north are well used by Lapwing, and there is likely to be sufficient alternative habitat available in the surrounding area to accommodate the small number of Lapwings which may be displaced from the application site.
- 5.7.14 The pond on the site has been shown to support a small population of the protected species great crested newts. The pond and immediately surrounding habitat are to be retained and improved, but currently hedgerows (particularly 17H) of value to amphibians are shown as being removed. This will result in a direct loss of habitat suitable for use by great crested newts, and a loss of a valuable movement corridor. If 17H were to be retained, GMEU have advised that they would consider that the proposal would conserve the great crested newt population, providing that precautionary measures are implemented during any ground clearance and construction works to avoid any direct harm to newts. A comprehensive method statement must be prepared giving full details of the measures to be taken to avoid harm to amphibians. This method statement will also benefit reptiles, which are considered in more detail below. A License will need to be obtained from Natural England before any works which could affect great crested newts can commence. Obtaining this License is separate from any grant of planning permission.
- 5.7.15 Otters are known to use the Canal, but the site itself is of very limited value for otters because it is so open. Providing that the landscape buffer zone between the development and the Canal is retained and protected, it is unlikely that the proposals will cause any harm to otters. A (dead) Slow Worm was recorded within 10 metres of the site in May 2022, along the eastern roadside along Highland Brow, possibly a road casualty. The application site supports habitat which is largely hostile to slow worms, so it is most likely that the slow worm population is associated with the land to the east of the site where the habitat is much more suitable for the species. However, slow worms could make use of the pond area and the boundary hedgerows on the site, including the hedgerow along Highland Brow which will need to be partly removed to facilitate access to the development. Slow worms could therefore be harmed during site clearance and construction work. Post-development, providing that hedgerows and the areas around the pond are retained or replaced, the more complex site which would result would be able to support slow worms. The species is often associated with urban areas and can use suburban gardens. To protect slow worms, it is recommended that a method statement is prepared giving details of the measures to be taken during vegetation clearance, groundworks and construction to avoid any possible harm to slow worms. Biodiversity enhancement measures proposed for the site must also include proposals which would be of benefit to slow worms.
- 5.7.16 It is also advised that no tree felling, vegetation clearance or groundworks required to facilitate the scheme should be undertaken during the optimum time of year for bird nesting (March to August inclusive) unless nesting birds have been shown to be absent by a suitably qualified person. Trees which may need to be removed should be checked for the possible presence of bats prior to any tree works commencing.

5.7.17 In relation to biodiversity net gain, the submission does not include a metric to measure the losses/gains to biodiversity which may be associated with the development. Such metrics are not compulsory, but they do provide an objective measure of whether a development can provide a net gain in biodiversity, as is strongly encouraged by the NPPF and by Local Policy. GMEU have advised that a metric should be used in this case to properly demonstrate losses and gains. They have gone on to say that the application will result in the loss of a relatively extensive area of a low value habitat (arable land) and proposes some habitat enhancements, including new grassland creation and new tree and shrub planting and advised that the site would benefit from the installation of bird nesting and bat roosting boxes. They have also advised that a comprehensive Landscape and Ecology Management Plan should be prepared for the development, which can be covered by condition. Policy DM44 sets out that there should, as a principle, be a net gain of biodiversity assets wherever possible but does not set out an amount or a requirement to measure this. As such, given the existing low value of the land, with the exception of the linear features, and the opportunities to provide enhancements within the site, it is considered that the lack of a detailed assessment of net gain would not be a sufficient reason to refuse the application.

5.7.18 As set out above, it is considered that likely impacts to the environmentally designated sites cannot currently be ruled out due to potential impacts from the drainage of the development, particularly given that there has not been an acceptable drainage scheme submitted. In addition, there are contradictions within the submitted reports with regards to the removal of trees and hedgerows and it would appear that the scheme involves the removal of a hedgerow which provides important habitat and wildlife corridor for amphibians and reptiles in particular, but also other wildlife, and would therefore be likely to have an adverse impact on these species and the overall biodiversity of the site. There are also concerns regarding pressure that the development would place on important trees, for both biodiversity and amenity value, along the western boundary and it is considered that a greater buffer is required. The proposal is therefore currently not acceptable in terms of its likely impact on biodiversity and trees and is therefore contrary to both National and Local Plan policies.

5.8 **Affordable housing, housing standards and mix** NPPF: paragraphs 62 and 63 and 78 (housing needs and affordable housing); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy: SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth) Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM1 (Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs), DM2 (Housing Standards) and DM3 (The Delivery of Affordable Housing).

5.8.1 Policy DM3 sets out the requirements for affordable housing and that 30% affordable housing will be required on site on greenfield sites, for 15 units and over. It requires that the tenure is split into 50/60% affordable/social rent and 50/40% intermediate tenure. However, since the plan was adopted, the Government has introduced a requirement for 25% of affordable homes to be provided as First Homes. These are homes are discounted by 30%, sold to first time buyers and secured by a S106 Agreement. Until such time the affordable housing tenure mix is amended in the local plan, the PPG provides a tenure split which will result as follows: 25% First Homes, 37.5% shared ownership and 37.5% social/affordable rented. The SHMA identifies the affordable housing need and table 4.1 of the DMDPD provides an indicative mix as follows:

Property Type	Affordable %
House (2 bed)	30
House (3 bed)	20
House (4+ bed)	5
Bungalow	10
Flat/apartment (may include 1 bedroom house)	35

5.8.2 The submission sets out that 35 affordable units are proposed, although it lacks details in relation to the type, tenure and location within the site. This would equate to 30% affordable housing. In the most recent site plan, it appears that the sizes and house types for the affordable units have been set out as the list has been split into two sections, although it is not clear and clarification has been sought from the agent. The first list gives a total of 34, which is one less than the amount set out elsewhere in the submission. Working on the basis that this first list relates to the affordable units, the scheme proposes 16 two bedroom units (47%) and 18 three bedroom units (53%) and includes no bungalows or apartments. It would therefore fail to comply with the indicative mix set out above.

5.8.3 Policy DM3 also requires that affordable housing is integrated in the design of development and policy DM1 promotes balanced communities. The Meeting Housing Need SPD explains this requirement and advises that affordable housing should be ‘pepper potted’ throughout a development in groups of no more and 3 or 4. Housing should be designed so that both the external appearance and associated space such as parking does not define the affordable homes. The application does not indicate which houses are intended to be provided as affordable homes. However, it appears that the majority are likely to be located together along a cul-de-sac with car parking in front. This layout does not integrate the affordable housing into the development but forms a large group resulting on an area which would result in segregation contrary to policy DM3.

5.8.4 Policy DM1 seeks to ensure that new development promotes balanced communities and meets evidenced housing need in accordance with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The SHMA identifies a need for a range of house sizes, including smaller homes, this is carried forward into table 4.1 of the DMDPD, as follows:

Property Type	Market %
House (2 bed)	20
House (3 bed)	35
House (4+ bed)	25
Bungalow	10
Flat/apartment (may include 1 bedroom house)	10

5.8.5 From the details contained on the site plan, it would appear that the open market houses would comprise 18 three bedroom units (22%) and 63 four bedroom units (78%) and there are no bungalows or apartments proposed. It is therefore considered that the proposal fails to provide an appropriate mix of dwellings, with a predominance of four bedroom units.

5.8.6 Policy DM2 adopts the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) for all new dwellings and requires that 20% of new dwellings meet Building Regulations Requirement (M4(2) in relation to accessible and adaptable Dwellings. Amended plans were received which changed some of the house types as it was queried that the details provided did not fully correspond to the submitted layout plan. Of those now currently proposed, none of the two or three bedroom units appear to meet the overall internal floor space required by NDSS. The largest one of these (Acacia) appears to be slightly small for the number of people. In addition, three of the four bedroom units (Cypress, Hawthorn and Walnut) also appear to fall below the overall space required for the number of people that could be accommodated, indicated by the size of the bedrooms (whether double or single). In addition, two of the larger four bedroom units appear to have double bedrooms that fall below what is required by the space standards (Hornbeam and Willow). Therefore, it appears that only two of the house types comply with the requirements of the NDSS (Foxglove and Hazel) and the submission does not confirm or provide the information necessary to determine if 20% of the new dwellings meet the M4(2) requirement. The dwelling designs are therefore contrary to the requirements within policy DM2.

5.8.7 In addition to the Development management policies discussed above, one of the Growth Principles in policy SG1 relates to delivering a wide range of market and affordable housing, in terms of type and tenure to ensure that opportunities to live in the Garden Village are available to all sections of the community and contribute significantly to the creation of cohesive, balanced communities and thereby assist the district in meeting its evidenced housing needs within the Local Plan period. As set out above, the proposal fails to provide affordable and open market housing in line with the identified housing needs within the District, does not appropriately integrate the affordable housing into the development, fails to provide dwellings of an appropriate standard, compliant with the NDSS, and fails to demonstrate that 20% will meet the M4(2) requirement of being accessible and adaptable dwellings.

5.9 **Air Quality** NPPF paragraphs 186 (Ground Conditions and Pollution); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth) and EN9 (Air Quality Management Areas); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM31 (Air quality management and Pollution) and DM57 (Health and Wellbeing)

- 5.9.1 The crossroads within Galgate are designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and the site is located approximately 600 metres from this. The road used to access the site joins the crossroads so there are potential implications from the proposed development. There is also the potential for the development to impact on the Lancaster City Centre AQMA. Policy DM31 sets out that all development proposals must demonstrate that they have sought to minimise the levels of air polluting emissions generated and adequately protect their new users, and existing users, from the effects of poor air quality. It goes on to say that any development which has the potential to, individually or cumulatively, contribute to increasing levels of air pollution, will be required to demonstrate how either on-site or off-site mitigation measures will be put in place to reduce the air quality impact.
- 5.9.2 An air quality assessment has been submitted with the application. During construction, mitigation measures are recommended to reduce the risk of dust and particulate matter being generated and re-suspended. It sets out that, with implementation of the appropriate measures, no significant impacts are anticipated during the construction phase. It also concludes that the development is likely to have an insignificant impact on air quality at existing and proposed sensitive receptors once it is operational, such that the impacts can be considered insignificant. The Air Quality Officer has confirmed agreement with the broad conclusions of the air quality assessment. It is noted that the assessment indicates that around 212 additional light duty vehicle (LDV) trips would pass through the Galgate AQMA on a daily basis. The Air Quality Officer has set out that it would be anticipated that at least a similar amount would head towards Lancaster and potentially contribute to the impacts on the city centre/ Lancaster City Centre AQMA and these impacts have not been considered in the assessment. Air quality in Lancaster city centre is still indicated to be in breach of the annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide.
- 5.9.3 The Air Quality Officer has advised that, given the contributory air quality impacts on both the Galgate and Lancaster AQMAs from the proposal, a high level of mitigation should be provided. It is recommended that a 7KW electric vehicle charger should be provided for every dwelling unit but also suggested that measures are sought to facilitate the use of low emission approaches and could include:
- operation of a low emissions car club at the development site;
  - provision of facilities and infrastructure to promote cycling and walking;
  - measures to promote the use of public transport e.g. free bus use for future development occupiers;
  - any other measures to reduce polluting emissions, particularly associated with transport.

It is considered that measures to address air quality could be agreed through a planning condition or agreement. However, it should be acknowledged that additional facilities and infrastructure to promote cycling and walking would be limited without changes to the layout, in addition to changes to the wider highway network.

5.10 **Education and Health NPPF paragraphs: 93 and 95 (Services and School Places); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth), SG3 (Infrastructure Delivery for Growth in South Lancaster); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM57 (Health and Wellbeing) and DM58 (Infrastructure Delivery and Funding)**

5.10.1 Lancashire County Council Schools Planning Team have requested financial contributions for 26 primary school places and 13 secondary school places on lack of infrastructure provision grounds. They have advised that the scale of the development means it is likely that the primary places required to mitigate the development will be provided at the new primary school (Land NE Bailrigg Lane) and secondary places required to mitigate the development will be provided at the proposed new secondary school site within the Garden Village. They have therefore applied a 'New Build Cost Per Place in line with LCC's Education Contribution Methodology and DfE guidance which equates to £554,918 for primary places and £335,972 for secondary places, although this could increase due to a number of applications that are pending decision.

5.10.2 In addition to the above, Policy SG3 sets out infrastructure that would be required to support development in this area, covered by Policy SG1. This includes the delivery of sufficient education places at both a primary and secondary school. The Schools Planning Team has set out that a primary and secondary school site requirement has been identified as part of the Local Plan where the local planning authority have identified a number of housing developments which should be



treated collectively as a strategic site. Where a number of small developments are expected to come forward in an area with an aggregated requirement for a new school or additional school land, Lancashire County Council would expect the LPA to set out their expectations for strategic sites in their Local Plan and assist in the negotiations to secure a school site or additional school land to accommodate the collective impact of the applications. Where the demand is generated by more than one development or phase, it may be that one developer would be required to provide the school land to address the collective demand. This would require applicants to provide a contribution towards the cost of the school site land, proportionate to the size of their development. Lancashire County Council would seek to work with the LPA to ensure that such equalisation arrangements are established prior to the approval of any of the developments affected to ensure that the development 'hosting' a new school or providing additional school land is not disadvantaged.

- 5.10.3 The Schools Planning Team have advised that, as planning applications have been submitted prior to the adoption of the AAP there needs to be a clear position on school land provision. There is currently no detail provided within the application regarding how either school site will be secured and provided. Without confirmation of the mechanism for the provision of the required school land it is not clear that this development is sustainable and the Schools planning team have objected to the proposal. Policy SG1 is clear that development would only be permitted in advance of the AAP if it would be no prejudice to the delivery of the wider Garden Village, including its infrastructure requirement. Given that there is currently no mechanism to secure a school site or contributions towards this, as it would be investigated in more detail through the AAP, the current proposal would therefore fail to comply with this requirement of Policy SG1 as it would potentially undermine the delivery of the school infrastructure required to support development in this area, covered by policy SG3.
- 5.10.4 The response from the NHS sets out that the proposal will generate approximately 355 new patient registrations based on average household size of 2.4. The site falls within the catchment area of Lancaster Medical Practice (Galgate HC) and they have advised that this need can only be met through the development of a new practice premises in order to ensure sustainable general practice. However, the response goes on to say that the growth generated from this proposed development would not trigger consideration of the commissioning of a new general practice but would trigger a requirement to support the practice to understand how the growth in the population would be accommodated and therefore premises options and a figure of £81,771 has been requested. However, the response also sets out that the physical constraints of the existing site means that the current premises cannot be extended and opportunities to re-configure existing space to accommodate current growth have already been undertaken. Therefore, it is not clear how the requested contribution would be used and, with a lack of evidence to support this request, it is considered that it fails to meet the requirements of the CIL regulation tests and could not therefore be requested at this time.
- 5.11 **Sustainable Design and Renewable Energy** NPPF paragraphs: 126 (Achieving Well-Designed Places) and 154 -155 and 157 (Planning for Climate Change); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM30 (Sustainable Design) and DM53 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation)
- 5.11.1 In the context of the climate change emergency that was declared by Lancaster City Council in January 2019, the effects of climate change arising from new/ additional development in the District and the possible associated mitigation measures will be a significant consideration in the assessment of the proposals. The Council is committed to reducing its own carbon emissions to net zero by 2030 while supporting the district in reaching net zero within the same time frame. Buildings delivered today must not only contribute to mitigating emissions, they must also be adaptable to the impacts of the climate crisis and support resilient communities. One of the Key Growth Principles, set out in Policy SG1, relates to taking proper account of the need to design new development to minimise its contribution to, and the impacts of, Climate Change and to ensure that new development is resilient and adaptable to the effects of Climate Change.
- 5.11.2 The development as proposed will not be close to net zero for regulated energy associated CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions or embodied carbon. The proposal will therefore contribute to worsening carbon emissions in the district not only at the point of build but also, given the nature of the energy strategy, the buildings will continue to contribute to CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions over the lifetime of the buildings. The

Council would welcome the design of the build to facilitate the transition to net zero and for it to be outlined how this could be achieved at the site even if the buildings are not net zero from the beginning.

5.11.3 One of the primary areas for emissions reductions for development in supporting the transition to net zero is in building to high fabric standards and supplying the new buildings with renewable and low carbon energy. This is highlighted in the Local Plan in policies DM29: Key Design Principles and DM30: Sustainable Design and supported by PAN9 – Energy Efficiency in new Development Planning Advisory Note. These policies and Planning Advice Note have not been applied in the design of the development to the extent where they can be said to be incorporated to their fullest. DM30: Sustainable Design clearly outlines expectations for sustainable development. The policy outlines:

- Measures to reduce energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions, and water consumption;
- Opportunities for energy supply from on-site, decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy systems;
- Opportunities to contribute to local and community-led energy initiatives;
- Account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy, water consumption and water efficiency measures;
- Use of materials that reduce energy demand (for example, insulation) and increase the energy efficiency of the building/development; and
- The reuse of existing resources (including the conversion of existing buildings) where this would be 'fit for purpose'.

5.11.4 The proposed development will include gas boilers. With the phase out of gas boilers across the UK, the homes will need to be retrofitted for renewable/low carbon thermal energy provision within the building's lifespans. The supporting text to Policy DM53 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation (para 13.13) of the adopted Local Plan encourages developments to connect to a heat network or be heat network ready. Related to the thermal energy provision of the properties, Policy T3: Lancaster Canal VIII outlines that proposals should "Seek to maximise opportunities for reducing carbon emissions and building resilience, in particular investigating the potential for using the canal in relation to heating and cooling within new development." The Energy Statement does not address these issues. This may be a valuable addition to the development, particularly in light that the proposed development will be fitted with gas boilers, meaning the homes may be expensive to retrofit with heat pumps following gas boiler phase out from 2035. The proposed footprint of many of the properties may mean that there is not sufficient space to accommodate for the additional water tanks, pipework and fittings required with heat pumps making the properties also potentially technically difficult to retrofit particularly with a low temperature heating system. This may make connection to a district heating system necessary. The Council however does welcome that the proposed heating is a wet heating system.

5.11.5 In relation to renewable energy, and particularly Policy DM30, it is not clear how they will be incorporated, if at all. It is also not clear if the design of the build is such that they can be supported to allow for future fitting by homeowners should it be the case that renewable energy provision is not envisioned as being included as part of the build. It is not clear if EV charging points are proposed although they could be covered by a condition and are now required by Building Regulations. The application outlines that the building will result in a 20.0% reduction in CO2 against Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations. However, in terms of meeting the aims of reaching net zero in less than eight years, in line with net zero ambitions of the District, it would be welcome to have a clear decarbonisation pathway for the buildings should they not be net zero from day one. The application does not address emissions reductions in terms of full operational emissions of the site. Nor is it clear if embodied carbon and life cycle emissions have been taken into account and if the applicant has sought to reduce them. The 2021 Building Regulations are now in force which will require additional energy efficiency measures, ventilation and overheating measures. The Energy Statement should therefore be updated to meet these requirements as a minimum and provide for enhancements beyond the regulations. The 2021 Building Regulations are likely to result in changes to design and these should also be addressed within the scheme.

5.11.6 It is acknowledged that Policy DM30 only requires high standards of design to be encouraged, however, this is also a key consideration of the Broad Location for Growth. It is therefore expected that any development within this would ensure that development is designed to minimise its

contribution to climate change. As set out above, the current scheme fails to do this. It is considered that this links to the overall design concerns as set out in the separate section above, in addition to the requirements for development if to come forward within the Broad Location for Growth prior to the adoption of the AAP.

## **5.12 Mineral safeguarding NPPF paragraphs: 219-204 (Facilitating the Sustainable use of Minerals); Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policy: M2 (Safeguarding Minerals)**

5.12.1 The site is partly located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area as identified by Lancashire County Council and considered within the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Policy M2 sets out that planning permission will not be supported for any form of development that is incompatible with working the minerals, unless the applicant can demonstrate that:

- The mineral concerned is no longer of any value or has been fully extracted.
- The full extent of the mineral can be extracted satisfactorily prior to the incompatible development taking place.
- The incompatible development is of a temporary nature and can be completed and the site returned to its original condition prior to the minerals being worked.
- There is an overarching need for the incompatible development that outweighs the need to avoid the sterilisation of the mineral resource
- That prior extraction of minerals is not feasible due to the depth of the deposit.
- Extraction would lead to land stability problems.

5.12.2 The submission includes a desk-based mineral assessment report. This sets out that a review of the site history has confirmed that the site has remained in agricultural usage throughout its entire history. Clay pits were noted along the northern boundary of the site and within the north eastern corner of the site although this pit was never formally noted to be a clay pit. The clay pit located along the northern boundary was later utilised as a pond. The western portion of the site is located within a designated mineral safeguarding area and relates to sand and gravel deposits. The site is located within a MSA that relates to shallow sand and gravel deposits. A desk study and intrusive investigation have confirmed historical extraction within the north of the site at the beginning of the 20th century, however, this relates to the former clay pits and there is no evidence for the extraction of the granular terrace and sub-alluvial deposits. The report concludes that intrusive investigations have proven that no superficial deposits have been identified that may have significant economic value. And that the development would not impact or sterilise of mineral deposits of economic value.

## **6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance**

6.1 The site is located within the Broad Area of Growth within the Local Plan in relation to the Garden Village. The site is not allocated for housing and formal land allocations will only be known once the Area Action Plan for Lancaster South is adopted. As this is currently being prepared, Policy SG1 envisages the submission of planning applications by applicants prior to the Area Action Plan. The Policy sets out criteria for any applications that are submitted during this pre-Area Action plan period. SG1 contains 15 Key Growth Principles that all development should adhere to. In addition to these, SG1 also says the following:

*“Development within the broad location for growth in advance of the Lancaster South Area Action Plan DPD will be permitted provided that:*

- 1. There would be no prejudice to the delivery of the wider Bailrigg Garden Village (including its infrastructure requirements) and would not undermine the integrated and co-ordinated approach to the wider Bailrigg Garden Village development; and*
- 2. That the development would conform with and further the Key Growth Principles described in Policy SG1; and*
- 3. That the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been fully considered and that the residual impacts upon the transport network will not be severe”.*

6.2 All three of these caveats represent a ‘high bar’ that need to be satisfied if development is to be considered favourably. The high bar is worded this way to ensure that no development is able to avoid contributing to infrastructure and be of a manner that would not be conducive to the design principles that have been established in Lancaster South. In addition to SG1, Policy SG3 provides additional weight. It says that the Council “will not permit piecemeal development in this area which does not seek to address matters of strategic infrastructure in accordance with the expectations of

Policy SG1 of this DPD”

- 6.3 Whilst the development is located adjacent the existing edge of Galgate, it does raise significant concerns in relation the impact on the local highway network and flood risk/ drainage in particular. The impacts on the highway network in particular are unlikely to be resolvable given the existing highway capacity issues within Galgate which will be exacerbated by the traffic associated with the proposed development. Highway implications and sustainable transport are one of the key considerations of Policies SG1 and SG3
- 6.4 Notwithstanding the 5-year land supply position, which remains a significant consideration until the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill reaches a far-more advanced stage, the proposal is considered to be of a very poor in form and layout, will have a detrimental impact on residential amenity, biodiversity and the highway network, fails to provide appropriate cycling and pedestrian links, does not adequately address flooding and drainage and fails to provide an appropriate housing mix to an appropriate standard. It also fails to adequately address school infrastructure requirements. Particularly given the high bar in SG1 and the infrastructure requirements in SG3, it is considered that the benefits provided by the new dwellings would be significantly outweighed by the harm that would be caused, even applying a tilted balance towards the housing development

## Recommendation

That Planning Permission BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The site is located within the Broad Area of Growth within the Local Plan in relation to the Garden Village. The site is not allocated for housing and formal land allocations will only be known once the Area Action Plan for Lancaster South is adopted. The proposal fails to satisfy the criteria which allows for development to be brought forward in advance of the AAP, in particular, it fails to comply with all the identified Growth Principles and is likely to undermine delivery of the wider Garden Village. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies SG1 and SG3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document.
2. The proposal would have a severe impact on the local highway network as a result of the increased traffic flows in an area that currently experiences capacity issues and high levels of congestion and is also constrained by on street parking. The scheme also provides poor permeability for pedestrians and fails to provide appropriate and safe cycle linkages to Galgate, in particular, or improvements to the wider cycle network. The submission also fails to provide sufficient information to allow the impact on the Strategic Road Network to be fully considered. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 9, Policies SP10, SG1 and SG3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policies, DM57, DM60, DM61 and DM63 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
3. The submission fails to fully assess the flood risk at the site, demonstrate how known flooding problems would be satisfactorily managed and how the proposal would not result in a flood risk within or outside the development, locate the most vulnerable development in area at lowest flood risk, demonstrate that residual risks can be managed and consider how people will be kept safe from the identified flood hazards, including consideration of safe access and egress routes. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 14, Policies SP8 and SG1 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policies DM33 and DM34 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
4. The submission fails to provide sufficient information to fully assess the impact of the development on the nearby ecologically designated sites. In particular, Natural England have identified a hydrological connection from the development site to Morecambe Bay and, as an acceptable drainage scheme has not been submitted, likely significant effects cannot be ruled out at this stage. In addition, the scheme appears to involve the removal of a hedgerow which provides important habitat and wildlife corridor for amphibians and reptiles in particular and would therefore be likely to have an adverse impact on these species and the overall biodiversity of the site. There are also concerns regarding pressure that the development would place on important trees, for both biodiversity and amenity value, along the western boundary. As a result, the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of the National

Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 15, Policies SP8, SG1 and EN7 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policies DM44 and DM45 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.

5. The proposal fails to create a high-quality design, including sustainable design and overall sense of place, and would result in a cramped form of development that would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and would contradict the aims and objectives of the Broad Location of Growth to provide a high quality self-contained garden village. The submission also fails to demonstrate how appropriate open space would be provided and would be integrated with open space in the area. As such, the proposal fails to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Sections 8,12, 14 and 15, Policies SP8, SG1 and T3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policies DM27, DM29, DM30, DM46 and DM57 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
6. As a result of the close proximity of the proposed development to existing residential properties, it would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity and living conditions of the occupants of those properties. As such, the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 12, and Policy DM29 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
7. The proposal fails to provide affordable and open market housing in line with the identified housing needs within the District, does not appropriately integrate the affordable housing into the development, fails to provide dwellings of an appropriate standard, compliant with the NDSS, and fails to demonstrate that 20% will meet the M4(2) requirement of being accessible and adaptable dwellings. As a result, the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 5, Policy SG1 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policies DM1, DM2 and DM3 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
8. The submission fails to adequately address infrastructure requirements within the Broad Area of Growth, in particular relation to the provision of land for two new schools in the area and how this development would contribute to this to ensure that it is delivered to support the wider proposals which are planned in the area. The proposal would potentially undermine the delivery of the school infrastructure required to support development in this area. It is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF, in particular section 8, Policies SG1 and SG3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policies DM57 DM58.

### **Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015**

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm that it takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council offers a pre-application service, aimed at positively influencing development proposals. Regrettably the applicant has failed to take advantage of this service and the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed in this report. The applicant is encouraged to utilise the pre-application service prior to the submission of any future planning applications, in order to engage with the local planning authority to attempt to resolve the reasons for refusal.

### **Background Papers**

None