

Agenda Item	A5
Application Number	25/00805/OUT
Proposal	Outline application for the erection of up to 200 dwellings, including affordable housing, public open space, landscaping, and sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) and associated works. All matters reserved except for means of access.
Application site	Land to the west of Slyne Road Bolton Le Sands Lancashire
Applicant	Mr Warren Cadman, Wrenman Strategic Land Ltd.
Agent	Mr Laurie Lane
Case Officer	Mr Robert Clarke
Departure	Yes
Summary of Recommendation	Approval subject to conditions and completion of Section 106 Agreement. Delegate back to Chief Officer – Planning and Climate Change to finalise legal agreement.

(i) **Procedural Matters**

The Planning Regulatory Committee visited the site and its surroundings on 8 December 2025.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The site forming the subject of this application is formed by four agricultural fields located on the southern edge of the village of Bolton-le-Sands, within the Bolton-le-Sands Parish area. The southern boundary of the site is also close to the northern periphery of the village of Slyne, separated from the nearest residential development situated along Main Road/Slyne Road (A6) and Manor Lane by further agricultural fields. The western boundary of the site is adjacent to the eastern edge of Hest Bank.
- 1.2 The application site area measures 11.31 hectares. The northern boundary of the site lies adjacent to existing residential development located along Greenwood Drive, Greenwood Avenue, Pinewood Avenue and Ashworth Drive. The eastern boundary of the site is formed by a field boundary hedgerow which runs parallel with Slyne Road (A6). Slyne Road (A6) is an 'A' class road subject to a 40mph speed limit past the majority of the site. Further agricultural fields lie beyond this to the east of the A6. The southern boundary of the site is formed by a field boundary hedgerow which separates the site from the adjacent field to the south. The western boundary of the site is situated adjacent to existing residential development located along Kirklands, Hatlex Hill and Bryn Grove.
- 1.3 The site comprises four individual fields of varying sizes, separated by established hedgerows containing intermittent trees. The site exhibits an undulating landform, with ground levels rising

towards the centre and lower-lying areas along the eastern and western boundaries. Overall, the site takes the form of a low, gently sloping drumlin, with the highest point located approximately at the centre of the site at around 43m AOD. From this crest, land levels fall eastwards towards Slyne Road, which lies at just over 36m AOD. Ground levels along the western boundary reduce more markedly, falling to approximately 28m AOD. While the site is predominantly characterised by gentle gradients, more pronounced changes in elevation are evident within the northernmost field, adjacent to the rear gardens of properties on Pinewood Avenue, where a small, tree-covered embankment is present.

- 1.4 The site is located within the designated Open Countryside which defines the rural areas of the district. The site is also located within the North Lancashire Green Belt. Trees along the western boundary of the site, around Bryn Grove and Hatlex Hill, are subject to Tree Preservation Orders 4(1973) and 608(2017). The site is also located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. There is a small open and part culverted watercourse located within the site, adjacent to the boundary with Greenwood Drive and Pinewood Avenue. This flows northwards and enters Lancaster Canal. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) identifies an area of flood zone 3b extending into the site from the east before heading northwards. There is also a small pocket of flood zone 2 located close to the sites access onto Greenwood Drive, in addition to areas of both high and medium risk of surface water flooding within the eastern areas of the site, close to the A6. The extent of the surface water flooding increases when incorporating climate change allowances. The Council's SFRA identifies the site as being within the High Risk Urban Catchment - Coastal Catchment area.
- 1.5 Close to the southeast corner of the site, and close to the existing field gate, is a Grade II listed milestone/boundary marker. The Grade II listed Slyne Hall is located approximately 100 metres to the southeast of the site on the eastern side of Slyne Road. The Slyne Conservation Area is located approximately 250 metres to the south of the site and contains additional designated and non-designated heritage assets, including the Grade II* listed Manor House Farm.
- 1.6 Lancaster Canal is located to the north and west of the site, separated from the proposed fields by intervening development. The canal is identified as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA), it is also a Biological Heritage Site (BHS) and an identified Green/Blue Corridor within the Council's Local Plan. The canal towpath also forms a designated cycle/active travel route within the Local Plan. The site is located approximately 730 metres from Morecambe Bay and its associated ecological designations including Special Protection Area (SPA), Special area of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar Site and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
- 1.7 The development site is adjacent to, but not within, the boundary of the Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst the proposal includes a proposed active travel link to Hatlex Hill, which is within the boundary, the development itself remains adjacent to the Neighbourhood Plan boundary. As such, whilst the relationship of the development with the Neighbourhood Plan area is a material consideration, its policies are not applicable to the determination of this application.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of up to 200 dwellings with full details of the access arrangements provided at this stage. Matters pertaining to the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the proposed development are reserved for subsequent approval, herein "the reserved matters".
- 2.2 Access is a matter to be considered in full. A new vehicular access is proposed off Slyne Road on the eastern boundary of the site. The detailed access design extends 21.5 metres into the site. It features a carriageway width of 5.5 metres along with 2 metre wide pavements to each side. The junction with Slyne Road takes the form of a priority-controlled junction and includes off-site highway works to facilitate the junction design. This comprises the formation of a ghost island right turn lane which would prevent vehicles that are waiting to turn right into the site from blocking southbound traffic. The junction has been designed to a 30mph speed limit, as such, it is also necessary to extend the existing 30mph speed limit southwards to include the area around the proposed junction. Visibility splays of 43 metres at the access point are provided in both directions along Slyne Road. Pedestrian pavements already feature along the west side of Slyne Road, these will be adjusted to

suit the increased road width/alignment and junction design. In addition to this, an active travel route will be located internally within the site running north to south and parallel with the sites eastern boundary. This will include two pedestrian/cycle connections to Slyne Road at the northern and southern ends of the site.

- 2.3 An emergency access and active travel link is also proposed onto Greenwood Drive. The road width will initially form a continuation of Greenwood Drive, but will then narrow leading into the site from 6 metres to a width of 4 metres. The access will include droppable bollards to prevent misuse. A further active travel access link is also provided on the western boundary, to connect with Hatlex Hill. This will also include droppable bollards, again to prevent misuse. The submission indicates these links will be upgraded by improved surfacing, lighting and access restrictions.
- 2.4 Alongside the provision of up to 200 dwellings, the proposal shall include the provision of affordable housing, on-site public open space and associated infrastructure, such as the provision of a sustainable drainage scheme.
- 2.5 Illustrative plans including a Development Framework Plan, Masterplan, Green/Blue Infrastructure Strategy Plan and a Design and Access Statement have been submitted in support of the application. Whilst these have not been submitted for approval, combined they detail the way in which the site could be developed to provide housing, associated roads, active travel infrastructure, amenity open space, ecology mitigation and enhancement (BNG) and drainage infrastructure (SuDS). Earthworks are anticipated as part of the development to form the proposed drainage basins, development platforms and to mitigate against flood risk.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 The site has a very limited planning history. The only relevant case relates to the screening opinion for the proposed development earlier in 2025, which is detailed below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
25/00138/EIR	Screening Opinion for proposed residential development	Not EIA development
25/00106/PRENG2	Pre application advice request for the erection of up to 250 dwellings	Advise Issued

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Bolton le Sands Parish Council	<p>Objects to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of this site conflicts with the Local Plan development strategy settlement hierarchy set out in Policy SP2. - Large scale development within the Parish is not justified, and no evidence is provided to indicate the proposal would be targeted to meet local needs whilst being proportionate to the village. - The proposal would hinder the ability of the City Council to direct growth to allocated development sites, including the North Lancaster Strategic Site (Policy SG9). - The proposal is fragmented and not part of a co-ordinated plan-led approach to development. - This development combined with future potential development to the south would result in harm to the function, role and character of the village. - The proposal undermines the ability to secure infrastructure investment. - The development constitutes Environmental Impact Assessment development.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder engagement has been insufficient. - The Transport Assessment only considers the development in isolation and does not consider cumulative impacts. - The site access visibility splays have not been included within the development red edge boundary. - Proposed pedestrian and cycle infrastructure is not safe or well considered. - Proposal does not include speed reduction or other off-site safety interventions, or model peak traffic flows. - Local highway network surrounding village school is at capacity. - Village school cannot accommodate population growth. - The proposal is within the Green Belt, the proposal does not represent development of Grey Belt land, and no very special circumstances exist to justify the proposal. - Proposal would result in the coalescence of Bolton le Sands and Slyne with Hest. - The surface water drainage strategy is inadequate, the development would result in increased off-site flood risk. - The Biodiversity Net Gain/Ecological assessments are inadequate. - Proposal would impact the historic character and identity of the villages, it would erode the open land between these settlements and does not represent good spatial planning.
Slyne with Hest Parish Council	<p>Objects to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. - The proposal would result in the merging of villages. - The location of the site within the Open Countryside and Green Belt designations mean the proposal represents a departure from the Local Plan. - Highway safety concerns relating to the means of access onto Slyne Road through increased traffic, reduced access for emergency vehicles, increased vehicle related pollution, and poor sustainability credentials. - Local infrastructure does not have the capacity to facilitate the development. - The development has the potential to result in increased off-site flood risk, including at the Recreation Field.
CPRE	<p>Objects to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. - The proposal would result in the coalescence of Bolton le Sands and Slyne with Hest. - The proposal would lead to the loss of openness within the Green Belt, encroachment into the countryside as well as harm to the landscape, agricultural land and wildlife. - The site does not constitute Grey Belt land, and there are no very special circumstances to justify development within the Green Belt. - The proposal does not satisfy the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 110 and 115 relating to achieving sustainable development. - Raises concerns regarding sustainable transport opportunities/active travel and highway safety matters. - The site is at risk of flooding and the development could exacerbate matters.
Lancaster Civic Vision	<p>Objects to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development would have a significant negative impact on the local area and the local community. - The proposal contradicts Local Plan requirement and is not supported by essential wider infrastructure including transport, retail, schools and medical facilities. - Proposal undermines the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Development Plan. - The site is within the Green Belt, and the development would merge villages and result in harm to their identity. - The loss of open space would negatively impact local residents' quality of life.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development would lead to the destruction of valuable wildlife habitats and cause long-term environmental damage. - The site is at risk of flooding and the development could exacerbate matters. - Raises concerns regarding highway safety including the impact of the development upon existing local network capacity issues. - Development and associated increased traffic would detract from the tranquillity of this area, impacting the enjoyment of the countryside. - Impact upon archaeological remains. - Proposal does not address local views.
Dynamo Cycle Campaign	<p>Objects to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is very large and will impact traffic volumes. - Existing cycle infrastructure provided along the canal is poorly maintained. - Proposed development does not align with the NPPF paragraphs 115-118, as it provides no safe active travel links to existing infrastructure outside the development itself. - The Design and Access Statement seems to only refer to cycle movements within the site boundary. The Travel Plan does not explicitly discuss infrastructure to encourage cycling. - It is encouraged that a cycle route be provided from Hatlex Lane to connect with the Canal and to link with the promenade in Morecambe. - It is also requested that the canal towpath to Lancaster/Carnforth be properly maintained to encourage the use of this route. - Such measures could completely change the travel impact of this large and important development.
County Highways Authority (LHA)	<p>No objection – Previous concerns regarding the off-site highway works, access design, Transport Assessment and Travel Plan have been resolved through the latest amendments. The LHA has no objection to the development subject to the following conditions/obligations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction Management Plan (CMP) - Wheel washing facilities - Full construction details and implementation of the proposed access and associated works. - Precise scheme for off-site highway works including emergency and active travel access from Greenwood Drive, active travel access onto Hatlex Hill, upgrading of two bus stops. - Construction of estate road to base course level before wider development. - Details of road management and maintenance. - Implementation of Interim Travel Plan and submission of full travel plan. <p>The LHA has also provided additional design advice relating to the reserved matters, including parking provision, garage dimensions and all internal estate roads to be designed to adoptable standards.</p> <p>The LHA has also requested a financial contribution of £1,099.85 per unit towards selected Lancaster Travel and Transport Infrastructure Strategy initiatives, and a further contribution of £12,000 to enable Travel Plan monitoring.</p>
Natural England	<p>A series of consultation responses have been provided setting out various requests for additional survey efforts and assessment. Natural England's latest response dated 26 January 2026 confirms that Natural England raises no objection to the proposal subject to mitigation being secured through planning condition and obligation.</p>
Lead Local Flood Authority	<p>No objection – subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final details of surface water drainage scheme - Construction phase surface water details - Drainage Operation and Maintenance Manual - Drainage verification report.

	Site specific advice relating to drainage requirements and ordinary watercourse consent is also provided.
Biodiversity Officer	<p>Comments - The Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment is appropriate for adoption by the Competent Authority, including the assessment of overwintering birds.</p> <p>The habitat survey is accepted as a baseline for ecological assessment and biodiversity net gain metric.</p> <p>No bat roosts would be affected and the surveys in April/May showed that bat activity was only low.</p> <p>Amphibian surveys did not detect the presence of Great Crested Newt. The habitat is suboptimal for any breeding population of Great Crested Newt.</p> <p>Evidence of breeding lapwing nesting within the site. The proposal would result in the loss of lapwing territory, as conditions would not be suitable for this species within the proposed development. Other species likely breeding on site and in low numbers are blackbird, dunnock, goldfinch and wren. Indicative layout and habitat provision makes it likely that breeding and foraging opportunities for these birds would be maintained or possibly enhanced. Habitat enhancement opportunities should be secured within the development.</p>
Arboricultural Officer	No objection in principle – comments are made regarding the requirement to remove 188 metres of the existing roadside hedgerow along the A6 boundary. Further comments are provided regarding landscaping requirements for the development.
Waste and Recycling Officer	Comments - commentary relating to bin provision, road layout and collection point requirements.
Conservation Officer	No objection – Proposal is unlikely to result in harm to the setting of Lancaster Canal and to Slyne Hall. The development of this site would not have an adverse impact upon the Slyne Conservation Area. The preservation of the Grade II listed milestone is necessary, which can be achieved through detailed layout considerations, particularly of the active travel link. A scheme for the protection of this asset is essential. Provides general advice relating to matters of design, including appearance, of the proposal.
Lancashire Police	<p>Comments - Provides a Crime Impact Statement and provides recommendations relating to crime prevention strategies including matters relating to the design of dwellings/development including layout, design, boundaries, access routes, security systems, window security, landscaping, parking and lighting.</p> <p><i>NB: The recommendations are more relevant to the details at reserved matters stage.</i></p>
Public Realm Team	<p>No objection, subject to securing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-site Amenity Greenspace - On-site play equipment (Children’s and Young Persons provision) - Off-site contribution towards allotments (Slyne community orchard or Halton village) - Off-site contribution towards Parks and Recreation enhancements (Slyne Recreation ground) - Off-site contribution towards outdoor sports provision (Slyne Recreation ground) <p>For all off-site contribution requests, the final sum is to be calculated at reserved matters stage.</p>

Lancaster Canal Trust	Comments - Supports the comments made by the Canal & River Trust in relation to the need for further details of surface water drainage and contributions to sustainable transport infrastructure.
Canal and River Trust (CRT)	Comments - Provides commentary on the need to fully assess drainage impacts on existing canal infrastructure and requests a condition to secure details of the drainage design. A further request was also made to secure a financial contribution towards the enhancement of the canal towpath. However, in further correspondence provided by the CRT (received 06/01/2026), it has been confirmed that the financial contribution request is no longer being made. A further informative advice note regarding CRT contact details is also requested.
Historic England	Does not wish to provide comments, recommends that views of the Conservation Team are sought.
Active Travel England	Standing advice is provided.
Environment Agency	Does not wish to provide comment. With respect to the presence of a foot and mouth burial pit in the field to the south of the application site, the EA confirms they have no additional comments to make.
Environmental Protection Officer	Comments - Provides commentary on the need to secure mitigation to achieve appropriate noise standards, Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and contamination remediation by planning condition. Additional commentary is provided regarding the presence of a foot and mouth burial pit which identifies limited residual risk due to the passage of time, distance and lack of pollution pathways.
Fire Safety Officer	Comments - Provides advice relating to Building Regulation requirements relating to vehicle manoeuvrability and water provision.
County Education	No objection , the County Council will not be seeking a contribution for primary or secondary school places.
County Historic Environment Team (Archaeology)	Comments - The Historic Environment Team agrees with the characterisation of the site as one as having a low potential. In this instance, further archaeological investigation is not warranted.
United Utilities	Comments - Proposal is acceptable in principle, conditions requested relating to detailed surface water and foul drainage design, further advice regarding water efficiency and infrastructure requirements is provided.
NHS	No objection – subject to a financial contribution of £131,616 (200 units) towards extension and reconfiguration at the Brookfield Surgery Bolton le Sands. In the event that this request is not secured, this would result in an objection .
Engineers	No response received.
Sustainable Growth	Comments - The proposal will be required to provide an Employment and Skills Plan.
Mineral Safe Policy Team	No response received.
County Active Travel	No response received.

4.2 The following responses have been received from members of the public:

669 letters of objection, including some duplicated comments. A summary of the main reasons is as follows:

Principle matters including:

- The development would be unsustainable development and would result in the overdevelopment of village(s).
- The proposal would result in urban sprawl within the Green Belt and the over population of the local area.
- The development site is located within the North Lancashire Green Belt and the development conflicts with green belt planning policies.
- The development would erode the openness of the Green Belt.
- The development would result in the merging of the settlements.
- The development represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt and inadequate justification has been provided to demonstrate the existence of very special circumstances.
- The land does not constitute grey belt land.
- The development site contributes to the green belt purposes.
- Development such as this should be directed towards brownfield sites, rather than developing open countryside.
- The development does not accord with policies relating to design, accessibility, transport requirements, landscape and visual impacts and conservation and heritage matters.
- There is a lack of justification for this development of additional housing.
- Concerns are raised that there are already numerous existing empty homes and existing homes for sale, including homes within recently proposed nearby housing developments.
- There is no need for additional housing in this area, and existing allocations have already been made for housing in other areas.
- The loss of agricultural land will affect food security and sustainability.
- Concerns are raised that the proposed housing would not be true affordable housing.
- Lack of consultation with the community.
- Insufficient time has been given to assess and comment on the application.
- Increases in population will impact employment and the local economy.
- Attempts to allocate the site for housing have previously been considered and refused.
- Supporting statements, some of which include desk based assessment, do not enable informed assessments and concerns area raised that they contain errors and omissions.
- Inadequate archaeological surveys have been undertaken to assess the archaeological status of the land.

Design and landscape matters including:

- Development of the site would result in the loss of green belt land and openness and the loss of 'Lapwing Fields'.
- The development conflicts with policies within the NPPF and the Local Plan, including policies EN3 and EN4, regarding development and landscape considerations.
- Approving development here would set a precedent for future development of green belt land.
- The development would result in cumulative impacts to the landscape and would constitute ribbon development.
- The development would harm the nature and character of the area.
- The development would damage the landscape, result in the loss of attractive views and the drumlin topography.
- The development would result in the merging of villages and this would result in the loss of village identity.
- The development would result in harm to heritage assets including Slyne Conservation Area and Grade II listed Slyne Hall and impact on historic character of the village.
- The development would not accord with the adopted Slyne Conservation Plan.
- The Addendum and revised design statement does not address concerns raised.
- The revised design layout does not reduce impact on surrounding area and does not address scale, character, and amenity concerns.

- Part of boundary hedgerow included in application does not belong to developer and owners have not been consulted.

Traffic and highway concerns including:

- There are already road safety issues, including danger along the A6 due to speeding.
- There is inadequate emergency access.
- There is already limited parking and traffic congestion within the area.
- The proposed emergency access onto Greenwood Drive and the A6 will increase the risk of accidents.
- The development will increase safety concerns, particularly around the proposed pedestrian and cycle links.
- There is a lack of lighting existing and proposed.
- The development will contribute to existing traffic issues, increased car usage and congestion.
- There are narrow roads in the area which lack pavements.
- There are roads and access points which have poor sightlines.
- Greenwood Drive and Haltex Hill are already congested and the development will make this worse.
- Concerns are raised over the future maintenance of public areas, cycle paths, pathways and pavements.
- The proposal has a lack of parking areas proposed.
- Revised information does not reference impacts on Bryn Grove which will be affected, and concerns this information has been omitted.
- Pressure on existing roads and transport infrastructure.
- Concerns that vehicle movement/access and pedestrian access is dangerous in and out of Hatlex Hill with lack of pavements, which poses danger to public/cyclists/drivers.

Residential amenity concerns including:

- The development will result in the loss of privacy and overlooking for neighbouring properties.
- Light pollution will be harmful to residential amenity.
- There are concerns that there will be a rise in anti-social behaviour and crime.
- Concerns over the proposed play areas, picnic areas, dog walking areas along with potential associated poor maintenance and antisocial behaviour concerns.
- The development would lead to a decline in community feeling and identity and quality of life as a result, as the development is not in keeping with the character of village.
- There is a lack of open space proposed within the development.

Environmental concerns including:

- Walking and cycling routes in the area are already dangerous.
- The development will result in the loss of mature trees and hedgerows.
- The development will harm wildlife including protected species and red listed species including lapwings.
- The site is a valuable habitat for various species of birds, including species in decline. The development will result in the loss of habitat for these species.
- Bird survey evidence provided by local residents suggests the site is ecologically important and potentially functionally linked land associated with the Morecambe Bay ecological designated sites. Bird survey evidence indicates that the site is territory for Lapwing.
- There is a lack of informed assessment of the impacts to wildlife.
- There are concerns that the Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment and the Ecological Assessment baseline is not representative and that the assessment of wildlife, including of qualifying species such as Curlew, is not robust and not properly addressed in accordance with policy.

- The development will not accord with the Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy, particularly for wading bird habitat.
- The development will cause construction noise and dust pollution.
- The development will cause air pollution.
- The development will cause light pollution and associated impacts on dark sky area.
- The proposal will increase pressure on existing drainage infrastructure.
- The development will increase flood risk, one objection contained video evidence of a flood event.
- There are concerns regarding land and water contamination including in relation to asbestos, and a nearby burial pit for foot and mouth livestock.
- There are concerns that the geo-environmental assessment is not adequate.
- Existing surface water runoff via the culvert could result in pollution of the wider watercourse/environment.
- The development and its construction phase will increase carbon emissions and increase energy use.
- There are concerns that the proposed detention basins would not mitigate flood risk.

Infrastructure concerns including:

- The development will lead to increased pressure on existing local infrastructure and services which are already at capacity. This includes roads/drains/digital Infrastructure/electricity and water supply as well as healthcare/education and childcare/public transport/refuse services.
- There is no additional infrastructure proposed, and the site is not within easy access of existing facilities.
- The revised information does not provide clarity on the drainage strategy, including whose responsibility it will be to maintain the infrastructure including the pumping station(s).
- The local primary schools state that they have no capacity to accommodate the likely number of children that would result from the development.
- Access to the Bolton-le-Sands school site is already a safety concern due to the constrained road network.

3 letters of support. A summary of the main reason is as follows:

- Support for building on land to encourage people to move back to village.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of development
- Development within the Green Belt
- Access, traffic impacts, sustainable travel and parking
- Landscape character and visual effects
- Flood risk and drainage
- Biodiversity
- Residential amenity and pollution
- Open space
- Housing needs, affordable housing, housing standards and mix
- Heritage and archaeology
- Sustainable design
- Infrastructure
- Employment and Skills Plan

5.2 **Principle of Development** NPPF Chapter 2 Achieving Sustainable Development, Chapter 5 Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes, Chapter 11 Making Effective Use of Land; 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, EN3: Countryside Area; Development Management DPD Policies DM1: New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs, DM4: Residential Development Outside Main Urban Areas, and DM44: The Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity; Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policies M1 Managing Mineral Production, M2 Safeguarding Minerals and Guidance Note December 2014.

5.2.1 Principle of housing growth

The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (SPLA DPD) sets out the district's strategic development strategy, advocating an urban-focussed approach to future growth. This is reflected in Policy SP2 which sets out the district's settlement hierarchy. Policy SP2 aims to direct significant growth to the main urban areas of the district but also identifies a range sustainable rural settlements that will provide the focus for rural growth outside the main urban areas. The application site is located on the southern edge of Bolton-le-Sands and is also adjacent to the northern and eastern edges Slyne-with-Hest. The development site is immediately adjacent to existing residential development within both settlements. Bolton-le-Sands, Slyne-with-Hest and Hest Bank are all identified as sustainable rural settlements and as such, the development site is in a location in which the provision of housing would be supported in principle; subject to the constraints of the Open Countryside and Green Belt matters set out below.

5.2.2 The site and the whole of the villages of Bolton-le-Sands, Slyne-with-Hest and Hest Bank lie within the designated Countryside Area as defined by the Lancaster District Local Plan, which defines the rural context of the district. Policy EN3 does not seek to preclude development in these areas, but states that any development proposals located within this designation should have due regard to all relevant policies contained within the Local Plan, in particular policies within the Development Management (DM) DPD relating to development in the rural areas.

5.2.3 The support offered to residential development outside the main urban areas by policy SP2 is further reflected through policy DM1 and DM4. Policy DM1 states proposals for new residential development will be supported where land is used efficiently, taking account of the characteristics and specific circumstances of individual sites and that proposals are located where the natural environment, services and infrastructure can accommodate growth. Policy DM4 clarifies that the Council will support proposals for rural housing provided that they are well related to existing built form, that they remain proportionate to the character and scale of the existing settlement, and that they do not demonstrably undermine the prevailing landscape, which are matters discussed further within this report.

5.2.4 Paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that to support the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. The Council's most recent Housing Land Supply Statement identifies a housing land supply of 2.8 years, which is a significant shortfall against the required 5-year supply set out in the NPPF. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF also requires that, where a Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites, permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of importance (such as areas at risk of flooding, designated heritage assets or statutory habitat sites) provide a strong reason for refusing permission; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies. These include directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination. These matters, along with all other pertinent planning considerations will be addressed in the following sections of this report.

5.2.5 Loss of Agricultural Land

The loss of the agricultural land is a material planning consideration and a matter of principle. Policy DM44 states development proposals '*should avoid the use of the best and most versatile agricultural land and should, as far as possible, use the lowest grade of land suitable*'. The NPPF equally reinforces the need to protect the highest quality agricultural land. Paragraphs 187, 188 and associated footnote 65 state '*planning policy and decisions should contribute to and enhance the*

natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils'. The best and most versatile (BMV) land is Grades 1, 2 and 3a. The application is supported by an Agricultural Land Classification assessment, which concludes that the whole site constitutes Grade 3b which is not defined as BMV. Accordingly, the loss of agricultural land is not a constraint to the proposed development and would not conflict with policy DM44 or the Framework in this regard.

5.2.6 Mineral safeguarding

The site is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) as identified by Lancashire County Council within the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Policy M2 of this Plan 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.

5.2.7 A Mineral Resource Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. This concludes that the site is within an area containing sandstone (Carboniferous Millstone Grit) in addition to Coal Measures deposits relating to the underlying Pendle Grit Member. In the first instance, Policy M1 of the Joint Lancashire Mineral and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy states that '*development will not be supported for any new extraction of sand and gravel, limestone, gritstone or brick shale*'. This would be inclusive of the sandstone gritstone within this area, as such the minerals underlying this site does not pose a restriction to the proposed development. Furthermore, the site is situated adjacent to existing residential development, which would be unacceptably impacted by extraction activities. Whilst prior extraction may be temporary, the impacts on neighbouring residential amenity could be significant. Finally, given the relatively small size of the site/minerals and the fact it is adjacent to existing development and important transport infrastructure (A6), it is not an unreasonable assertion that prior extraction would also be unviable. Accordingly, it is considered that the development would not conflict with the policy M2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

5.2.8 Statement of Community Involvement

Undertaking prior engagement with both the Local Planning Authority and the local community is advocated within the National Planning Policy Framework and within the Councils own Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). In developing this submission, the applicant has undertaken prior engagement with the Local Planning Authority, Lancashire County Council (relating to highways and flood risk/drainage matters) and a consultation exercise with the local community, and this has resulted in the submission of a Statement of Community Involvement. The community engagement involved different methods of communication including leaflets to residents and ward/parish councillors and the creation of a consultation website. Interested parties could respond through both a postal address and an email address. A feedback form was also provided on the consultation website. In total, 291 submissions were received during the public consultation. Responses raised concerns and comments relating to various topics relevant to the development, these are detailed and summarised within the supporting SCI itself, along with the applicant's own responses to each of the matters raised. The SCI then also sets out the way in which the applicant has sought to take account of the community concerns and comments, which has resulted in amendments to the proposal being adopted prior to the submission of this planning application.

5.3 Development within the Green Belt NPPF Chapter 2 Achieving Sustainable Development, Chapter 13 Protecting Green Belt land; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (SPLA DPD) Policy EN4: The North Lancashire Green Belt; Development Management DPD (DM DPD) policy DM50: Development in the Green Belt.

5.3.1 The development site is located entirely within the North Lancashire Greenbelt, as such the requirements of policy DM50 are relevant to this proposal. Policy DM50 does provide guidance for

development within the Green Belt, however, this only relates to the reuse of existing buildings, extensions to existing dwellings, and replacement dwellings. None of these scenarios apply to this proposal, as such, this policy simply defers to national planning policy requirements and clarifies that inappropriate development in the Green Belt will be resisted. For this reason, it is necessary to refer to the requirements set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the associated guidance set out within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), in determining this proposal.

5.3.2 The NPPF confirms that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belt land, and that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Green Belts serve 5 purposes, which are set out in paragraph 143 of the NPPF. These are:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

5.3.3 The NPPF requires that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances', which will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. However, footnote 55 of the NPPF clarifies that development proposed on land which constitutes either previously developed land or grey belt land, is not inappropriate.

5.3.4 Paragraph 154 sets out a number of development types which are deemed to be exceptions and do not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. This proposal, which seeks outline permission for up to 200 dwellings, does not accord with any of the specified exceptions, and would therefore be deemed inappropriate development under the requirements of this paragraph.

5.3.5 However, paragraph 155 introduces the concept of 'grey belt' land along with paragraph 156 which introduces 'Golden Rules'. Paragraph 155 states that the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following criteria apply:

- a) The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
- b) There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
- c) The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and
- d) Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 below.

5.3.6 Paragraph 156 states that major development involving the provision of housing on sites in the Green Belt proposed through a planning application should provide specified contributions. These are termed the 'Golden Rules', and they include:

- a) affordable housing which reflects either: (i) development plan policies produced in accordance with paragraphs 67-68 of this Framework; or (ii) until such policies are in place, the policy set out in paragraph 157;
- b) necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and
- c) the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces.

5.3.7 With reference to the requirements of paragraph 156a), which requires the provision of affordable housing, paragraph 157 explains that the affordable housing that development is required to provide should be 15% above the current local plan requirement, capped at 50%. The current local plan requirement for development in this area is 30%, as specified in Policy DM3. As such, when

incorporating the requirements of 156a) and 157, the development of this site would be required to provide 45% on site affordable housing to comply with this element of the Golden Rules. As advised within the recently updated PPG, where development takes place on land situated in, or released from, the Green Belt and is subject to the 'Golden Rules', site specific viability assessment should not be undertaken for the purpose of reducing developer contributions, including affordable housing.

5.3.8 With reference to the requirements of paragraph 156c), which requires the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public, paragraph 159 clarifies that improvements to green spaces required as part of the Golden Rules should contribute positively to the landscape setting of the development, support nature recovery and meet local standards for green space provision where these exist in the development plan. This paragraph goes on to state that where land has been identified as having potential for habitat creation or nature recovery within Local Nature Recovery Strategies, proposals should contribute towards these outcomes.

5.3.9 Following assessment against the requirements of paragraphs 155-159, the NPPF states at paragraph 158 that, where development proposals are able to comply with the Golden Rules, significant weight in favour of granting permission should be given. As such, paragraphs 155-159 provide an alternative route through which development of land for housing may not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. To achieve this, any proposal must be on land that can be defined as grey belt land, and it must satisfactorily address the Golden Rules.

5.3.10 Grey belt land

Grey belt land is defined within the NPPF as follows:

For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.

5.3.11 The site does not constitute previously developed land (as defined within the NPPF). As such, it is necessary to consider the contribution that this site makes to Green Belt purposes a), b) and d) as set out in paragraph 143. For ease of reference, these are repeated below:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;

Assessment as to whether the application of policies relating to areas or assets of particular importance (as specified in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt)) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development is set out further within this report.

5.3.12 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was updated in February 2025 and provides further guidance on making judgements as to whether land is grey belt, including considerations to be taken into account when assessing a proposal against Green Belt purposes a), b) and d). This application is supported by both a Planning Statement and a Green Belt Assessment. In addition to this, the Council had undertaken the North Lancashire Green Belt Review in 2016, which assessed the performance of sites and groups of sites within the Green Belt against the Green Belt purposes. Within this review, the development site is formed by two separate parcels of land identified as SWH23 and SWH24, together these form the northern part of strategic parcel SP34. Whilst the North Lancashire Green Belt Review 2016 is of some age, it is accepted that very little has changed both in this local area, or within the wider Green Belt since the review was undertaken. Furthermore, the 5 purposes of the Green Belt remain the same. For this reason, the assessment set out within the North Lancashire Green Belt Review 2016 is considered to be highly relevant and is a material consideration.

5.3.13 In relation to the contents of paragraph 155a) and the definition of Grey Belt within the NPPF, the test involves an assessment as to whether the proposed site **strongly** contributes to Green Belt purposes a), b) or d), as set out in NPPF paragraph 143. For each purpose a), b) and d), the PPG is clear (paragraph: 005 [Reference ID: 64-005-20250225]) that the assessment of these purposes

relates to large built up areas and towns. Importantly, it clarifies that villages should not be considered as large built-up areas or towns.

- 5.3.14 Whilst these settlements are contiguous with each other, with Slyne adjoining Hest Bank and Hest Bank adjoining Bolton-le-Sands along Coastal Road, within the Council Local Plan at policy SP2, all three settlements are identified individually as Sustainable Rural Settlements, they do not represent a single settlement and should not be aggregated as such. Comments received by the Local Planning Authority, including those submitted by Kingsley Smith Solicitors on behalf of the Association of Friends of Lapwing Fields Green Space, seek to aggregate these individual settlements. This includes reference to the Bolton-le-Sands Conservation Area Appraisal which in its introduction refers to Bolton-le-Sands as a small town. However, this Conservation Area Appraisal was produced for the specific reason of defining what is important about the historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to identify its special characteristics, rather than determining the village or town status of this settlement or to provide specific guidance as to Green Belt policy matters. Conversely, the Bolton-le-Sands Parish Council website consistently refers to Bolton-le-Sands as a village, moreover, the Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan Document also refers to Slyne-with-Hest as a village, with figure 3 defining the footprint of the village.
- 5.3.15 Neither the NPPF nor the PPG provide a definition of “large built up area” or “village.” The question of whether all three settlements are villages, and not a large built-up area, is a matter of planning judgement. In doing so, the appropriate starting point would be to have regard to the Development Plan. Policy SP2 sets out the Lancaster district settlement hierarchy. This starts with Lancaster identified as a ‘Regional Centre’, with Morecambe and Heysham then identified as ‘Key Service Centre’, Carnforth sits below this and is identified as a ‘Market Town’. All three of the subject settlements sit below Carnforth, and are identified as ‘Sustainable Rural Settlements’. The final tier within the hierarchy, which sits below ‘Sustainable Rural Settlements’ are ‘Rural Villages’. It is acknowledged that the three subject settlements each sit within the ‘Sustainable Rural Settlements’ tier, as opposed to the ‘Rural Villages’ tier. However, their designation as ‘Sustainable Rural Settlements’ and not the ‘Rural Villages’ tier, does not prohibit them from being defined as villages for the purposes of paragraph 155 of the NPPF. It instead indicates that these settlements include, or are within easy reach of the necessary services required to be considered as sustainable settlements. With reference to the ‘Rural Villages’ tier, paragraph 7.9 of the SPLA DPD also states that *‘the remaining villages are not considered to be sustainable locations for future development and should only support small-scale development where there is an evidenced local need to do so’*.
- 5.3.16 As such, the ‘Sustainable Rural Settlements’ set out within policy SP2, can also constitute villages for the purposes of paragraph 155 of the NPPF. To define the settlement hierarchy, the Council has undertaken a Sustainable Settlement Review (2018), which sets out the justification for the three subject settlements being defined as ‘Sustainable Rural Settlements’. Importantly, within the Review’s discussion regarding each of the three settlements, each of the settlements are consistently referred to as villages.
- 5.3.17 In addition to this, it has also been established within a recent planning appeal decision relating to land at Sea View Drive in Hest Bank, which is also within the North Lancashire Green Belt (APP/A2335/W/24/3350855) that all three settlements constitute villages. Paragraph 14 of this appeal decision states:
- ‘Hest Bank is a large village that is contiguous with both Slyne and Bolton-le-Sands. All three villages are identified and defined as separate Sustainable Rural Settlements by Policy SP2 of the Lancaster Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document 2025...’*
- 5.3.18 For these reasons, Officers conclude that all three of the subject settlements represent individual villages, these settlements do not constitute large built up area(s), nor are they towns. It is on this basis that the assessment as to whether the site *strongly* contributes to Green Belt purposes a), b) and c) has been undertaken.
- 5.3.19 Contribution of site to purpose a), b) and d)
In relation to purpose a), whilst the site is located on the edge of existing villages, it is not situated adjacent to or near a large built up area. The development site therefore does not contribute strongly to the checking of the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. Similarly, with respect to purpose b), given the location of the site adjacent to and within a pocket of land surrounded by existing

villages, the development of this site would not lead to the merging of towns. Furthermore, in light of the separation between the site and the nearest towns (Lancaster, Morecambe and Carnforth), and the presence of existing residential development to the north (Bolton-le-Sands) and to the south (Slyne), the development site does not strongly contribute to the separation between the nearest towns. Likewise, given the separation distances of the site to the nearest historic town(s), and the presence of intervening development between the site and the nearest historic town(s), the development site has no visual, physical or experiential connection to any historical aspects of the nearest towns and therefore makes no contribution to purpose d).

5.3.20 Footnote 7 areas or assets

The definition of grey belt as set out within the NPPF, confirms that: *'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.* In this case, there are areas or assets of particular importance (as specified in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt)) which are applicable and require careful consideration. These relate to habitats sites, designated heritage assets, and areas at risk of flooding. However, as described in greater detail in the following sections of this report, whilst these areas or assets of particular importance are of relevance to the determination of this development, this planning application either satisfactorily addresses the requirements of planning policies relevant to these matters, or the application of planning policies relevant to these matters are considered not to provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting the development proposed.

5.3.21 Conclusion on grey belt

In accordance with national Green Belt policy set out in the NPPF, and based on the assessment contained within paragraph 5.3.19, it has been established that the site does not make a strong contribution to purposes (a), (b) or (d) of the Green Belt. Furthermore, for the reasons set out in paragraph 5.3.20, and expanded upon in the subsequent sections of this report, the effects of the proposal on the identified footnote 7 areas or assets of particular importance would not be of such significance as to provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development. Notwithstanding objections to the contrary, it is therefore concluded that the site meets the definition of grey belt land.

5.3.22 Whether inappropriate development

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF sets out that the development of homes within the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where all of the specified criteria set out in sub-paragraphs a. to d. as assessed below, apply. The criteria of paragraph 155 are provided at paragraph 5.3.5 of this report.

5.3.23 155 a. Remaining Green Belt across the area of the Plan

As identified in paragraph 5.3.21, the development would utilise grey belt land, as such the proposal satisfactorily addresses the first element of criteria a. of paragraph 155, which requires the use of grey belt land. The second element of criteria a. of paragraph 155 requires development to ensure that it does not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

5.3.24 As identified within the North Lancashire Green Belt Review 2016, the development site is formed by land parcels SWH23 and SWH24. Along with parcels SWH25 and SWH26, which are located immediately to the south, these four parcels form Strategic Parcel SP34 (or SG34 as identified within the associated Green Belt Parcelling Map). Relative to the remaining areas of the North Lancashire Green Belt, both the development site and the strategic parcel SP34 represent a relatively small pocket of land that is located between existing residential development to the north, south and west. At paragraph 8.19 of the North Lancashire Green Belt Review 2016, it is identified that this Strategic Parcel, and the smaller General Parcels within, have a strong relationship with the surrounding existing residential settlement areas. Furthermore, the A6 transport corridor acts as a hard boundary which separates this pocket of land from the wider areas of countryside and remaining areas of Green Belt to the east. In addition to this, the significantly rising topography of the land to the east of the A6 transport corridor serves to obscure open views and largely prevent a visual connection or relationship with the wider expanse of Green Belt landscape to the east. Overall, it is concluded within the Green Belt Review that parcel SWH23 provides a weak contribution and that SWH24 provides a moderate contribution to the five purposes of the Green Belt. In addition to this, the neighbouring parcels to the south of the development site, which area SWH25 and SWH26, provide a moderate contribution and weak contribution respectively to the five purposes of the Green Belt.

Taken together, the wider Strategic Parcel SP34 is concluded overall to make a moderate contribution to two Green Belt purposes (purposes b) and c)) and no contribution to the remaining three Green Belt purposes (purposes a), d) and e)). As such, none of the smaller parcels nor the larger Strategic Parcel are identified within the North Lancashire Green Belt Review 2016 as strongly contributing to any of the purposes of the Green Belt.

5.3.25 Very little has changed both in this local area, or within the wider Green Belt since the North Lancashire Green Belt Review was undertaken, as such the assessment and conclusions of this review are deemed to be accurate, up to date and relevant. It is the opinion of Officers that, as the proposal would be situated between/surrounded by both existing residential development and the A6 transport corridor, the development would be visually contained relative to the wider open setting which extends to the east of the A6. As a result of the segregated nature of the development site from the wider North Lancashire Green Belt, the fact that the Strategic Parcel is surrounded by existing developed settlement areas, it is concluded that the development of the site would not affect the ability of the remaining North Lancashire Green Belt from serving all five of the Green Belt purposes in an effective and meaningful way. For this reason, it is concluded that the proposal satisfactorily addresses the second element of paragraph 155 a.

5.3.26 155 b. Demonstrable unmet need

As described in paragraph 5.2.4 of this report, the Council's most recent Housing Land Supply Statement identifies a housing land supply of 2.8 years, which is a significant shortfall against the required 5-year supply set out in the NPPF. Footnote 56 of the NPPF clarifies that, in the case of development proposals involving the provision of housing, an unmet need means the lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Accordingly, in light of the Council's significant shortfall against the required 5-year supply, a demonstrable unmet need for this type of development is established. As such, the proposal satisfactorily addresses the requirements of paragraph 155 b.

5.3.27 155 c. Location of development

Paragraph 155 c. of the NPPF requires development to be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF. Whilst this is discussed in greater detail within the following section of this report, it is accepted that the development site is in a sustainable location. The application site is located on the southern edge of Bolton-le-Sands and is also adjacent to the northern and eastern edges of Slyne-with-Hest and Hest Bank. The development site is immediately adjacent and is well related to existing residential development within these settlements. Bolton-le-Sands, Slyne and Hest Bank are identified as sustainable rural settlements and as such, the development site is in a location in which the provision of housing would be supported in principle by Policy SP2. As summarised within Section 4 of the supporting Transport Assessment which accompanies this application, the site is also accessible by foot, cycle and public transport to a range of amenities and facilities within the surrounding village centres, the local area and the wider District including Carnforth, Morecambe and Lancaster. Finally, it is concluded that the proposal would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to NPPF paragraphs 110 and 115 concerning sustainable transport modes, highway design, safety and suitable access. Overall, it is concluded that the proposal demonstrates compliance with the requirements of paragraph 155 c.

5.3.28 155 d. Golden Rules

This paragraph requires the development to meet the 'Golden Rules' set out in paragraphs 156 and 157. These are set out and assessed in turn below:

5.3.29 a. **Affordable housing:** As described within the Affordable Housing Needs Statement which accompanies this planning application, the proposal will deliver 45% affordable housing on-site. This complies with paragraph 157, and therefore 156 a. as described within paragraph 5.3.7 of this report.

5.3.30 b. **Improvements to National and Local Infrastructure:** To support improvements to infrastructure, the proposal is able to provide within the site a range of public open space facilities as well as safe active travel routes linking the development site and existing residential development together. Outside the site, the proposal is able to secure contributions towards local infrastructure including nearby open space facilities and highway infrastructure. For these reasons, it is determined that the proposal satisfies 156 b.

5.3.31 c. **The provision of new, or improvements to, existing green spaces:** Whilst the proposal is in outline, it would successfully address this requirement through the delivery within the site of high quality accessible green space, as indicated within the supporting Green and Blue Infrastructure Plan and described within the Design and Access Statement. These green spaces would both be accessible to residents of the development, but also to the wider community. These new green space areas will both contribute positively to the landscape setting of the development and help to support nature recovery by contributing towards achieving significant levels of Biodiversity Net Gain. In turn this will facilitate habitat creation and nature recovery as identified under the potential measures for the Urban U1.2 – ID 15,692 designation set out within the Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The proposed development would not be suitable for incorporating habitat conditions or environments to support wading birds, including lapwing, as associated with the Grassland G1.1 – ID 4694 designation. This is a result of the relatively high sensitivity of these species to this type of development including the associated residential disturbances. Despite this, overall, the proposal will secure new areas of green space which will be accessible to the public. Furthermore, these green spaces will contribute towards several of the priorities for nature recovery set out within the Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy. This will provide greater benefit to nature overall and will contribute positively towards the delivery of wider environmental outcomes.

5.3.32 Conclusion

For the above reasons, it is concluded that the proposal satisfactorily addresses the requirements of paragraphs 155 – 157 and 159 of the NPPF. The proposal does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt as defined by paragraph 153 and associated footnote 55 of the NPPF, as the development site constitutes Grey Belt land. It is therefore not necessary to undertake an assessment of the effect of development upon Green Belt openness, or for the proposal to demonstrate the existence of very special circumstances which would outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. In successfully addressing the requirements of paragraph 155 and, importantly, the Golden Rules set out in paragraph 156, paragraph 158 of the NPPF requires the decision maker to afford significant weight in favour of the grant of permission. As the site is determined as Grey Belt land and the proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the proposal complies with Policy EN4 and Policy DM50 of the Local Plan and Section 13 of the NPPF.

5.4 **Access, traffic impacts, sustainable travel and parking NPPF Chapter 9 Promoting Sustainable Transport and Chapter 12 Achieving Well-designed and Beautiful Places; 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, SP10: Improving Transport Connectivity, T2: Cycling and Walking Network, T3: Lancaster Canal: 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 and DM63: Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans, and DM64: Lancaster District Highways and Transport Masterplan; and Lancaster Travel and Transport Infrastructure Strategy (LTTIS).**

5.4.1 The district's development strategy (policies SP2 and SP3) aims to manage growth in the most sustainable way possible by directing growth to the main urban areas and to the identified rural sustainable settlements. All three villages of Bolton-le-Sands, Hest Bank and Slyne with Hest are each identified as such. Opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions varies between the main urban areas of the district and those areas which are more rural in nature. This variation must be taken into account when assessing existing and proposed transport infrastructure opportunities, which is likely to lead to changes in transport technology and usage.

5.4.2 Fundamentally, development proposals must ensure that the criteria set out within paragraph 115 of the Framework, which are summarised below, are met:

- a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;
- c) the design of streets, parking areas and other transport elements meet standards that reflect national guidance; and

- d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network, or highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

These essential criteria are reflected and expanded upon within the Councils Local Plan at policies DM60 to DM63 of the DM DPD. Policies DM4 and DM29 also require development, especially those in the rural areas, to be located where the environment and infrastructure can accommodate the impacts of expansion and new development is well connected to existing settlements and services.

5.4.3 Access

The application is seeking approval of the main vehicular site access and two separate active travel links onto Slyne Road as part of the outline application. These access points and the associated junction with Slyne Road, as well as a short length of the internal access road leading into the site, are indicated on the latest revision of the Access Arrangement drawing. This also includes topographical and hedgerow detail to indicate the way in which the access road would relate to the existing site layout.

5.4.4 In addition to the main vehicular site access, the proposal also seeks approval of an emergency access route from Greenwood Drive, which will also serve as an active travel connection, as well as a second active travel connection to Hatlex Hill on the western boundary of the site.

5.4.5 The surrounding highway network comprises Slyne Road (A6), which in the vicinity of the site comprises a single carriageway road. It also features a pedestrian pavement along its western side which extends from Bolton-le-Sands in the north to Slyne in the south. There is presently no street-lighting along the length of road between these two villages and leading past the application site. At present, the section of road which passes most of the application site is subject to a 40mph speed limit. This drops to 30mph at the entrance points into Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne. Slyne Road (A6) is the main transport corridor which links the sustainable villages of Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne to Carnforth in the north and Lancaster in the south. Other roads which surround the development site include Greenwood Drive, Greenwood Avenue, Bryn Grove and Hatlex Hill. These are minor roads which serve the residential development which encompasses the site to the north and west.

5.4.6 The proposed main vehicular access will include a new priority-controlled junction providing access to Slyne Road. The proposal will include areas of carriageway widening/re-alignment to facilitate appropriate carriageway widths and junction geometry. This also enables the inclusion of a ghost island right turn lane, which will enable vehicles approaching the site from the north, and which are turning right to enter the site, to exit the main southbound carriageway to prevent waiting vehicles from blocking southbound traffic. The junction will also include the extension and improvement of the existing pedestrian pavement which will then extend into the development site itself. Visibility splays of 43 metres in both directions are proposed and can be provided within the extent of the adopted highway. These splays are commensurate with roads which are subject to a 30mph speed limit. As such, in conjunction with the proposed access, it is also proposed to relocate the existing 30mph speed limit zone further to the south to incorporate the new access.

5.4.7 An emergency access is also proposed from Greenwood Drive, located to the northeast of the development site. The detail of this emergency access, which will also act as an active travel link, is included within the aforementioned Access Arrangement drawing. It will include an initial extension of the Greenwood Drive carriageway before reducing in width. To prevent misuse of this access, the design will also incorporate droppable bollards.

5.4.8 Swept path drawings have been provided which indicate the way in which larger vehicles including refuse collection lorries and fire engines are able to successfully utilise the main site access onto Slyne Road. A further drawing has been provided which confirms that a fire engine is also able to successfully utilise the emergency access leading from Greenwood Drive.

5.4.9 The proposed access design has developed through initial pre-application discussions with the Local Highways Authority (LHA) and over the course of the determination of this application. The LHA has now confirmed within its latest consultation response that the details provided on these drawings are acceptable, subject to the detailed design to be secured by planning condition and at the Section 278 stage (which is a separate highway agreement). Accordingly, on the basis of the LHA confirming its agreement to the proposed access strategy, a condition is recommended to secure the final details and the implementation of this primary access design, along with the associated off-site

highway works including carriageway/footway improvements and appropriate surfacing, appropriate visibility splays, and the extension of the 30mph speed limit to the south to incorporate the proposed site access. A second condition is also recommended to secure the precise design and specification of the emergency access arrangement from Greenwood Drive.

- 5.4.10 A further condition has also been requested by the LHA to require the site access road to be constructed in accordance with Lancashire County Council Specification for Construction of Estate Roads to at least base course level, up to the entrance of the site compound before any development takes place within the remainder of the site. In light of the nature and scale of the proposal, this is recommended. For the same reason, the additional conditions requested by the LHA to secure a Construction Management Plan, to include details of wheel washing, is also recommended. These latter conditions are required to ensure the highway is not adversely affected during the construction phase of development.
- 5.4.11 There is an expectation for all roads (subject to the street hierarchy and design at reserved matter stage) to be designed to adoptable highway standards. This is a matter capable of being secured by planning condition should the proposal be permitted.
- 5.4.12 The development also incorporates new active travel connections. In addition to that already discussed leading from Greenwood Drive, further active travel connections are also to be included within the development. Firstly, this will include two pedestrian and cycle access points leading from Slyne Road, which are to be located at the southern and northern ends of the development site's Slyne Road frontage. The points where this active route interfaces with the adopted highway along the A6 has been shown within the Access Arrangement drawing. The southern access point is intended to be a pedestrian only access connection, on the basis that cyclists approaching the development site along the A6 from the south are more likely to remain on the A6 instead of diverting into the development site to negotiate further access/junction infrastructure. Cyclists approaching the site from the south would more likely use the main vehicular access to enter the development site or remain on the A6 if continuing northwards. The northern access has been designed as a shared active travel route and would provide access for both pedestrians and cyclists onto the A6. Whilst a matter for further consideration at the reserved matters stage, within the development site, an indicative internal active travel route would link both the northern and southern access points with the main internal access road. This is shown as being located behind and running parallel with the existing roadside hedgerow, it also includes provision for the potential extension of this active travel route southwards. It is then intended that a shared pedestrian/cycle travel route would be provided along the northern side of the access road leading further into the development site.
- 5.4.13 A further active travel connection is also proposed on the western boundary of the site, to provide access onto Hatlex Hill. The inclusion of an active travel connection on this side of the development site will facilitate much improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity by enabling east to west travel and providing a much-needed pedestrian link from Bolton-le-Sands to Hest Bank and Lancaster Canal to the west. At present, the only links between these settlements and the canal are located either 0.5 miles to the north close to the junction with Coastal Road, or via travelling an extended route through Slyne to the south.
- 5.4.14 The merits of linking the development site to the road network to the west, which includes Hatlex Hill and Hatlex Lane, for active travel purposes has been carefully considered in light of the nature of these roads. Both Hatlex Hill and Hatlex Lane are relatively narrow roads and provide limited segregated pedestrian facilities such as pavements. However, the constrained nature of these roads, such as the single carriageway width and presence of bends, themselves encourage lower speeds and engenders a further degree of care from road users. As such, the road network in this area has a sense of being a shared highway environment and wouldn't discourage pedestrians or represent an unsafe pedestrian environment. The supporting Transport Assessment includes a Personal Injury Accident (PIA) review for the highway network adjacent to the site for the most recent five-year period. However, to provide confidence over the appropriateness of incorporating this active travel route, this PIA review has been extended to capture 25 years' worth of data. This extended review has indicated that no incidents have been recorded along Hatlex Hill/Hatlex Lane during this time. Therefore, it is concluded that there are no existing highway safety issues along Hatlex Hill or Hatlex Lane that are likely to be exacerbated by the proposed active travel link, or which would preclude the provision of this link.

5.4.15 The provision of the active travel link to Hatlex Hill and Hatlex Lane will also facilitate improved access to Lancaster Canal for both residents of the development and existing residents within the southern areas of Bolton-le-Sands. This would both not only facilitate improved active travel access to services within Hest Bank, such as those located along Coastal Road, it would also enable improved access for residents to the tranquil and verdant setting provided along the Lancaster Canal, to the benefit of the health and well-being of the local community and the areas sense of place. The final details of all of the active travel access arrangements will be subject to approval through planning condition and would be expected to accord with appropriate standards, such as LTN1/20.

5.4.16 Overall, and despite the strong opposition to the proposed access arrangements raised by interested parties and the wider community, the proposed access strategy is considered acceptable to the Local Highway Authority and would not conflict with requirements of planning policy in respect of providing a safe and suitable access for all users.

5.4.17 Traffic Impacts

The proposed development will result in increased traffic both during the construction phase and once the site is operational. During the consideration of the application, the Local Planning Authority has received numerous representations from interested parties raising significant concerns about highway safety. The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA), along with a subsequent technical note submitted in response to the Local Highway Authority’s comments and requests for clarification.

5.4.18 The submitted TA and subsequent post submission technical note robustly assess the impacts of additional traffic having regard to the existing and future baseline scenarios, existing highway constraints and accident data. To establish potential trip generation for the proposed residential development, the TRICS database has been analysed. The trip rates and vehicle trip generation for the proposed development (up to 200 dwellings) for the AM and PM peak hours are included in the table below:

Multi Modal Trip Generation	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)			PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		
	Arrivals	Departures	2-Way	Arrivals	Departures	2-Way
Total Vehicles	26	73	98	67	28	95
Cyclists	1	2	3	2	1	3
Pedestrians	6	13	19	8	6	14
Public Transport Users	0	7	7	2	0	3
Total People	40	149	189	119	48	168

Table 5.5 – Methodology 1: Traditional TA Approach – Trip Generation

As can be seen from the table, the TA anticipates that the development would generate approximately 98 new two-way vehicular trips in the AM peak and 95 two-way vehicular trips in the PM peak hours.

5.4.19 However, the National Planning Policy Framework now states that transport issues should be considered using a vision-led approach to identify transport solutions that deliver well-designed, sustainable and popular places. In this regard, the applicant has confirmed they are committed to promote sustainable travel to and from the site. To enable this, the application commits to providing a series of sustainable travel measures and enhancements. First and foremost, this includes the active travel measures associated with the development’s access strategy. It also includes additional enhancements to existing public transport facilities, a contribution towards the Lancaster Travel and Transport Infrastructure Strategy (LTTIS) and the establishment of a Travel Plan (including a contribution to enable associated monitoring). The initial Travel Plan which has been submitted in support of this proposal seeks to promote sustainable modes of travel via a series of measures and initiatives. It seeks to reduce single occupancy car use by 10%.

5.4.20 When considering all sustainable travel enhancements outlined above, and the objectives of the Travel Plan to reduce single occupancy car use, the vision-led approach would serve to reduce the additional two-way vehicular trips in the AM and PM peaks identified through the TRICS database

analysis by approximately 10 trips. A comparison of the trip generation is provided within the table below:

Total Vehicles	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)			PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		
	Arrivals	Departures	2-Way	Arrivals	Departures	2-Way
Baseline (Methodology 1)	26	73	98	67	28	95
Vision-led (Methodology 2)	23	66	89	60	25	85

Table 5.6 – Methodology 2: Vision-led Approach – Trip Rates and Trip Generation

5.4.21 In addition to trip generation, the highway impacts of traffic arising from the development have been fully assessed at key junctions within the local road network, as set out in the submitted Transport Assessment. The results show that all assessed junctions would continue to operate within acceptable limits and would not impact the operational capacity of the highway network. Accordingly, and having regard to paragraph 116 of the NPPF—which requires refusal only where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe—the evidence demonstrates that the proposed development would not give rise to impacts of that scale.

5.4.22 The methodology and outcomes of the TA and post submission technical note are not disputed by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) and are therefore considered robust in assessing the significance of the effects arising from the development. Whilst the assessment of the development in isolation is agreed to result in a negligible adverse effect upon the highway network, when combined with the wider district growth ambitions set out within the Local Plan and wider strategic highway infrastructure constraints, the level of effect arising from the development could arguably be greater.

5.4.23 For this reason, the LHA has requested a financial contribution calculated using a gravity model which assesses the development’s impact on various parts of the network based on the scale, type, and location of the development in the context of the adopted Local Plan. This model also incorporates the estimated costs of the associated infrastructure works set out in the LTTIS. The contribution requested will support the delivery of strategic improvements aimed at increasing network capacity and promoting sustainable travel.

5.4.24 The requested contribution equates to £1099.85 per dwelling, which based on a development of 200 dwellings, would total £219,970. The final total figure would be confirmed at the reserved matters stage once the total number of dwellings is determined and would be apportioned across the relevant initiatives identified within the LTTIS. These initiatives would be:

- A6 Slyne Road
- Local highway network around M6 junction 34

Given the likely distribution of trips generated by the development, these initiatives are considered directly related to its impacts and would meet the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations.

5.4.25 In addition, mitigation is proposed in the form of upgrades the two nearest bus stops along the A6 to meet LCC’s quality bus stop standards, and the provision of a fully detailed Travel Plan and associated financial contribution of £12,000 to support its on-going monitoring. With this mitigation in place, the effects arising from the development upon the wider highway network would be negligible overall. On this basis, the LHA has raised no objection to the proposed development.

5.4.26 Without the identified contributions/conditions to mitigate the impacts of the development and support the delivery of strategic highway infrastructure, it is anticipated there would be severe impacts in terms of both safety and congestion. Policy DM58 and DM64 both support contributions to mitigate impacts to highway infrastructure. For this reason, the LHA’s contribution request is supported, both by the Local Planning Authority and the applicant. The upgrading of the bus stops and the provision of a fully detailed Travel Plan can be secured by planning condition, whilst the identified financial contributions will be secured by s106 agreement. In light of this, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the Local Plan policies and the NPPF in relation to traffic impacts. In conclusion, the LHA has raised no objection to the development and is satisfied the development traffic can be accommodated on the network without resulting in highway safety

impacts or in residual cumulative impacts on the road network that would be severe. In this regard the development does not conflict with the Framework or the DM DPD.

5.4.27 Sustainable travel

Planning policy seeks to ensure development maximises opportunities to travel by sustainable transport modes. This includes the promotion of walking and cycling and access to public transport. The Chartered Institution for Highways and Transportation (CIHT) sets out suggested walking distances between sites and key services based on desirable, acceptable and preferred maximum distances. These are set out below:

	Town Centres (m)	Commuting/School/ Sightseeing (m)	Elsewhere/Local Services (m)
Desirable	200	500	400
Acceptable	400	1,000	800
Preferred Maximum	800	2,000	1,200

The WYG Report entitled ‘Accessibility – How Far Do People Walk and Cycle’, states that 1,950 metres is the 85th percentile distance for walking as the main mode of travel.

5.4.28 The development site is located on the edge of the existing village of Bolton-le-Sands, adjacent to existing residential development. Services within the village, including the primary school, are mostly located on Main Road, with access being made through the residential roads to the north. When measured from the proposed Greenwood Drive active travel access, the village primary school is approximately 1,800 metres from the site. The Co-op shop located on Bye Pass Road is also 1,800 metres from the site. Brookfield Surgery is slightly further away at approximately 2,000 metres. However, as a result of the second active travel access route leading onto Hatlex Hill, the services provided within Hest Bank, most of which are located along Coastal Road, are approximately 800 metres away. Within Slyne, the pharmacy and village store are approximately 850 metres, whilst the village school is approximately 900 metres. The supporting TA includes pedestrian and cycle catchment plans which indicate walking and cycling accessibility from the development site, and this shows that the local key amenities provided within the surrounding villages are within close proximity and easy reach for pedestrians and cyclists.

5.4.29 It is concluded that the TA demonstrates that village amenities lie within the 1950 metre preferred distance. Furthermore, local pedestrian infrastructure is considered adequate, with street lighting and, with the exception of sections of Hatlex Lane and a short section of Hanging Green Lane, footways are provided.

5.4.30 In relation to walking, development proposals must not impact the pedestrian environment and should maintain, and where possible, improve the existing pedestrian infrastructure in accordance with policy T2 of the SPLA DPD. When considered alongside the proposed off-site improvements to Slyne Road, which are designed to enhance access for all users, and the opportunity to secure multiple new active travel connections which would enable existing and new residents to travel from east to west, the development site is located in an accessible location. It would also provide residents with a genuine opportunity to make regular, everyday journeys on foot.

5.4.31 In relation to cycling, the site is located in close proximity to the Lancaster Canal, which forms part of National Cycle Network Route 6. Ramped access onto the towpath is available at St Michaels Lane to the north and Hest Bank Lane to the west. The towpath then provides direct access to Carnforth to the north and Lancaster to the south. Comments have been provided regarding the quality of the cycling environment provided along the towpath. The Canal and River Trust within its initial consultation response had requested a financial contribution towards the enhancement and ongoing maintenance of the canal towpath. However, within subsequent correspondence, the Trust confirmed that this request is no longer being made as alternative funding is in the process of being secured to upgrade the towpath in this area. It is considered that the towpath provides a genuine route for cyclists to reach surrounding amenities and towns. In addition to the canal, the surrounding road network also provides a viable route for cyclists. For this reason, cycling would be a realistic mode of travel for future residents of this development.

- 5.4.32 In terms of public transport, the area is served by existing bus services which pass along the Slyne Road (A6) corridor. The nearest bus stops are located near to the junction of Greenwood Avenue with the A6. Depending on where the measurement is taken from, residents, particularly those within the western areas of the site, would be just outside of the 400 metres walking distance recommended by the CIHT, with some dwellings potentially being located around 550 metres walking distance. However, the LHA has accepted that the existing bus stop locations are reasonable to serve the development and have not indicated the need to relocate existing or provide new bus stops. Bus 55 and 555 provide frequent services from these bus stops to places such as Carnforth, Lancaster or Kendal. For this reason, travelling by bus represents a realistic and convenient option for future residents. Furthermore, the development will secure financial contributions towards upgrading the nearest bus stops to Lancashire County Council's quality bus stop standards. Consequently, the proposal will deliver enhancements to existing public transport infrastructure, thereby supporting increased patronage of the established bus services.
- 5.4.33 Access to rail services is poor in the villages as no infrastructure exists. For rail services, residents would be required to commute into Lancaster or Carnforth via other means of transportation in the first instance. From there, these stations offer regular rail connections regionally and nationally.
- 5.4.34 Active Travel England (ATE) are a statutory consultee for developments over 150 housing units, which this development exceeds. ATE has provided comment indicating that development should include consideration of the National Model Design Code, Inclusive Mobility and LTN 1/20. The layout of the development is not a consideration at this stage. However, a condition is recommended to secure the details of internal estate roads, private drives, footways and other active travel routes to be designed to adoptable standards and LTN 1/20.
- 5.4.35 The Development Framework Plan also includes details of potential future access linkages along the length of the southern boundary of the site to provide access to the land to the south of the site. These linkages could be brought forward should any development on land to the south of this site be brought forward in the future. This would deliver tangible benefits through creating further accessible routes which could subsequently provide access to Manor Lane in the south and potentially the recreation ground to the west. For clarity, at present there are no development proposals for this neighbouring land before the Council, as such these access point would not be deemed necessary or reasonable as things stand. However, should any future development come forward – recognising that this would be subject to a separate planning application and assessed on its own merits – the provision of linkages between the sites would offer clear benefits. As such, a separate condition is recommended that would require the submission of details and subsequent provision of active travel routes along the southern boundary of the site. However, this would only be triggered in the event of planning permission being granted for a complementary land use on land to the south. If no development comes forward on this land, then the requirements of this condition would not be engaged. Any active travel link here should also be designed to LTN 1/20 standard.
- 5.4.36 In order to encourage and incentivise active travel and the various means of public transportation as outlined, a Travel Plan will be required for the development. This has already been discussed within paragraph 5.4.19 of this report. An interim Travel Plan has already been provided, and the provision of a fully detailed Travel Plan and associated financial contribution of £12,000 to enable its associated on-going monitoring is also agreed.
- 5.4.37 Overall, the development is considered to be sustainability located and is able to support and encourage the use of alternative sustainable modes of transport and therefore accords with planning policy in this regard. There are no significant adverse effects arising from the development on the pedestrian and cycle environment. In fact, betterment will be provided through the proposed off-site improvements works and the opportunity to secure multiple active travel pedestrian linkages.
- 5.4.38 Parking
Policy DM62 sets out the Council's maximum parking standards for new development. The submission indicates the development will be designed to meet the requirements of policy DM62 with the details provided as part of the layout considerations through reserved matters. Parking is not explicitly a reserved matter; therefore, a condition is recommended to control the provision of the parking prior to occupation of respective dwellings, together with access and turning provision via the internal estate roads. There is an expectation for all roads (subject to the street hierarchy

and design at reserved matter stage) to be designed to adoptable highway standards. Cycle parking within each dwelling will be required in accordance with DM62, details of cycle parking infrastructure would be secured by later reserved matter approvals. In instances where cycle parking is provided within a shed type garden structure, as opposed to a garage, these should be designed to Secured By Design Status.

5.4.39 In conclusion, the proposal has robustly demonstrated that safe and suitable access can be provided for all modes of transport and that the additional traffic generated by the development can be safely accommodated on the local highway network without resulting in significant adverse impacts. There are no highway safety objections from the statutory consultees. The scheme also delivers enhancements in the form of improved highway and pedestrian infrastructure and active travel linkages. Therefore, despite concerns raised by the local community to the contrary, there are no technical highway grounds on which to withhold planning permission. Finally, for the reasons the proposal satisfies the requirements of Paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF, and as such, it also accords with the requirements of Paragraph 155 c with respect to Green Belt matters.

5.5 **Landscape character and visual effects** NPPF Chapter 8 Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities, Chapter 12 Achieving Well-Designed Places, and Chapter 15 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP8: Protecting the Natural Environment, EN3: The Open Countryside, SC4: Green and Blue Corridors and Chains and T3: Lancaster Canal; Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM4: Residential Development outside Main Urban Areas, DM29: Key Design Principles, DM43: Green and Blue Infrastructure, and DM46: Development and Landscape Impact.

5.5.1 Paragraph 187 of the Framework states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. In preparing the Local Plan, the Council recognised that the district contains a range of important landscapes that are valued features of the natural environment and are worthy of protection to varying degrees. The Plan appropriately distinguishes between landscapes of national significance, such as National Landscapes and those of local significance.

5.5.2 The site is not located within a National Landscape, nor is it located within a landscape that has been identified as being within a local landscape designation, which are identified through policy EN5. Moreover, the application site is not considered to be, or form part of, a Valued Landscape. The site and surroundings do not contain attributes which would elevate it above other more everyday landscapes, as defined by the Landscape Institute. However, that is not to say that the landscape in which the development site is located is not valued or attractive. Policy DM46 explicitly addresses landscapes which do not fall within identified landscape designations, but which still are still valued, unique and provide a distinct sense of place. This policy sets out that the Council will seek to protect and enhance such landscapes and will require development to be in scale and keeping with the landscape character and to be appropriate to its surroundings in terms of siting, scale, massing, design, materials, external appearance and landscaping. Consideration will be given to both the individual and cumulative impacts of a proposal. Furthermore, Policy DM29 requires all development to contribute positively to the identity and character of the area, thereby promoting high-quality and context-sensitive design across the district.

5.5.3 The site is formed by four agricultural fields of varying sizes, each enclosed by boundary hedgerows. Slyne Road borders the site to the east. To the north and west existing residential development within Bolton-le-Sands and Hest Bank is adjacent to the development site. Further residential development extends northwards and westwards from this. To the south, a further agricultural field(s) separate the development site from Slyne. Additional residential development extends southwards. Such is the layout of the surrounding development that the development effectively forms the northern half of a pocket of open agricultural land that is enclosed by existing residential development and the A6 corridor. Open countryside lies to the east of the A6, and this provides a rural boundary to the eastern edge of the identified settlements.

5.5.4 Topographically, the site is undulating, as described within paragraph 1.2 of this report, and this is reflective of the prevailing drumlin landscape. The site features a central drumlin, the crest of which sites at a level of around 43m AOD. To the east and west of this, levels drop to around 36m AOD close to the A6, and 28m AOD on the western boundary. This undulating topography continues to

the east of the A6, and this includes Inglebrick hill, a larger drumlin which rises to approximately 81m AOD and which forms a sense of enclosure to the eastern side of the A6. The northern end of Inglebrick hill includes two communications masts disguised as trees. This drumlin is a large and locally distinct landform feature which largely restricts open landscape views towards or from the east.

- 5.5.5 With respect to landscape characterisations, the site is located within the National Landscape Character area NCA31: Morecambe Coast and Lune Estuary. The key characteristics of which include, amongst other features, a dramatically undulating landscape leading to the coastal strip with substantial drumlin features.
- 5.5.6 The site also lies within the *Low Coastal Drumlins* Landscape Character Type (LCT), sub-type *Carnforth–Galgate–Cockerham (12a)*, as defined in the Lancashire County Council’s Landscape Strategy for Lancashire (December 2000). This landscape type is characterised by low lying hills—typically around 40 metres in height—with broad, rounded tops, particularly prevalent toward the northwest coast of the study area. This LCT is also influenced by strategic current and historic transport infrastructure including the West Coast Mainline, A6/M6 corridor and the Lancaster Canal. Both the development site and the wider locality is reflective of the LCT, demonstrating many of the landscape characteristics, such as drumlin/undulating topography, whilst it is also influenced by the A6 corridor and its associated development. The site does not impact any statutory landscapes (directly or indirectly) owing to the distance from the closest National Landscapes and the intervening development and surrounding countryside.
- 5.5.7 The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which supports this application also provides a description of the site and of the wider study area, to establish the landscape baseline conditions in which the development would be located. The LVIA also establishes a visual baseline to identify the locations from which the development would be visible. This includes identification of visual receptors including from within the immediate local landscape and from locations slightly further afield. Locations assessed include from public vantage points, Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and public highways. Officers concur with the established baseline and consider the identified viewpoints to provide an appropriate basis upon which to assess the development proposal.
- 5.5.8 Due to the undulating topography within the development site, and the presence of existing residential development which encompasses the sites northern and western sides, visibility of different parts of the site varies depending on topography and the presence of existing built form. Generally speaking, the upper parts of the drumlin towards the centre of the site, as well as the lower lying eastern field are the most visible. Views of other parts of the site are more restricted due to the layout of surrounding development.
- 5.5.9 Viewpoints assessed within the supporting LVIA include from various points along the A6 and Lancaster Canal, from surrounding publicly accessible spaces including Slyne with Hest Cemetery and football club (Bottomdale Road) and the tennis club/recreation ground (Hanging Green Lane), and from various Public Rights of Way within the surrounding countryside. The sensitivity of the visual receptor from these various viewpoints varies from medium-low to medium-high depending on factors such as proximity, topography and presence of screening. Residential receptors include the residential dwellings located on the various residential roads which encompass the development site, the sensitivity of these receptors is high. A total of 16 viewpoints outside of the development site have been assessed within the LVIA, from different locations including distances and elevations.
- 5.5.10 Having visited the site and its surroundings, Officers conclude that the site is influenced by the existing developed edge of the settlements which immediately abut, or are located in close proximity to, the development site boundaries, as well as the A6 transport corridor which encloses the eastern boundary. There are no public rights of way through the site, however, as identified within the LVIA, near and distant views are achieved. The near views include from various points along the A6 as well as from surrounding residential roads and the canal towpath. These viewpoints enable views into the site, including an appreciation of its undulating topography. However, it is also apparent that these views are achieved from already developed residential areas, as such existing residential development and transport infrastructure already form a fundamental component part of these existing views, and this heavily defines the visual surrounding context to the development site. Furthermore, traffic noise from the A6 corridor is also apparent, particularly from viewpoints located

along the eastern and southern edges of the site. Disturbance arising from surrounding development and transport infrastructure reduces the tranquillity and to a certain extent the rural sense of place which is more apparent in areas to the east.

- 5.5.11 It is noted that the location of viewpoint 10, as indicated on the aerial photograph drawing contained within the LVIA and which details the location of the near distance viewpoints, is not correct and that this view is taken from slightly further along to the canal towpath to the northeast, closer to No. 7 Ashworth Drive. Despite this minor discrepancy, it is considered that the assessment set out within the LVIA with respect to this viewpoint is still appropriate.
- 5.5.12 With respect to the more distant views of the site, due to the topography of the land to the east of the A6, views of the development site from the east, including from the cemetery/football ground and the various public rights of way present in this area, are largely restricted. Other longer distance views of the site are also achieved, such as from Pasture Lane to the north. From this location, the crest of the drumlin within the development site is visible upon the horizon line along with the central hedgerow. However, views of the existing residential development, including that located along Ashworth Drive, are also achieved, and this again forms a developed residential foreground, and it is in this context that any development within the application site would be viewed.
- 5.5.13 In light of this assessment, the conclusions within the LVIA for landscape quality (medium), value (medium), susceptibility to change (medium) and, taking into account the landscape value and susceptibility, the overall landscape sensitivity (medium), are not contested.
- 5.5.14 The LVIA assesses the potential landscape and visual effects arising from the development during its construction, year 1 and post development (year 15) stages. The assessment concludes that the potential year 1 effect of the development upon the landscape character of the site and surrounding area would range from moderate-substantial adverse (for the site itself) to moderate adverse (immediate surroundings) and slight adverse (for the surrounding townscape and wider landscape).
- 5.5.15 With respect to visual effects at year 1, for those views achieved from the A6, this ranges from substantial-moderate adverse (for the length of the site adjoining the A6) to neutral effect (for the sections of the site beyond). The effects from other identified views (as highlighted in paragraph 5.5.9) range from slight adverse, negligible adverse and neutral. Finally, for adjacent residential receptors, the effect at year 1 is defined as substantial adverse. The substantial effect is significant and is a consequence of the permanent change of the site from the current agricultural land with its replacement of up to 200 dwellings with associated infrastructure.
- 5.5.16 The LVIA therefore concludes that embedded design measures are required to mitigate this harm and to provide opportunities for furthering the landscape character in the longer term. First and foremost, these measures include the adoption of a number of layout principles to guide the development of the site. This includes the protection of the top of the drumlin, keeping it free from development and forming a green corridor extending from the northern to the southern boundary of the site. Topographical low points within the site will also remain free from residential development, and these areas would accommodate above ground SuDS features such as drainage basins. In turn, these will form multi-functional spaces which will enhance the visual appearance of the site and contribute to the sites sense of place and character. Other on-site amenity features will include the provision of a notable quantity of on-site open space areas, including suitable provision for dog walking, as well as a considered layout to retain access to attractive key views of the surrounding landscape, again to reinforce the sites sense of place. The layout will also take account of the sites sloping topography to ensure that appropriate development platforms are identified and to ensure that transport routes within the site feature appropriate gradients. East to west travel connections are also to be incorporated into the design.
- 5.5.17 The supporting Design and Access Statement also provides details as to intended building heights and densities. This sets out that new homes would predominantly be 2-storey in height in order to reflect the scale of surrounding residential development. However, it also sets out that the proposal intends to incorporate the careful use of some 2½ storey homes within the lower parts of the development site, as this will assist in creating a varied and interesting roofscape. In principle, this approach is acceptable, subject to the exact details of this approach being thoroughly considered at reserved matters stage.

- 5.5.18 Importantly, the Design and Access Statement also acknowledges the need to consider the topography of the site, and the subsequent impact that the scale of the dwellings will have. The associated Building Heights Plan provides a layout indicating building heights for different parts of the site. This indicates the inclusion of 4 bungalow properties within the central area of the site, in an area close to the drumlin crest. Due to the topographical difference between this central area of the site and the surrounding existing residential development, and the visibility of the higher central part of the site in near and longer distance views, it is considered that the use of single storey properties, particularly within the areas which line the central green corridor, is paramount. However, it is considered that there should be a greater use of single storey properties, particularly focussed in the central and northern areas along both sides of the central green corridor, than what is currently shown on the indicative details provided. This part of the site is more steeply sloping than areas towards the southern end of the site, as such the topographical change relative to the surrounding existing residential development is more distinct and visible in longer distance views from the north, such as that from Pasture Lane. The use of lower single storey properties in these areas would help the residential development assimilate into the sloping topography, and this would limit the impact that larger scale/height properties would otherwise have upon the horizon line. Clearer details would also be needed of retaining structures, including that indicatively shown on the Development Framework Plan. At this stage, the information provided is only illustrative and is not for formal approval as part of this outline application. However, as Officers do hold some reservation with the current indicative details, if approved, Officers would encourage the developer to utilise the Councils pre-application advice service to inform the reserved matters design, prior to submitting any application.
- 5.5.19 Whilst this is not a matter for determination as part of this outline application, the illustrative proposal indicates that the site could deliver a density of up to 35 dwellings per hectare on average. This is higher than the density of surrounding development, however, it is considered that an increase in density may be able to be accommodated, particularly within the topographically lower eastern area of the site, given its much lower prominence topographically speaking and resultant lower visibility in longer distance views. The delivery of attractive and well vegetated frontages to both the eastern and southern boundaries, along with a pleasant and spacious tree lined main avenue leading into the site, would help assimilate the increased density of built form within this part of the site. Importantly, due to the topographical complexity and resultant visibility of the upper areas of the site, development on each side of the drumlin should be of a lower density. The appropriate use of increased densities could represent a more efficient use of land and would contribute towards alleviating the district's housing crisis. Any reserved matters proposal would need to detail the way in which an increased density could be accommodated within the design of the site and wider surroundings.
- 5.5.20 To a certain extent, Officers were satisfied that the LVIA provides an accurate, reliable and robust assessment of the landscape impacts of the scheme. However, it is important to note that this initial LVIA was based upon the initial masterplan design and Development Framework Plan, which included a residential development parcel within the northernmost field. Officers raised significant amenity and landscape concerns with this element of the proposal, due to the steeply sloping northeastern flank of the drumlin and the height difference relative to properties on Pinewood Avenue. It was considered any development in this location would be materially harmful to the character and visual appearance of the locality and the amenity of existing residents in this area.
- 5.5.21 To alleviate these concerns, the applicant has reviewed the masterplan design and Development Framework Plan and has subsequently relocated development to the southern part of the site, in the area where the off-lead dog walking area was initially proposed. This in turn has been relocated to the northern field, which will, according to the revised Development Framework Plan, now remain free from residential development. This alteration satisfactorily addresses Officer concerns, it also means that the whole of the northern field, which is an attractive part of the site and affords expansive views over Morecambe Bay and to the Lakeland fells beyond, will be retained as publicly accessible open space.
- 5.5.22 An addendum to the LVIA has been produced to reflect the changes which confirms that the removal of built form from the northern field and its replacement to the south is a positive design change and will enable a better appreciation of the drumlin landform, particularly in viewpoints from the north, including Pinewood Avenue, the Canal towpath and from further afield on Pasture Lane.

- 5.5.23 Taking into account the amended Development Framework approach (described in paragraph 5.5.20 – 5.5.22) as well as the embedded design mitigation measures including the delivery of a comprehensive Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy, the LVIA concludes that from all vantage points assessed, the residual visual effects (year 15) arising from the development are expected to reduce. The assessment has followed established guidance and standard methodology, considering the likely impacts on a range of visual receptors. As is typical, the greatest level of visual effect is experienced by receptors located closest to the site. In this case, once the development becomes operational, visual effects are predicted to range from moderate adverse (for the A6 eastern frontage) to negligible adverse and neutral for the remaining receptors. With respect to residential receptors, this would reduce to moderate adverse for dwellings along Greenwood Drive, Pinewood Avenue, Greenwood Crescent, Ashworth Drive and negligible adverse for properties located along Manor Lane to the south. The residual effect upon properties located on Hatlex Hill, Bryn Grove and Kirklands would be greater, as this would reduce to substantial-moderate adverse at year 15. The severity of these effects is principally due to the direct intervisibility between the site and the receptors mentioned. The degree of visual harm is heightened for those receptors due to their high sensitivity and proximity. However, most properties will overlook open space and retained and bolstered landscaping, which will over time serve to provide filtering of views of the development.
- 5.5.24 Given the overall scale of the site and its varied topography, the development will affect the wider landscape to differing degrees. These impacts are assessed to range from moderate adverse in views along the A6, reducing to negligible adverse and neutral for the remaining receptors. While the development would expand the periphery of the neighbouring villages, its scale and siting would not appear incongruous within the existing pattern of development in this area. This is particularly the case as the proposal would be perceived as the partial infilling of pocket of land already enclosed by existing development and transport infrastructure.
- 5.5.25 It is apparent that the mitigation measures have been carefully designed into the scheme following a landscape capacity assessment, to ensure that the proposal assimilates as best as possible into the receiving landscape. Clearly, the scale, layout, landscaping, and design of development will be critical considerations to determine whether the development conforms to relevant policies at the reserved matters stage. However, based on the details provided as part of this outline proposal, Officers are satisfied that development here could be brought forward in a manner that would both be well-related to the existing settlement and proportionate in scale and character.
- 5.5.26 Overtime, it is concluded that the overall effects of the development in landscape terms would reduce, though residual moderate adverse effects would still persist for lengths of the A6 corridor. As such, in light of the landscape implications arising from the development of this site, and the need to incorporate design measures to mitigate the impacts of the development overtime as much as possible, it is considered that a condition is necessary to ensure any subsequent reserved matters proposals are brought forward in substantial accordance with the design principles and environmental objectives set out within the Illustrative Development Framework Plan and Illustrative Green/Blue Infrastructure Strategy Plan, and the principles set out within the latest Design and Access Statement. This is reasonable as these documents present a positive, landscape-led approach to the design of subsequent development, which is particularly important given the visibility and topography of the site. To minimise adverse effects during construction, adherence to a suitable CEMP will be required, also secured by condition.
- 5.5.27 In conclusion, the proposal would result in conflict with the landscape-related policies of the Local Plan. However, these landscape impacts are expected to be localised to lengths of the A6 and sections of the residential roads which enclose the site to the north and west. On balance, this conflict is not considered significant with the harm being contained to the immediate site and its surroundings.
- 5.6 **Flood Risk and Drainage** NPPF Chapter 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SP8: Protecting the Natural Environment; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33: Development and Flood Risk, DM34: Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage, DM35: Water Supply and Wastewater and DM36: Protecting Water Resources, Water Quality and Infrastructure and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

5.6.1 Flood Risk

Strategic policy seeks to ensure new growth within the district is directed to areas at least risk of flooding, does not create new or exacerbate existing flooding issues and aim to reduce flood risk overall. This approach is consistent with the NPPF, which states that development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas at lower risk of flooding.

- 5.6.2 The majority of the site lies within flood zone 1. However, the Environment Agency (EA) Flood Map for Planning (FMFP) identifies a small pocket of flood zone 2 close to the access to Greenwood Drive, close to the location of an existing small partly open/partially culverted watercourse, which presently provides field drainage for approximately 6 hectares of land. The watercourse runs to the west of the Greenwood Drive/Pinewood Avenue dwellings and enters Lancaster Canal to the north. In addition to this, the Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) mapping shows an area of flood zone 3b which passes through the site from the east and then to the north. However, there is no watercourse within the site in the flood zone 3b location detailed on the SFRA map. The site-specific flood risk assessment which accompanies this application has shown that the location of the flood zone 3b as detailed within the Councils SFRA is incorrect. This has included a CCTV survey of the culverted section, and a topographical survey of the open channel section. This has also determined that the existing culvert provides sufficient capacity for the current catchment run-off and any future run-off from development. It considers that that a blockage of the culvert could result in overland flow, however, due to the size and condition of the existing culvert, this is deemed to have a very low chance of occurring. In such an event, the flow path in this location (where the emergency access connects with Greenwood Drive) is not identified as being deeper than 200mm (with climate change incorporated). For this reason, when compared to the DEFRA Flood Risks to People flood hazard classification, this event would pose a negligible risk. With respect to the extent of flood zone 3b, the site-specific assessment concludes that the Councils SFRA should be updated to only show the watercourse as forming the flood zone 3b extent.
- 5.6.3 With respect to surface water flooding, there are areas of both high and medium risk of surface water flooding within the eastern areas of the site, close to the A6. The site-specific flood risk assessment identifies that the surface water flood risk to the site, without mitigation, is medium. The proposed site access point from Slyne Road would be located outside of the areas at risk of surface water flooding. However, a proposed residential development parcel would be located within the area identified as being at risk of surface water flooding. The medium risk classification is due to the impermeability of the ground and the inability for run-off from the onsite catchment to soakaway. The risk is contained within localised pockets and the available mapping shows that depths are unlikely to exceed 300mm. To mitigate the risk posed by locating dwellings within these areas of medium risk of surface water flooding, the site-specific flood risk assessment identifies that all dwellings can be located at least 150mm higher than the current level of surface water flood risk. This means that flood avoidance for these more vulnerable uses is achieved, and that by implementing this mitigation, the risk of surface water flooding is low.
- 5.6.4 It is necessary to highlight the recent changes to guidance set out within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) relating to the application of the sequential test when considering surface water flood risk. These changes to the PPG came into effect on the 17th of September 2025 and state that if a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development and would not increase flood risk elsewhere, the sequential test need not be applied. In light of the findings of the submitted site specific flood risk assessment with respect to surface water, it is considered the flood risk sequential test is not engaged by surface water risk, as this can be appropriately avoided and mitigated. A condition to ensure that the development is undertaken in accordance with the mitigation contained within the site-specific flood risk assessment is recommended.
- 5.6.5 With respect to the areas of flood zone 2 and 3b associated with the watercourse which is located to the east of the Greenwood Drive/Pinewood Avenue dwellings, the proposed emergency access/active travel route which extends from Greenwood Drive into the development site would pass through these areas of flood risk. The merits of identifying the culverted section of the watercourse, over which the access would pass, as flood zone 3b is questioned given the watercourse is below ground at this point and that there is no natural storage function provided in this area. Furthermore, it has been shown that the risk to people resulting from any overland flow which may occur in this area has been assessed as negligible. Emergency vehicles could readily

cross given the relatively low depth (not identified as being deeper than 200mm (with climate change)), whilst people and cycles would not be obliged to cross this area and would be able to use the main access onto Slyne Road or the western access onto Hatlex Hill, both of which would be unaffected during a flood event. However, the EA FMFP now indicates the area through which the access would pass as being within flood zone 2. The EA FMFP indicates that flood zones 2 and 3 have been updated to include local detailed models, and a new improved national model.

- 5.6.6 Given the approach of the SFRA to designate watercourses, including culverted sections, as flood zone 3b, and the identification of an area of flood zone 2 within the EA FMFP, it is considered that a precautionary approach to the adoption of the flood risk sequential test (FRST) is both reasonable and necessary in this instance. As the Greenwood Drive access arrangement passes through these identified flood zones, the flood risk sequential test (FRST) is deemed to be engaged. For this reason, a FRST accompanies the application.
- 5.6.7 In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the scope of the FRST assessment was discussed and agreed with the Local Planning Authority before submission. Given the scale of the development and the nature of the proposal (housing to meet a district need), it was agreed that the area of search to review alternative sites should be the main urban areas, sites on the edge of the urban areas and sustainable rural settlements, also including land adjacent to them.
- 5.6.8 The purpose of the sequential test is to consider whether there are any reasonably available sites suitable to accommodate the proposed development that are at a lower risk of flooding than the application site. The PPG states *'Sites should be considered 'reasonably available' for the purposes of the sequential test if their location is suitable for the type of development proposed, they are able to meet the same development needs and they have a reasonable prospect of being developed at the same time as the proposal.'* The PPG also states, *'In considering whether alternative lower-risk sites (which could, where relevant, be a series of two or more smaller sites) would be capable of accommodating the proposed development, such alternative sites do not need to be owned by the applicant to be considered 'reasonably available'.*
- 5.6.9 The applicant has undertaken a robust FRST looking extensively at the suitability and potential availability of other sites. The FRST also draws a reasonable comparison in relation to the respective flood risks of the identified sites, relative to the site forming the subject of this proposal. Of all of the sites assessed within the FRST, no sites were identified that would genuinely be considered sequentially preferable in flood risk terms, including sites at Lundsfield Quarry, Brewers Barn and Grab Lane amongst others. Furthermore, the FRST also provides evidence demonstrating that the identified sites are also unavailable to the applicant. Officers are therefore satisfied the FRST is passed in accordance with policy DM33 and the NPPF.
- 5.6.10 Having passed the FRST, it is necessary to consider whether or not it is necessary to satisfy the exception test as set out at paragraphs 177-179. The need for the exception test will depend on the vulnerability of the development, which is proposed within the at-risk areas, in line with the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in Annex 3. The part of the development which passes through the identified flood zone is the emergency access, as well as an active travel route. Within the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in Annex 3 of the NPPF, essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes) is defined as essential infrastructure. A case is made that the emergency access onto Greenwood Drive constitutes essential transport infrastructure, particularly as it is an element of the scheme which has been requested by the Local Highways Authority to facilitate an acceptable access strategy. Officers consider this to be a reasonable assessment. Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'incompatibility' indicates that essential infrastructure within flood zone 3b areas must be subject to the exception test. The location of essential infrastructure within flood zone 2 areas does not trigger the sequential test. Whilst a case is made by the applicant that the culverted section of the watercourse should not be designated as an area of flood zone 3b, the application of the FRST and the exception test must be undertaken in a consistent manner. Accordingly, as the emergency access passes through the identified flood zone 3b area (over the culverted section of the watercourse) it is considered that the exception test is engaged in this instance.
- 5.6.11 The application is supported by an exception test assessment. First and foremost, this addresses the requirements of paragraph 178 of the NPPF, which states that to pass the exception test it should be demonstrated that:

- a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and
- b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

In respect of requirement a), Officers concur with the findings of the exception test assessment provided by the applicant, which sets out succinctly a range of wider sustainability benefits (to the community) that this development is capable of delivering. It is considered that these benefits outweigh the flood risk, particularly as the element of the scheme which triggers the application of the exception test is deemed to be essential infrastructure that has been required by the Highways Authority. With respect to requirement b), the development as a whole has demonstrated the way in which the development will be safe for its lifetime and will not result in flood risk elsewhere. In addition to this, the proposal has demonstrated that it will reduce surface water flows significantly from current rates towards the watercourse. In turn, this will also reduce the risk of any flooding occurring at the inlet of the culvert in the location where the proposed Emergency Access is to be located. The development will also provide a betterment to existing properties to the west of the site, along Byn Grove and Hatlex Hill, by capturing and appropriately disposing of existing overland flows which presently run-off the site in this direction. On this basis, Officers are satisfied that the development satisfies the requirements of paragraph 178 of the NPPF.

5.6.12 In addition to this, the exception test assessment also addresses the requirements of the PPG which state that, within flood zone 3b, essential infrastructure that has passed the exception test should be designed and constructed to:

- a) remain operational and safe for users in times of flood;
- b) result in no net loss of floodplain storage;
- c) not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.

With respect to a), as set out previously, the depth of any overland surface water flooding in the area of the access would not be above 200mm. This is sufficient to ensure that the use of the access by emergency vehicles remains possible. With respect to b), the development in this area would not affect the existing capacity of the culvert, which has been shown to be sufficient, nor would it include any form of development that would displace flood water. With respect to c), the access can be designed in manner so as not to impede any overland flow, such as the use of appropriate surfacing and kerb lines. The exact details of the construction of this point of access are to be secured by condition. As such, in addition to providing an appropriately designed access in highway terms, the access design must adopt measures to ensure existing water flows are not impeded or redirected to prevent the development from increasing flood risk elsewhere.

5.6.13 Overall, it is considered that the inclusion of the emergency access arrangement onto Greenwood Drive would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk that this element of the development could be subject to. Furthermore, the development will be safe for its lifetime and will result in betterment in flood risk terms to specified areas of the site. Finally, the proposed emergency access arrangement can remain operational and safe for users in times of flood, will not result in a net loss of floodplain storage and can be designed in a manner that does not impede water flows and will not increase flood risk elsewhere. Accordingly, Officers conclude that the exception test is passed. For this reason, it is concluded that the application of national and local policies relating to flood risk, do not provide a strong reason for refusing this proposal, and with regards to the application of the definition of grey belt land, flood risk (a footnote 7 areas of particular importance), would not preclude the development site from constituting grey belt land.

5.6.14 Drainage Strategy

Paragraph 182 of the Framework requires that applications with potential impacts on drainage should incorporate SuDS to control flow rates and reduce runoff volumes. These systems should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development and, wherever possible, deliver multiple benefits. For major developments, SuDS should:

- Take into account advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA);
- Have appropriate minimum operational standards;
- Include maintenance arrangements to ensure effective operation for the lifetime of the development.

- 5.6.15 Policy DM34 of the Development Management DPD sets out that surface water must be managed sustainably in all new development. The Council expects proposals to utilise SuDS as a priority, particularly naturalistic solutions integrated into the site's soft landscaping, delivering multifunctional benefits as part of a high-quality green and blue environment.
- 5.6.16 This application is accompanied by an Outline Drainage Strategy, which has been informed by the identified baseline flood risk conditions and a catchment analysis. The Outline Drainage Strategy has also been informed by prior pre-application engagement with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The proposed surface water drainage strategy seeks to positively drain the impermeable areas of the development site (the precise details of which are to be controlled by condition when the layout of the development is known) at a controlled greenfield discharge rate of 18l/s into the existing watercourse at the northern end of the site. This watercourse flows into Lancaster Canal to the north, and a maximum discharge rate of 18l/s represents a potential 74% betterment on the current discharge rate currently drained by the watercourse. Should the extent of the impermeable areas within the development increase as part of any reserved matters application, then the associated QBAR and Qmax rates would be expected to be remeasured to reflect this, to ensure that the flow rates leading into Lancaster Canal are appropriate.
- 5.6.17 Infiltration testing has been carried out on site, and this has proven that infiltration is not viable as the sole method of disposing of surface water. Subsequently, it is proposed that surface water be attenuated within a series of attenuation basins located within the topographical low points within the site before being discharged to the watercourse. The proposal also includes a dry basin, which has the capacity to provide a further 1,000m³ of attenuation above the identified design requirements. This would be located in the eastern area of the site, in the approximate location of the existing surface water flood risk. This dry basin would only be utilised in extreme rainfall events which are above the design parameters, or if there is a failure within the drainage system. The supporting Illustrative Development Framework Plan indicatively shows these features accommodated within the site layout.
- 5.6.18 Due to the topography of the site, the drainage strategy splits the site into three distinct drainage catchments, the eastern, middle and western catchments. Both the eastern and middle catchments would be drained via a gravity feed to the watercourse. As the western catchment is located on the opposite side of the drumlin, surface water drainage from this area of the site would need to be pumped. 24 hour emergency storage capacity will need to be provided within this catchment area in the event of a pump blockage or failure, this has been calculated and incorporated into the volume of the detention basins proposed in this part of the site. At present, the current site catchment allows notable volumes of greenfield runoff from the site to flow towards the properties to the west, including Hatlex Hill. The inclusion of attenuation basins within this part of the site will serve to intercept this overland flow, which would then be stored and pumped to the eastern side as per the drainage design, this will provide betterment to these neighbouring properties.
- 5.6.19 Within its comments, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) provides site specific advice which, in this case, includes commentary on the proposed pumping solution. The LLFA states that pumped solutions should only ever be used as a last resort, once gravity discharge via all other options within the drainage hierarchy, have been thoroughly assessed and discounted. The LLFA considers that the proposal is acceptable and in principle, as it has been demonstrated that surface water from the proposed site can be drained. However, the LLFA will require the applicant to demonstrate as part of any future detailed drainage strategy that the currently proposed pumped solution is fully justified and designed to ensure that any residual risk can be managed. To facilitate the pumped drainage arrangement, a surface water pumping station is proposed within the western area of the site.
- 5.6.20 Despite local concerns over the increase in potential flooding arising from the development, the applicant has provided technical evidence to demonstrate that the development can be drained without increasing the risk of flooding on or off site and can deliver betterment with respect to reducing existing overland flows and flow rates. Importantly, the strategy includes numerous above ground drainage features which positively contribute to the delivery of a genuine sustainable drainage system with multifunctional benefits including for design, placemaking, biodiversity, flood risk and open space. This also contributes towards the proposal according with the requirements of the NPPF paragraph 159 regarding the Golden Rules. The precise details of any SuDS features will be a matter secured by condition (associated with the final drainage scheme) and the layout

determined at reserved matters stage. The Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection to the development subject to the imposition of conditions to secure the final drainage scheme based on the principles of the drainage strategy, a construction surface water management plan, a detailed management and maintenance plan for the approved scheme and a verification condition to demonstrate the approved drainage scheme has been installed. Informative notes relating to other consenting regimes and legal requirements which will be necessary to deliver this drainage strategy are also requested. The Canal and River Trust (CRT) has also reviewed the proposal, given the discharge ultimately enters Lancaster Canal. The CRT has confirmed that it would need to review a fully detailed drainage strategy and recommends a condition be attached to any approval to secure this detail. This can be appropriately combined with the condition already requested by the LLFA. These conditions would also address the requirements set out within the consultation response provided by United Utilities with respect to surface water.

5.6.21 Foul drainage will connect to the public sewer within Slyne Road. The foul drainage system would also need to be pumped due to the topography of the site, as such two pumping stations are indicated within the Outline Drainage Strategy drawing and within the supporting Illustrative Development Framework Plan. United Utilities have raised no concerns with this approach.

5.6.22 Considering the above, and with the imposition of suitable flood risk and drainage planning conditions, it has been demonstrated that the development can be safe from flood risk and that the development would not result in a flood risk elsewhere over the lifetime of the development. It is concluded that there are no flood risk or drainage grounds to resist the proposal and that the development accords with the NPPF and local planning policies in this regard.

5.7 **Biodiversity and trees** NPPF Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP8: Protecting the Natural Environment and EN7: Environmentally Important Areas; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM43: Green and Blue Infrastructure, DM44: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and DM45: Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland.

5.7.1 Strategic policies SP8 and EN7 both recognise the importance and value of biodiversity within the district and expects development proposals to protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity. This policy position is reflected in the Development Management DPD policies. Policy DM44 states development proposals should protect and enhance biodiversity and, as a principle, there should be net gain of biodiversity assets wherever possible. The policy goes on to state that where harm cannot be avoided, it should be mitigated and as a last resort compensated for, and where a proposal leads to significant harm, planning permission should be refused. Policy DM45 identifies the importance of retaining trees, woodland and hedgerows where they positively contribute to visual amenity, landscape character and/or the environmental value of an area. This policy expects new development to positively incorporate existing trees and hedgerows and where this cannot be achieved, the losses must be justified and mitigated. Policy DM45 seeks to maximise and encourage new tree and hedgerow planting of native species to mitigate the wider impacts of climate change and to enhance the character and appearance of the district.

5.7.2 Impact on Designated Sites
The site is located approximately 700 metres from the Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary Special Area of Protection (SPA), Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Morecambe Bay Ramsar site, in addition to the associated Special Scientific Intertest (SSSI). Given the proximity of the site to the designated areas, there is the potential for the development to have an adverse impact on their integrity both during construction and operational phases of the development. This application is supported by an Ecological Impact Assessment and a Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (sHRA), which the Council has adopted to fulfil the Councils duty as the Competent Authority.

5.7.3 In relation to potential effects, the application has sufficiently demonstrated, to the satisfaction of Natural England, that the development would not directly impact the designated sites and that the site does not provide habitat of sufficient quality or extent to function as Functionally Linked Land (FLL) for qualifying species of the Morecambe Bay SPA and Ramsar site. For this reason, the development site itself is not considered to be functionally linked land. This is despite the findings of previous recent surveying efforts undertaken by GMEU concluding that the development site formed

part of a pocket of land to the west of the A6 which has moderate potential as functionally linked land.

- 5.7.4 Land to the east of the A6 corridor was deemed to contain habitat of greater quality and extent to function as FLL. Based on its previous recent surveying efforts, GMEU concluded that this area of land has a high potential as FLL. The sHRA has assessed the impacts of the proposal upon this area of land and has concluded, again to the satisfaction of Natural England as the statutory consultee for such matters, that the proposed development would not generate adverse disturbance effects on SPA/Ramsar qualifying features utilising land to the east of the A6. This is principally a result of topography and the fact that SPA/Ramsar birds principally utilise land further to the east (closer to Ancliffe Lane) which is substantially screened by landform and is not subject to significant levels of visual or acoustic disturbance pathways from uses to the west, including the development site and the A6. The sHRA does set out that this is also achieved in part as no impulsive or piling works are proposed, and working hours will be restricted to daytime periods only. These working practices in effect form mitigation to ensure no effects upon this nearby habitat, as such this will need to be secured as part of the CEMP condition, to ensure that there are no likely significant effects on Morecambe Bay SPA qualifying features through acoustic disturbance.
- 5.7.5 It is established within the sHRA that there are no hydrological or airborne pathways between the development site and the designated sites, as such potential impacts through these means can be ruled out. With respect to recreational disturbance, the sHRA concludes that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the designated areas subject to appropriate mitigation being secured by condition. To mitigate against residual risk, Homeowner Information Packs will be required. The purpose of such is to highlight the importance of the designated sites, set out relevant codes of conduct and share details of alternative areas for recreation, including dog walking, away from the designated sites. The provision of Homeowner Information Packs can be secured by planning condition. In addition to this, as recommended by Natural England, educational information boards/signage within the development to complement the information contained within Homeowner Information Packs, and to guide member of the public to alternative recreational provision are also to be secured. The provision of on-site signage can be secured by planning condition.
- 5.7.6 More notable mitigation will be achieved through the provision of substantial quantities of on-site public open space. The development includes extensive retained open greenspace as well as a designated designed area of off-lead dog walking. This will offer opportunities for informal recreation, walking, and dog exercise, which is the primary concern with respect to recreational disturbance. Furthermore, the development would be within easy access of a broader network of footpaths beyond the site, supporting accessible and convenient circular routes for regular recreational use. Open space requirements would be secured by legal agreement ensuring it is safeguarded and subsequently managed and maintained to provide long term mitigation against recreational disturbance (along with providing open space for the development and wider community). The detail of the Homeowner Information Packs, on-site signage and the design of the sites on-site open space will come forward as part of meeting the legal agreement obligations or satisfying planning conditions. Natural England would be consulted as part of these processes.
- 5.7.7 Without mitigation, the proposed development could have detrimental impacts upon Morecambe Bay SAC, Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary SPA and Morecambe Bay Ramsar site. However, with the implementation of the mitigation outlined above, it is considered that the proposed development will have no significant adverse effects (negligible) on the integrity of the designated sites, their designation features or their conservation objectives, through either direct or indirect impacts either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects. The mitigation measures are capable of being secured by planning condition and legal agreement should planning permission be approved. There have been a number of public representations raising concerns about the effect of the development on qualifying species and the robustness of the sHRA. While Officers have considered these representations, Natural England, as the statutory consultee responsible for designated sites, concurs with the conclusions of the sHRA and the need to secure the mitigation identified, now raising no objection to the development. For this reason, it is concluded that the application of national and local policies relating to these designated habitat sites, do not provide a strong reason for refusing this proposal, and with regards to the application of the definition of grey belt land, habitat sites (a footnote 7 areas of particular importance), would not preclude the development site from constituting grey belt land. In this regard, the development, with mitigation,

would accord with the requirements of the Habitat Regulations, strategy policy SP8 and policy DM44 of the DM DPD.

5.7.8 Ecological Impacts

The application is supported by an Ecological Impact Assessment. This sets out that the site predominantly comprises of arable land, which is of negligible ecological importance as a habitat. The most ecologically valuable habitat within the site are the lengths of hedgerow and ephemeral waterbodies. On site surveys found no evidence of amphibians, including great crested newts, badger, brown hare, or hedgehog. A low number of common and soprano pipistrelle bats were detected foraging along the lengths of hedgerow, but no roosts sites were detected within the site, or within the large off-site ash tree located close to the site boundary. A bat detector was deployed for 26 nights, with no bat activity being detected between 16th April and 7th May 2025. As such the risk to bats is deemed to be low.

5.7.9 With respect to birds, 16 species of birds were recorded on site, this included confirmation that a breeding pair of lapwings were present as well as house sparrow, both of which are red listed species. Nesting by four other species (blackbird, dunnock, goldfinch and wren) is also considered likely. Lapwing is a wading bird species which is identified as a species in decline (evidenced by its listing on the UK Red List for Birds of Conservation Concern - BoCC) but is not a qualifying species associated with the Morecambe Bay designated sites. The presence of lapwing, as well as other bird species, within the development site is a matter highlighted within numerous comments received by the Local Planning Authority. This includes detailed and robust bird survey evidence provided by interested parties. Clearly, the development site provides habitat for a range of species, including species identified as red and amber status (BoCC).

5.7.10 The presence of lapwing within the development site is intrinsically linked to the current use of one of the fields for maize production. Lapwing are ground nesting birds which require open, sparsely vegetated ground, such as that found within maize fields. This is reinforced by the survey data contained within the supporting Ecological Impact Assessment detailed in Figures 9, 9a, 9b, 9c and 9d. These figures detail the distribution of bird species identified within the site during the survey dates. With respect to lapwing, this shows that, with the exception of one survey effort (shown in figure 9d), all instances of lapwing were identified as being within the larger field currently used for maize production.

5.7.11 However, due to the demands of maize production upon soils, maize production cannot be sustained for long periods of time. As such, it is common practice to return maize fields to grass following a number of years of maize production. The field within the development site which is used for maize production has been in this use since at least 2020, though Google Streetview images suggest perhaps as early as 2015. For this reason, this field will be nearing the end of its maize production cycle and is highly likely to be returned to grassland in the near future. This would as a result remove the suitability of this field as lapwing habitat, including for nesting. This conclusion is disputed by interested parties, as well as Natural England. Natural England considers that this simply highlights the dynamic nature of land management in this area. However, regardless of development proceeding, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the subject field is expected to cease being used for maize production in the short term, and as result its suitability as lapwing territory is highly likely to decline or be lost in the near future due to standard agricultural practices.

5.7.12 Despite this, the development of the site in the manner proposed will also result in the direct loss of lapwing territory. The development will also prevent the land from ever being used for agricultural purposes in a manner that would be compatible with lapwing habitat again, such as future maize production. As identified within paragraph 5.3.31, the site is identified within the Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) as providing opportunities for facilitating habitat conditions or environments to support wading birds, including lapwing, as associated with the Grassland G1.1 – ID 4694 designation. However, in light of the high sensitivity of these species to disturbance such as that which is expected with the type of development proposed, it is not feasible to provide suitable habitat for wading birds within the development site. As such, the loss of lapwing habitat (and other wading bird habitat) because of the development cannot be mitigated.

5.7.13 Nevertheless, the development does incorporate significant opportunities to deliver Green and Blue Infrastructure which would support nature recovery by contributing towards achieving significant levels of Biodiversity Net Gain. This would also accord with the habitat creation opportunities

identified as part of the potential measures for the Urban U1.2 – ID 15,692 designation set out within the LNRS which has the capacity to provide greater benefit to nature overall and which will contribute positively towards the delivery of wider environmental outcomes set out within the LNRS.

- 5.7.14 This development represents an opportunity to secure ecological and targeted habitat enhancements, such as (but not limited to) physical infrastructure, such as those for bird nesting and bat roosting habitat. A scheme of habitat creation measures to be suitably located throughout the site can be secured by condition. This would be expected to deliver suitable habitat for a range of bird species. The indicative Green and Blue Infrastructure design also shows that most of the hedges would be retained and there would be new wildflower grassland, trees and SUDs basins in zones around the periphery of the site and in a zone through the middle. The Council's Biodiversity Officer considers that this makes it likely that breeding and foraging opportunities for these birds would be maintained or possibly enhanced.
- 5.7.15 Lancaster Canal is identified as a Biological Heritage Site (BHS). The development site has a direct connection to the canal via the existing watercourse, and it is proposed that the development be connected to the watercourse for drainage purposes, therefore a potential pollution pathway exists. BHS are non-statutory wildlife sites identified for their nature conservation importance, and these are deemed to be of regional importance. In light of the potential for impacts to this environment to arise through both the construction and operational phases, it is important that measures are put in place to secure appropriate construction phase and operational phase drainage systems to manage and prevent the risk of pollutants entering the canal. This can form part of the aforementioned drainage conditions.
- 5.7.16 Trees and Hedgerows
The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impacts Assessment (AIA) and Tree Survey. Within the development site and forming boundaries to the site, there are numerous trees and tree groups of a variety of species and ranging in retention/quality category from A to C. There is also a total of 17 lengths of hedgerow, all of which fall within the B category, which denotes a hedgerow of moderate quality, the retention of which is desirable. There are no protected trees within the development site. However, trees within the gardens of dwellings on Hatlex Hill and Bryn Grove are subject to a Tree Preservation Order, which border the site.
- 5.7.17 With respect to the proposed access arrangement on to Slyne Road, which is a matter being approved at outline stage, the AIA (October 2025) indicates that a 188-metre-long section of the existing hedgerow H1, which forms the boundary to Slyne Road, would require removal. However, following concerns raised by Officers regarding the extent of this removal, and subsequent ecological and landscape impacts, the impact of the access design upon the roadside hedgerow has been reviewed. An updated Tree Retention & Removal Plan, which focusses solely on the impacts of the proposed access arrangement upon this hedgerow, has subsequently been provided. This indicates that the total hedge that would require removal to facilitate both the main vehicular site access and the proposed northern active travel access would be 117 metres. This is required to facilitate the access points and the associated visibility splays. Whilst a loss of 117 metres of prominent field boundary hedgerow is notable, this is an improved position from the original submission and is deemed necessary to secure the access into the development site. This loss is capable of being mitigated through replacement planting along the development site frontage, which would be secured at reserved matters stage.
- 5.7.18 A short section of hedgerow H4, which is located adjacent to Hatlex Hill, would also be removed to widen the existing field gate access to form the proposed active travel route access and maintenance access to the western drainage system. This loss can also be mitigated.
- 5.7.19 Based on the development indicated within the Development Framework Plan, the AIA also identifies a requirement for the removal of a further 8 sections of hedgerow ranging between 4 metres and 12 metres in length. These would be required to enable the construction of streets and recreational routes within the site. Furthermore, an approximately 100 metre length of hedgerow H3 would also require removal to enable the delivery of housing within the central development parcel. Finally, a further three potential active travel routes, the potential future delivery of which are to be secured by condition, are indicated along the southern boundary of the site. The delivery of these active travel routes would require the removal of corresponding sections of hedgerow H2. With respect to trees, the proposal indicates that it would be necessary to removal an early-mature willow

(T16), a semi-mature hawthorn (T17), both of which are B1 category trees, as well as mature elder group G5 (C2 category).

5.7.20 Hedgerows are a prominent feature of the site and wider landscape. Furthermore, hedgerows within this site appear to form part of a pre-1850 field system, with field boundaries clearly shown on the OS map surveyed in 1845 and published in 1848. By virtue of their age, hedgerows within the site could be 'important' as defined by The Hedgerow Regulations 1997. The AIA does not explicitly determine whether or not hedgerows within the site could constitute 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations, however, it does state that *'some of the hedgerows contain elder with large stems, which may point to a significant age'*, which indicates the potential for hedgerows to be 'important'. However, the Ecological Impact Assessment has considered this further, and confirms that hedgerow 2 and 5 (as identified within the Ecological Impact Assessment) had bluebell along their western extents. For this reason, it concludes that hedgerows 2 and 5 are classified as 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations. None of the other hedgerows within the site are considered as 'important' hedgerow. Compared to the AIA, hedgerow 2 corresponds with the southern boundary hedgerow of the site, identified as H2 within the AIA. Hedgerow H5 corresponds with the western extent of hedgerow H3, up to the intersection with H12. As such, the proposal would require the removal of small sections of hedgerow which has been identified as 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations, to deliver street and recreational access connections.

5.7.21 The Councils Arboricultural Officer raises no objection to the principle of the development. It is considered that the proposal satisfactorily incorporates arboricultural features both within and bordering the site, with most hedgerows and trees to be retained, buffered and enhanced. Clarification has been provided regarding the impact of the development upon the roadside hedgerow, with the impact of delivering the access being reduced from 188 metres to 117 metres. Whilst losses are inevitable as part of any development to facilitate streets, residential development and infrastructure, with the exception of access impacts, this is a matter to be considered at reserved matters stage, once the precise layout of development has been established.

5.7.22 However, at this stage, it is considered that there are significant opportunities to retain large sections of hedgerows as well as providing new replacement planting to mitigate unavoidable and justified losses. Given the outline nature of the proposal, an updated AIA will be required prior to the commencement of development and concurrent with the submission of reserved matters, to ensure tree and hedgerow protection measures are in place having regard to a specific layout and the detailed access design. With respect to hedgerows, this updated AIA should, in the first instance, explore opportunities for the translocation of impacted hedgerows given their identification as BAP habitat, before seeking approval for their removal. This can be secured by planning condition should the development be permitted.

5.7.23 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

The submitted application is subject to mandatory BNG. Furthermore, both the NPPF and Local Plan policies encourage new development to make positive contributions towards ecology and habitat. This application is accompanied by a BNG assessment which sets out that the baseline condition of the site comprises 23.09 habitat units, 5.59 hedgerow units, and 0.38 watercourse units. The aim of this assessment was to establish whether the Development Framework is capable of achieving a net gain in biodiversity. When assessed in the context of the Development Framework Plan, the BNG assessment concludes that development could provide increases of 12.54 habitat units, 3.06 hedgerow units, and 0.06 watercourse units. This represents a net gain in percentage terms of 54.31% habitat units, 54.77% hedgerow units, and 15.24% watercourse units.

5.7.24 The BNG metric will be subject to change and refinement as greater development detail is established at reserved matters stage. The submission and agreement of an updated BNG baseline matrix will be secured through the s106 legal agreement. Subsequently, there is an expectation that any forthcoming reserved matters proposal includes a landscaping/ecological enhancement design which firstly aims to retain as much habitat as possible and adequately mitigates the losses. Overall, given the expansive areas of open space which are retained within this site, Officers are satisfied that there is scope within the development boundary to ensure that a minimum of 10% net gains in biodiversity (across all unit types) can be secured. Furthermore, the Council's Biodiversity Officer has raised no objection to the BNG assessment and has confirmed that the habitat survey is accepted as a baseline for ecological assessment and the BNG metric. The level of on-site BNG would be considered significant and therefore will be secured via planning obligation, alongside a

habitat management and monitoring plan. Furthermore, the costs of the authority's obligation to monitor this (£6,778.00) should also be secured through legal agreement.

- 5.7.25 Subject to conditions securing appropriate mitigation, with exception of the unavoidable loss of Lapwing territory, it is concluded that the development would not conflict with policy DM44. The implementation of a programme of mitigation measures will ensure that there are no significant adverse effects in the longer term to protected species or priority habitat.
- 5.8 **Residential Amenity and pollution** NPPF Chapter 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities, Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places, Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM31: Air Quality Management and Pollution, DM32: Contaminated Land and DM57: Health and Well-Being.
- 5.8.1 Paragraph 198 of the NPPF requires planning policy and decisions to ensure new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of development on pollution, health, living conditions and the environment. To achieve this, it is necessary to avoid noise impacts giving rise to significant adverse effects and to mitigate and reduce potential adverse effects resulting from noise from new development. Policy DM29 of the DM DPD and paragraph 135 of the NPPF is also relevant in the context of assessing the effects of development on residential amenity. Both strongly advocate the need for new development to be of a high standard of design ensuring high standards of amenity are maintained and secured for existing and future users. Policy DM29 specifically states that new development must ensure there is no significant detrimental impact to amenity in relation to overshadowing, visual amenity, privacy, overlooking, massing and pollution.
- 5.8.2 There are two main factors to consider in the assessment of amenity in this case. The first is the effect of the development on the amenity of existing residents. The second relates to the standard of amenity for future occupants of the development itself.
- 5.8.3 Effects on existing residents
The application site is located on the edge of existing residential development, with dwellings located on Greenwood Avenue, Greenwood Drive, Pinewood Avenue, Ashworth Drive, Bryn Grove, Hatlex Hill and Kirklands being located in closest proximity to the proposed development area, and therefore potentially the most directly affected. A notable proportion of the objections received have come from neighbouring residents.
- 5.8.4 As the application is submitted in outline, matters relating to the scale, appearance, and layout of the proposed residential development are not for determination at this stage. Consequently, specific impacts on individual properties cannot yet be fully assessed. These details will be considered at the reserved matters stage. However, the submitted Development Framework Plan and Section 4.6 of the Design and Access Statement establish a framework that allows for an initial assessment of the potential effects on nearby residents.
- 5.8.5 Furthermore, as already set out within this report, the Design and Access Statement indicates that the proposed dwellings would predominantly be 2-storey in height, with some 2½ storey homes in carefully selected locations. This scale of development would reflect the typical character of surrounding residential development and does not pose a significant concern. To comply with housing need policy, and to alleviate landscape concerns, there is also a requirement to provide lower height bungalow housing. Relative to the properties to the west of the development site, an appropriate separation distance is retained between the neighbouring dwellings located on Bryn Grove, Hatlex Hill and Kirklands and the proposed western development area. An acceptable separation distance is also incorporated between the central development area and the dwellings located on Greenwood Drive/Pinewood Avenue. It is acknowledged that the eastern development area extends up to the site boundary and is adjacent to the rear gardens of the Greenwood Drive dwellings. As detailed within Section 4.6 of the Design and Access Statement, it would be expected that the required separation distance of at least 21 metres can be achieved along with suitable boundary treatments within this development parcel. Figure 4.10 within the Design and Access Statement indicates how this can be achieved.
- 5.8.6 Ultimately, any reserved matters application will be required to demonstrate that an appropriate level of separation is maintained between new and existing dwellings in this location to ensure acceptable

standards of privacy and amenity are achieved, in accordance with Policy DM29. At this stage, Officers are satisfied the site is capable of accommodating the proposed development whilst adhering to these standards and ensuring existing residents maintain acceptable living conditions.

5.8.7 The potential impact on residential amenity extends beyond the physical impacts of new dwellings, such as through outlook, overlooking and loss of privacy. Other key issues include perceived impacts on matters such as security, safety, lighting and noise. Any future detailed design would need to ensure that these matters are considered and that existing standards of amenity are not compromised. To this end, the development should incorporate appropriate levels of natural surveillance across areas of open space, consistent with principles of good design. Furthermore, the design of lighting not only needs to ensure there is no adverse effect on existing and future residential property, but also needs to ensure retained landscape features and habitats are protected from excessive light pollution. Precise details of external lighting will be a matter controlled by planning condition, though at this outline stage, Officers are satisfied that light pollution can be appropriately designed so as to minimise its impacts and not lead to significant adverse effects on the environment or the amenity of residents. Whilst these matters will need to be carefully addressed at the detailed design stage, they are not considered to be grounds to withhold outline planning permission on residential amenity grounds.

5.8.8 Noise

The application is supported by a Noise Constraints Assessment. A 3D noise model has been constructed which has enabled a site risk assessment to be undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance. This has enabled an assessment of noise, for day and night, for potential rear garden areas and internal habitable rooms. This also included a Road Traffic Noise Survey to measure the level of noise along Slyne Road. The assessment concludes that the majority of the development site would be at negligible to low risk of impacts from noise, and that no mitigation would be required for development in these areas. However, there is an area of “medium risk” and a section of “high risk” located along the boundary with Slyne Road. In these areas, mitigation measures will need to be adopted in order to minimise the adverse effect of increased noise upon the dwellings located in this area. The Noise Constraints Assessment sets out that this can be achieved through the adoption of various measures including appropriate external and internal layouts, the adoption of whole dwelling ventilation systems, the installation of noise barriers to enclose gardens where necessary, or the installation of higher specification glazing standards. As this application is in outline, and the precise layout and design of the development is not known, the mitigation measures cannot be any more precise than the adoption of good acoustic design measures to minimise adverse effects and the need for mitigation. Clearly there is a need for further consideration of the design of plots at the detailed design stage, however, Officers are satisfied that this matter is capable of being resolved at the detailed design stage and that the site can accommodate the proposed development and adhere to appropriate standards with respect to noise. A condition is recommended to secure an updated Noise Assessment to assess the proposal and to inform specific and appropriate mitigation once the detailed design of the development is known.

5.8.9 It is acknowledged that the construction phase will result in a degree of disruption and harm to the amenity of existing residential properties. This is primarily due to increased noise levels from construction traffic and on-site construction activities. While some exceedances of acceptable noise thresholds are anticipated, these would be short-term and temporary in nature. Such impacts could also be mitigated through considerate working practices, such as controlling working hours and the use of silencers on plant and equipment. Specific measures can be secured as part of the Construction Method Statement (CMS) condition.

5.8.10 Contaminated land

Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states the planning decisions should ensure sites are suitable for the proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. Paragraph 197 goes on to state that where a site is affected by contamination, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.

5.8.11 This application is supported by a Phase I desk top survey and a Phase II intrusive assessment. The Phase II intrusive assessment identified asbestos fibres on the surface of the site. As such, remediation is required to ensure that this is safely removed, along with validation testing being undertaken to ensure no asbestos remains. This is to be secured by planning condition. With respect to ground gas, the assessment demonstrates a Characteristic Situation 1, indicating a very low

ground gas risk, and therefore no protection measures required. It also indicates that no radon protection is required.

5.8.12 Foot and Mouth Burial Pit

The Council has received correspondence from interested parties indicating that a foot and mouth burial pit exists within the field to the south of the site. It has also been alleged that animal remains have been uncovered within the development site during agricultural activities. The Council's Environmental Protection Manager has reviewed these concerns and has confirmed that the presence of a foot and mouth burial pit within the neighbouring field would not present a risk to the development of this site. First of all, the burial pit is located outside of the development site, approximately 90-100 metres from the site boundary. Secondly, no pollution pathways have been identified such as through overland surface water flows, evidenced by the surface water catchment plan contained within the drainage strategy. The site is not located within a groundwater source protection zone and there are no groundwater/potable abstractions within 1 km of the site. There are also no known private water supplies in this locality. Finally, the supporting intrusive Phase II survey included leachate analysis, which identified only marginally elevated levels of copper, and this was considered low risk to sensitive receptors. No other more concerning chemical leachate, that may be associated with a burial pit was identified.

5.8.13 The Environment Agency (EA) have also reviewed this matter, and in the first instance has confirmed that it holds no recorded information confirming the presence of a burial pit at this location. Notwithstanding this, the EA has also confirmed that the off-site burial pit does not give rise to a controlled waters issue for the development site. As such, the presence of a suspected off-site foot and mouth burial pit would not change the EA's original position and does not introduce any additional requirements for the protection of controlled waters. The EA confirms that it does not have any additional comments to make regarding this matter.

5.8.14 To clarify, the NPPF makes it clear that, where a site is affected by contamination, the responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner. In this case, overall, Officers are satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to enable a determination to be made on this application, and that the risk from the nearby off site burial pit remains low. However, it is reasonable to adopt a precautionary approach to this matter. In addition to the recommended condition regarding the remediation of asbestos fibres as set out within the Phase II intrusive survey, a further condition to require remediation of any other unforeseen contamination, which would include remediation (within the development site) of any unforeseen contamination associated with the off-site burial pit, if this is later determined to be necessary, is recommended.

5.8.15 Air Quality

Policy DM31 requires all development proposals to demonstrate that they have sought to minimise the levels of air polluting emissions generated and adequately protected their new users, and existing users from the effects of poor air quality. The closest Air Quality Management Area relates to Lancaster City Centre, which is approximately 2.5 miles from the application site. An Air Quality Assessment supports the application, and this has been undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance and regulations. The Assessment concludes that the construction phase of the development has the potential for air quality impacts resulting from fugitive dust emissions from the site. This was subsequently assessed and a site-specific dust control scheme produced, which aims to reduce such emissions, as well as associated impacts. Subject to the implementation of this scheme, the air quality impacts from dust generated by earthworks, construction and trackout activities would not be significant. A planning condition to secure the implementation of this scheme is recommended.

5.8.16 The operational phase of the development also has the potential to result in air quality impacts, such as through traffic exhaust emissions. For this reason, dispersion modelling was undertaken to predict pollutant concentrations at sensitive locations, as a result of emissions from the highway network. This indicated that impacts on annual mean Nitrogen Dioxide and Particulate Matter (PM10 and P2.5) concentrations as a result of traffic generated by the development were predicted to be negligible. As such, the proposed development is not expected to have a significant effect on existing local air quality conditions. Potential mitigation in form of electrical vehicle charging infrastructure is now a matter that is addressed by Building Regulation requirements, as such this does not need to be repeated. Overall, subject to the identified mitigation for dust emissions during the construction phase, the proposal satisfactorily addresses Policy DM31.

- 5.8.17 The Air Quality Assessment has regard to the Councils' planning advisory note in relation to the requirements for an Emissions Assessment. The Emissions Assessment seeks to quantify a monetary value of the predicted emissions from the proposal, which in this case have been found to be not significant. This has determined that the development should include mitigation measures equal to £28,463.00. A planning condition to require a scheme to secure a scheme of measures to demonstrate compliance with this Emissions Assessment is recommended. Typical forms of mitigation would include the provision of EV charging points (now a matter dealt with by building regulations) and initiatives embedded into the schemes Travel Plan, such as the provision of bus passes or cycle vouchers.
- 5.8.17 The Councils Environmental Protection Officer has reviewed the submitted noise, contamination and air quality surveys, and has concluded that, subject to the identified conditions, they are satisfied with the assessments provided.
- 5.9 **Open Space NPPF Chapter 8 Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities, Chapter 12 Achieving Well-Designed Places; Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM27: Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities, DM29: Key Design Principles and DM57: Health and Well-Being.**
- 5.9.1 The provision of open space forms an important aspect in place-making and securing high quality design. It also contributes to the health and well-being of communities. It is strongly advocated within the NPPF, in particular sections 8 and 12. Given the scale of the proposed development and the application site, the inclusion of areas of open space is essential to ensure the scheme is policy-compliant and to support the delivery of a well-designed, inclusive, and attractive residential environment.
- 5.9.2 Although the application is in outline form, the Development Framework Plan and the Illustrative Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy Plan identify notable areas of open space. These indicate that the proposal is capable of delivering a total of 5.45 hectares (including SuDS features) of green infrastructure across a range of open space typologies. Together, this would exceed the quantity standards set out within the Local Plan. The Open Space Strategy for these spaces is outlined within the aforementioned plans, but also within the Design and Access Statement. These documents present a positive, landscape-led approach to design, which is particularly important given the site's countryside location and topographical constraints, where embedded landscape mitigation is necessary in order to assimilate development into the wider landscape setting.
- 5.9.3 Overall, the submission demonstrates that the site can deliver policy-compliant on-site open space areas as a minimum. However, as set out within the submission itself, the proposal has the capacity to exceed policy requirements for certain typologies to deliver greater benefits to the community and ecological value of the locality. This would include the provision of Amenity Greenspace and Natural and Semi Natural Green Space, as well as equipped play facilities for children and young persons. While detailed matters such as layout and appearance of these areas will be addressed at the reserved matters stage, the open space provision, including full details of associated equipment, enclosures and surfacing etc. will be secured through a legal agreement linked to the outline permission. The on-site open space provision will be publicly accessible, thereby enhancing the recreational offer for the wider community in the immediate vicinity of the site. When considered alongside the proposed off-site improvements set out below, these elements are regarded as a positive benefit of the scheme.
- 5.9.4 In terms of off-site provision, 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*'.
- 5.9.5 There is a recognised need for enhancements to existing Outdoor Sports, Parks and Recreation Ground and Allotment facilities. Accordingly, a financial contribution towards improvements to these facilities will be required as part of the proposed development. As this is an outline application, the final contribution will be calculated at the reserved matters stage, once the number, type, and size of dwellings are confirmed. The Council's Public Realm team has been consulted and raises no

objection to the development, subject to securing appropriate on-site open space and off-site contributions to public open space. Specifically, contributions will be sought towards improvements toward the existing facilities at Slyne Recreation ground and the Slyne community orchard or Halton village allotments. These contributions will be secured through a legal agreement with the final figure calculated at reserved matter stage.

5.10 **Housing needs, affordable housing, housing standards and mix** NPPF Chapter 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM1: New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs, DM2: Space and Accessibility Standards and DM3: The Delivery of Affordable Housing.

5.10.1 Housing needs

As described at paragraph 5.2.4 of this report, the NPPF sets out the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. To facilitate this, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land comes forward where it is needed. The Council's most recent Housing Land Supply Statement (September 2025) identifies a housing land supply of only 2.8 years. Whilst this has increased slightly relative to the previous position statement, it still represents significant shortfall against the required 5-year supply requirement. Given the acute under supply of deliverable housing against identified housing requirements, the provision of new residential development (in this case up to 200 dwellings) is a significant benefit of the proposal that must be given significant weight in the overall planning balance. The supporting Planning Statement sets out that, subject to market conditions, on average around 40 market dwellings could be completed per annum. Whilst this is not fixed and could potentially change, delivery of housing could be provided relatively promptly should permission be granted. Taking into account associated infrastructure requirements and preliminary works that would be required to facilitate development, it is anticipated that the development of the site would take around 5.5 years to complete.

5.10.2 Affordable Housing

Policies DM3 sets out the target requirements for affordable housing for all new residential development in Lancaster District. In this case, the development boundary is located within the Rural West sub-area and constitutes a greenfield site, therefore, normally, affordable housing provision would be expected to be 30% on site provision. However, the site is also located within the North Lancashire Green Belt, and as described in paragraph 5.3.7, in order to meet the Golden Rules set out in paragraph 156 a) of the NPPF, the proposal is required to provide affordable housing that must be 15% above the current local plan requirement, capped at 50%. Therefore, as the current local plan requirement for development in this area is 30%, as specified in Policy DM3, development of this site is required to provide 45% on site affordable housing to comply with this element of the Golden Rules. Furthermore, as advised within the PPG, site specific viability assessment should not be undertaken for the purpose of reducing developer contributions, including affordable housing in these circumstances. The applicant has confirmed that the proposal will meet the requirement to provide 45% on site affordable housing which, based on a total housing provision of 200 dwellings, would result in up to 90 affordable homes being provided within the development site. The final details and the number of affordable homes would be determined at reserved matters stage when the layout and housing mix is understood in detail. The applicant is committed to providing policy-compliant affordable housing across the site and accepts this shall be secured by s106 legal agreement. Given the acute need for affordable housing in the district, the provision of policy-compliant affordable housing also weighs significantly in favour of the proposal.

5.10.3 Housing Standards

Policy DM2 relates to housing standards, requiring all new dwellings to meet the Nationally Described Space standards and at least 20% of new affordable housing and market housing to meet building regulations M4(2) Category (accessible and adaptable dwellings). To secure these standards at the detailed design stage (reserved matters), planning conditions are proposed as part of this recommendation.

5.10.4 Housing mix

Policy DM1 requires new residential development to meet identified housing needs that accords with the Council's latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The required housing mix will be based on the district wide housing needs set out in the SHMA and the indicative mix within table 4.1 of the Development Management DPD. At this stage, the application is in outline with no specific details provided as to the housing mix and sizes. Therefore, to ensure compliance with policy DM1,

it is necessary to impose a planning condition to require the precise details of the housing mix, types, and sizes to be agreed concurrent with the reserved matters application.

- 5.11 **Heritage and archaeology** NPPF Chapter 16 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment: Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP7: Maintaining Lancaster District's Unique Heritage; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM37: Development affecting Listed Buildings, DM38: Development affecting Conservation Areas, DM39: The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets, DM41: Development Affecting Non-Designated Heritage Assets or their Settings and DM42: Archaeology.
- 5.11.1 Close to the southeast corner of the site, and close to the existing field gate which provides access onto Slyne Road, there is a Grade II listed milestone/boundary stone marker. Slyne Hall, which is located approximately 100 metres to the southeast of the site, on the eastern side of Slyne Road. The Slyne Conservation Area is located approximately 250 metres to the south of the site and contains additional designated and non-designated heritage assets, including the Grade II* listed Manor House Farm, located at the junction with Manor Lane. The Lancaster Canal which passes to the north and west of the site, with intervening residential development, is identified as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. A number of the bridges over the canal, including Hatlex Bridge, are Grade II listed.
- 5.11.2 The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to consider the impact of these proposals on the Slyne Conservation Area under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act (1990) and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. This is supported by Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and by policy DM38 of the DM DPD. Policy DM38 requires that proposals preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and in particular that they do not *'have an unacceptable impact on historic street patterns/boundaries, open spaces, roofscape, skyline and setting including important views into and out of the area'*.
- 5.11.3 There are also statutory duties under sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990 to consider the impact of the proposals on the identified Listed Buildings and to ensure that their setting is preserved. This duty is also similarly echoed within Section 16 of the NPPF paragraphs, and by policies DM37 and DM39 of the DM DPD. Policy DM37 states that *'The significance of a Listed Building can be harmed or lost... through development within its setting. Any harm (substantial or less than substantial) ...will only be permitted where this is clearly justified and outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.'*
- 5.11.4 The impact of the proposed development on Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs) must also be considered in light of NPPF paragraph 216, and a balanced judgement reached with regard to the scale of harm or loss and the significance of the asset. Policy DM41 supports this obligation and further requires that *'Proposals affecting the setting of a Non-Designated Heritage Asset will be required to give due consideration to its significance and ensure that this is protected or enhanced where possible.'*
- 5.11.5 The site is located within the setting of heritage assets. With respect to the Grade II listed milestone/boundary stone marker, this is located close to the existing field gate. It is presently somewhat subsumed by the roadside hedgerow and is not particularly apparent. The supporting Heritage Assessment concludes that this asset may be regarded as one of high significance in historical terms. It represents a well-preserved example of an early 19th century parish marker, the primary setting of which is formed by its relationship and visibility from the road, which in this case identifies the parish boundary between Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne. Its position within wider agricultural land is also of importance, as it marks the agricultural fringes of the two parishes.
- 5.11.6 Due to the position and small scale of the boundary stone, and the proposal to provide an active travel access in the location of the current field gate, there is the potential for the development of this site to result in direct harm or damage to the structure. For this reason, it is essential that a scheme for the protection of this heritage asset in situ during the construction phase is secured. This can be secured by way of planning condition. With respect to visual impact of the proposed development upon the setting of the boundary stone, the development would result in the partial loss of setting through the loss of agricultural land and the introduction of residential built form. However, the assets primary setting, which is formed by its relationship with the road and marking

the location on the parish boundary will be maintained. This development also represents an opportunity to mitigate the visual impact upon this asset through the use of sensitive hard and soft landscaping around the active travel point, which may serve to better reveal the asset, making it a more prominent feature, whilst also helping to filter views of residential development located to the rear. Details of landscaping around the asset would need to be secured at the reserved matters stage, and through the condition securing the details of the construction of the active travel link. Any works that are required directly to the asset which impact its significance would require a separate listed building consent application. Overall, the impact of the development to this asset, bearing in mind its high significance, is deemed to be slight when incorporating potential mitigation and enhancement opportunities which this proposed development could secure.

- 5.11.7 Slyne Hall is a Grade II listed late 18th century house, constructed of sandstone rubble with slate roof. It is located to the southeast of the site, and on the opposite site of Slyne Road. It is located upon a raised position which increases its prominence within the landscape. The setting of this asset is formed by its prominent position overlooking the open agricultural land to the west, along with the group of other buildings which surround it. This asset is also one of high significance in architectural and historical terms. It is a well-preseved late 18th century rural house which retains its association with its attached historic farmstead. Its location within a wider agricultural landscape and its views over surrounding fields, contribute a significant amount to its significance.
- 5.11.8 With respect to the visual impact of the proposed development upon the setting of Slyne Hall, the location, scale and nature of the development is such that it will impact views of the wider agrarian landscape that are currently achieved from Slyne Hall, which in turn will remove part of the rural setting of the heritage asset. However, this is to a small extent mitigated by the fact that the proposal would not result in the loss of the open field that is located directly in front of the asset itself, but is off-set slightly to the north. Overall, the impact of the development to this asset, bearing in mind its high significance, is deemed to be slight when incorporating potential mitigation opportunities such as appropriate site layouts and landscaping which would be considered at reserved matters stage.
- 5.11.9 The Slyne Road Conservation Area is located approximately 250 metres to the south of the site and contains additional designated and non-designated heritage assets, including the Grade II* listed Manor House Farm, located at the junction with Manor Lane. The Conservation Area, along with its associated Listed Buildings and NDHAs, are deemed to be of high significance, as it reflects the historic core of the village of Slyne, which is in turn within a setting of agricultural fields. This is typical of the character of small rural historic villages in the area. There is limited intervisibility between the development site and the Conservation Area, with the development site only being visible at some distance from the northern fringe of the Conservation Area and from a short section of Bottomdale Road. The view from the north of the Conservation Area is identified as a significant view within the associated Conservation Area Appraisal. However, a notable undeveloped gap between the development site and the Conservation Area would be retained. As such, the visual impact of the development upon these assets is deemed to be slight as the retained gap will minimise the erosion of the rural setting present to the north. Impacts can be further mitigated through careful layouts and landscaping, particularly along the southern boundary of the development site, along with the use of appropriate design and materials for the dwellings that would reflect the local vernacular, as informed by the Slyne Conservation Area Appraisal. On this basis, it is concluded that the proposal has the potential to mitigate the impacts of development such that the scheme would result in negligible impacts to Slyne Conservation Area and the various assets it contains.
- 5.11.10 Lancaster Canal passes the site at a distance to the north and west as it winds through the villages of Bolton-le-Sands and Hest Bank. The canal is identified by the Council as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) due to its architectural and historical interests. Within this area, the setting of the canal is formed by the modern residential development which lines both sides of the canal, along with its verdant setting apparent along the towpath as well as the historic stone canal bridges which cross it in various locations, most of which are listed (Grade II) themselves. The canal is deemed to be of medium significance. Views of the development site from the canal are largely obscured by existing topography and modern residential development. For this reason, the extent of change experienced along the canal would be minimal, given the lack of visibility of the development site in views either from the Canal towpath or Hatlex Bridge (Grade II). This results in a neutral impact to this asset.

- 5.11.11 The Councils Conservation Team has reviewed the proposal and has stated that the greatest impact arising from the proposal would be to the Grade II listed boundary stone marker. As such, care will need to be taken to ensure no direct harm is caused and that any development and landscaping around this area is suitable in design terms. With respect to Slyne Hall, Conservation Officers conclude that, the distance of the asset from the development site and retention of an undeveloped intervening field and road mean there is unlikely to be a harmful impact on this listed building. Conservation Officers also conclude that, with respect to the Slyne Conservation Area and the various assets it contains, the site is too distant to have any adverse impact. To ensure the development is appropriate, Officers again advise that the detailed proposal take account of the locally distinctive character in the design of buildings and spaces and does not propose housing types that may constitute an overly repetitive and standardised design. To achieve this, use of contextually appropriate materials and high-quality landscaping and boundary treatments are highly important to the quality of the scheme. For the Canal, Conservation Officers conclude that the development would be unlikely to have any greater impact than existing development, most of which is in closer proximity to the canal. Overall, the Conservation Team conclude that there is potential for this proposal to avoid harm to heritage assets and to comply with relevant policy regarding heritage matters, it therefore raises no objection in principle to this development. Historic England were consulted on this proposal, however, it chose not to provide comment and instead advised that the advice of the Councils own specialist conservation advisors be sought.
- 5.11.12 Paragraph 212 of the NPPF makes clear that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation. Paragraph 213 adds that any harm to a heritage asset's significance, including through development within its setting, should be clearly and convincingly justified. Where a proposal results in less than substantial harm, Paragraph 215 requires that this harm be weighed against the public benefits of the development. In this instance, the level of harm arising from the development to the identified assets is deemed to be a low level of less than substantial harm, by reason of development within their setting. It is considered that this harm is in this case outweighed by the public benefits associated with the proposal, including the delivery of housing, including affordable housing, areas of public open space, greater accessibility and highway improvements. The proposal therefore accords with the legislative framework and relevant planning policies set out above.
- 5.11.13 Archaeology
In relation to archaeology, the supporting Archaeology & Heritage Assessment has concluded that the site has a low potential for archaeology of all periods to be encountered by the proposed development. On the basis of the evidence presented, the Historic Environment Team at Lancashire County Council agree with this characterisation of the site's potential. For this reason, it does not consider the site to be one that merits any further archaeological investigation. In this regard there is no conflict with policy DM42 and the NPPF.
- 5.11.14 It is concluded that the application of national and local policies relating to these heritage assets do not provide a strong reason for refusing this proposal, and with regards to the application of the definition of grey belt land, designated heritage and archaeological assets (a footnote 7 areas of particular importance), would not preclude the development site from constituting grey belt land.
- 5.12 **Sustainable design** NPPF Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places and Chapter 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM30a: Sustainable Design and Construction, DM30b: Sustainable Design and Construction – Water Efficiency, DM30c: Sustainable Design and Construction – Materials, Waste and Construction and DM53: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation.
- 5.12.1 In the context of the climate change emergency that was declared by Lancaster City Council in January 2019, the impacts of new development in the District and possible necessary mitigation measures to minimise such impacts, will be a significant consideration in the assessment of development proposals.
- 5.12.2 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, but they must also be adaptable to the impacts of the climate crisis and support resilient communities.

- 5.12.3 The Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan (CERLP) was adopted in January 2025 and provided a partial review of the DM DPD and the SPLA DPD. This introduced policies DM30a, DM30b and DM30c which provide specific requirements in relation to sustainable design and construction and also made changes to some other policies, to bolster their requirements with respect to climate mitigation.
- 5.12.4 The application is supported by an Energy and Carbon Statement. This sets out that the development will seek to demonstrate a commitment to reducing energy consumption under occupancy through the adoption of a 'Fabric First' principle. This will be achieved through the adoption of enhanced insulation standards, together with improved heating, ventilation and lighting efficiencies. Further improvements will also be secured through the use of Air Source Heat Pumps as a means of providing a decentralised source of low carbon heating and hot water.
- 5.12.5 As the application is submitted in outline, it is not possible at this stage to undertake the necessary energy calculations that would be required to quantify the improvements in carbon reductions that the proposed strategy would achieve, relative to the requirements of Policy DM30a. However, once these are available with the detailed design at a Reserved Matters Stage, it is stated that the development would minimise carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions by a minimum of 75% in comparison to Part L1A of the Building Regulations 2013. It is also expected that the minimum EPC rating for each individual dwelling would be Band B. This would be compliant with the requirements of Policy DM30a for any dwelling that is commenced before the 1st of January 2028. However, any dwellings the construction of which is commenced after the 1st of January 2028, would be required to meet the higher net zero requirements set out within this policy. Nevertheless, at this outline stage, the submitted Energy and Carbon Statement provides a clear commitment to exceed Building Regulation standards, in accordance with the energy hierarchy.
- 5.12.6 At this stage, Officers consider that the requirements of planning policy can be appropriately secured by condition. This would require the submission and approval of an updated Sustainable Design Statement including an Energy and Carbon Statement, prior to the commencement of development, and will include the requirement to meet the enhanced net zero requirements for any dwellings commenced after the 1st of January 2028. It should also address the requirements for enhanced water efficiency, whilst a separate planning condition is recommended to require all dwellings to meet the optional requirements of the Building Regulations Requirement G2: Water Efficiency, as required by policy DM30b.
- 5.13 **Infrastructure** NPPF Chapter 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM57: Health and Wellbeing and DM58: Infrastructure Delivery and Funding.
- 5.13.1 **Health**
The NHS Integrated Care Board has made representations on the application and seeks a contribution towards local health care infrastructure. This consultation response sets out that a development of this scale could result in an additional 480 new patient registrations. Accordingly, this generates a contribution request of £131,616.00, which was initially identified as being directed towards reconfiguration at the Brookfield Surgery in Bolton-le-Sands.
- 5.13.2 However, during further discussions on this matter, the NHS indicated that it would instead seek to direct the contribution towards another planned project at the main Carnforth surgery, and not the Bolton-le-Sands Surgery. This surgery falls under the same Ash Trees Surgery umbrella, and as such would be appropriate in terms of location, however, the NHS has confirmed that the Carnforth project is likely to be completed by April 2026. Therefore, this alternative project would be completed long before any financial contribution secured through this development would be made available, particularly as the trigger for payment of the requested contribution is likely to be prior to first occupation of the development. This would mean that, in effect, the NHS request would be securing a retrospective financial contribution towards a project that appears to have already been funded and will have been delivered, which isn't appropriate and would not meet the tests set out in paragraph 58 of the NPPF.
- 5.13.3 The NHS were asked to reconsider the project towards which the requested financial contribution would be directed, however, no further response has been provided by the NHS. As such,

regrettably, the Local Planning Authority is not seeking to secure a financial contribution towards health infrastructure in this instance.

5.13.4 Education

Paragraph 100 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to ensuring there is sufficient choice of education places available and great weight should be given when there is a need to create, expand or alter educational facilities in planning and decision-taking. Accordingly, the local planning authority has consulted Lancashire County Council Schools Planning Team who, upon being initially being consulted, indicated a request for a financial contribution to facilitate the provision of primary school places. However, within its final position statement compiled ahead of this proposal being reported to the Planning Committee, the Schools Planning Team has subsequently confirmed that it is no longer seeking to secure this contribution as it is concluded that sufficient capacity exists within the surrounding local primary and secondary schools within the next 5-year period. As such, there is no requirement for an education contribution as part of this proposal.

5.14 **Employment & Skills Plan** NPPF Chapter 6 Building a strong, competitive economy; Development Management (DM) DPD policy DM28: Employment and Skills Plans.

5.14.1 Policy DM28 requires that proposals of 20 or more new dwellings provide an 'Employment and Skills Plan' that will set out opportunities for, and enable access to, employment and the up-skilling of local people through the construction phase of the development proposal. An Employment and Skills Plan (ESP) document has not been provided in support of this current application at this stage, given the outline nature of this proposal and uncertainties surrounding the future developer and phasing requirements. For this reason, it is reasonable to impose a planning condition to secure a fully detailed ESP prior to the commencement of development.

5.15 **Other Matters**

5.15.1 Health Impact Assessment

The application is supported by a Health Impact Assessment (HIA), which has considered potential health impacts of the proposed development against the Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) Rapid HIA Tool. This considers a wide range of health determinants, including housing quality and affordability, access to services and infrastructure, active travel, environmental quality, social cohesion, and climate resilience. This concludes that the proposed development has the ability to deliver a wide range of health benefits for both future occupants and the existing surrounding community, as summarised within this report. The development incorporates a high standard of inclusive design, seeks to promote and improve walking and cycling linkages, encourages social interaction, and includes sustainable construction to improve environmental and health standards. Where potential risks or conflicts have been identified, such as construction phase impacts of infrastructure limitations, the development has sought to incorporate mitigation measures to minimise or alleviate this harm. Overall, it is concluded that the proposal does not conflict with health-related objectives of national and local planning policy.

5.15.2 Socio-Economic Benefits Statement

This application is supported by a Socio-Economic Benefits Statement, which seeks to identify the social and economic benefits that could be realised through the delivery of this development. This includes the delivery of benefits through all phases of development including the construction phase, such as construction spending and job creation, which is estimated to be 125 FTE jobs on the site every year for the 5.5 years of the build, or 687 FTE jobs over the entirety of the project. Furthermore, the proposal will facilitate increases within the local population encouraging new residents to live and contribute to the area including through both social and economic means.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 The Local Plan sets out the district's housing requirement at policy SP6. This sets a requirement of 10,440 new homes over the plan period (2011-2031) based on an incremental approach rising from 400 dwellings per annum, up to a total of 695 dwellings per annum (2029/30-2030/31). At present, based on this incremental approach, the Council should be facilitating the delivery of 685 dwellings per annum until 2028/2029. However, the Council's Housing Land Monitoring Report (HLMR) (July

2025) confirms a continued fall in completions, with only 196 new dwellings completed for the period 2024/2025, which includes 12 dwellings which were a result of new student housing. This represents just 29% of the annual dwelling requirement (685) for that period, and this follows a similarly low level of completions in 2023/24. The HLMR concludes that as of the 1 April 2025 the outstanding commitment for the district stood at 2,179 dwellings (including student accommodation and older persons accommodation). This demonstrates a significant shortfall in housing delivery in the district, which is reflected in the latest Housing Land Supply Statement (September 2025) which confirms that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-years supply of housing sites and in fact is only able to demonstrate a 2.8 years' worth of supply of housing. Within recent appeal decisions relating to the delivery of housing, Planning Inspectors have described the Councils poor housing land supply position as 'acute' and 'woeful'. Whilst these statements were made in the context of a 2 year's worth of supply of housing, the recent slight increase to 2.8 year's worth of supply of housing is not a significant improvement.

- 6.2 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Footnote 8 of the NPPF which relates to paragraph 11(d) confirms that the lack of a five-year supply renders the policies most important for determining applications out-of-date. Paragraph 11(d) states that where policies are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the proposed development; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
- 6.3 The development site has been determined as grey belt land, in accordance with the NPPF. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to represent a departure to the Development Plan. Furthermore, all of the associated criteria set out in paragraphs 155 and 156 are met. As a result, the proposal is therefore not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In addition to this, the assessment set out within this report has concluded that there are no policies relating to areas or assets of particular importance which would provide a strong reason for refusing the development, nor would any adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits that the proposal brings forward, therefore presumption in favour must be engaged. In accordance with paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework, significant weight must be afforded in favour of the grant of planning permission.
- 6.4 In accordance with the strategic development strategy for the district as set out within policy SP3, the application site is located on the periphery of, and is well related to, the settlements of Bolton-le-Sands, Hest Bank and Slyne. Each of these is identified as a sustainable rural settlement where housing growth is supported in principle. The provision of up to 200 dwellings to meet locally identified needs at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate an adequate supply of housing, weighs substantially in favour of the development. In addition, the proposal will provide 45% on-site affordable dwellings, up to a total of 90 dwellings. The provision of both market and affordable housing attracts significant weight. Other benefits arising from the development include traffic calming measures, and footway and pedestrian provision all of which will enhance the pedestrian environment along Slyne Road. In addition to this, active travel routes through the site will serve to enhance accessibility for the wider community to new and existing services within the development site and wider area. The proposal also secures financial contributions towards the Lancaster Travel and Transport Infrastructure Strategy to facilitate improvements to the local highway network and improvements to the local bus stops. The proposal also includes contributions to make off-site improvements to public open space facilities, along with the provision of new public open space infrastructure within the site itself, all of which benefits the wider community as well as future residents of the development. The proposal also provides notable landscaping, ecological and drainage schemes all of which can deliver enhancement to the site's visual appearance, ecological value and its role with respect to improved flood risk mitigation. These facets of the proposal should each be afforded moderate weight. There are also social and economic benefits from the provision of employment and upskilling through the construction phases and the knock-on effect to the supply chain (securing short-term economic benefits), though these benefits are relatively small overall and therefore afforded limited weight in favour of the development.

- 6.5 The applicant has demonstrated a safe and suitable access can be provided and the impacts of development traffic would not lead to safety concerns or have residual cumulative impacts that would be severe on the network. Subject to pre-commencement conditions, it has been demonstrated that there are options available to ensure the development can be drained sustainability and without causing a flood risk elsewhere. With mitigation, the impacts of the development upon nearby designated ecological sites, upon the ecological value of the site itself and its immediate surroundings and upon most of the identified species, are acceptable. The application also demonstrates that there is sufficient scope to secure notable net gains in biodiversity at the reserved matters stage. It has also satisfactorily demonstrated that the development would secure acceptable standards of amenity for existing and future residents. In relation to these matters, the proposals conform to the aims and objectives of the relevant local plan policies and the NPPF.
- 6.6 The main issues weighing against the proposal relate to the localised landscape impacts, which would be most prevalent during the construction and initial operational phases and when in close proximity to the site itself. The loss of countryside and replacement with housing development cannot be mitigated, however, the siting of development as indicated on the Development Framework Plan combined with the design and environmental principles and narrative set out within the Masterplan, Green/Blue Infrastructure Strategy Plan and Design and Access Statement provide a clear commitment to delivering a landscape-led development that appropriately balances the need to deliver housing alongside important environmental, social and landscape considerations. The layout indicated on the Development Framework Plan represents an appropriately located and scaled proposal that would appear as a comfortable addition to the village peripheries. Furthermore, it is concluded that harm to the landscape, is capable of being minimised to an acceptable level through embedded design measures. As such, overtime and once the development has become established, the proposal would result in a lessened impact to the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. The residual landscape harm remaining following development completion is afforded limited to moderate weight.
- 6.7 The proposal would also result in the loss of territory utilised by Lapwing, a bird species which is in decline and which features on the UK Red List for Birds of Conservation Concern. This loss cannot be mitigated, such as through replacement habitat within the development site. This is a harmful impact resulting from the development which weighs negatively against the proposal, even though this habitat may be inadvertently lost in any event through standard agricultural practices. However, the development also has the capability of providing significant enhancements for a variety of other bird species and biodiversity in general. As a result, the weight to be afforded to the ecological harm resulting from the loss of Lapwing territory is afforded limited weight overall, particularly in light of the implications of agricultural practices in the near future upon this habitat and is outweighed by the variety of other biodiversity gains that this proposal can secure.
- 6.8 In the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the assessment of this proposal against the NPPF taken as a whole, concludes that there are no clear strong reasons for refusing the application which would effectively disengage the tilted balance. Therefore, in applying the titled balanced, the test is whether any adverse impacts arising from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. This is a matter of planning judgement. Overall, it is concluded that the identified harm set out in this report, including cumulative harm, do not to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the significant benefits associated with the provision of housing, including affordable housing together with the other specified public benefits of this proposal.
- 6.9 In light of the assessment set out within this report, it is considered that the benefits of the proposal do outweigh the identified harms and for that reason, officers recommend that outline planning permission ought to be granted.

Recommendation

That Outline Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** following the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement within 3 months of the date of this Committee meeting, and subject to the conditions listed below. If a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement is not concluded within the timescale above, or other agreed extension of time, to delegate authority to the Chief Officer – Planning and Climate Change to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the obligations which make the development acceptable have not been legally secured:

The legal agreement shall secure:

- Provision of policy-compliant Affordable Housing – 45% of total number of homes to be provided as affordable housing units (on site), based on tenure split of 60% (social/affordable rented) : 40% (shared ownership/affordable homes for sale) or alternative tenure proposals to be agreed in an accordance with an Affordable Housing Scheme to be submitted with Reserved Matters and approved by the Council before the commencement of development.
- Provision of on-site of Amenity Greenspace, Accessible Natural Greenspace, Equipped Play Area (children’s) and Young Persons Provision.
- Provision of on-site Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with an approved BNG Plan and Landscape and Ecological Creation and Management Plan.
- Provision of a BNG monitoring contribution - £6,778.00.
- Highways contribution of £1,099.85 per dwelling towards Lancaster Travel and Transport Infrastructure Strategy initiatives, as detailed in paragraph 5.4.24.
- Travel Plan Contribution - £12,000.00.
- Setting up of a Management Company.
- Management and Maintenance of all landscaping, unadopted roads, lighting and drainage infrastructure and on-site open space.
- Off-site open space contributions (to be calculated at Reserved Matters Stage) towards allotments (Slyne community orchard or Halton village), Parks and Recreation enhancements (Slyne Recreation ground) and outdoor sports provision (Slyne Recreation ground).

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Timescale for submission of reserved matters application (2YRS)	Standard
2	Development in accordance with Approved Plans (Location plan, Access Plan)	Standard
3	Reserved Matters to be based on the broad principles set out in the submitted Design and Access Statement and Illustrative Development Framework Plan and Illustrative Green/Blue Infrastructure Strategy Plan	Control
4	Phasing condition	Prior to commencement
5	Final surface water sustainable drainage strategy, incorporating LLFA and Canal and River Trust requirements	Prior to commencement
6	Construction Surface Water Management Plan	Prior to commencement
7	Construction Environmental Management Plan, including working hours and other matters to reduce impacts upon residential amenity and confirmation of no impulsive or piling works	Prior to commencement
8	Construction Management Plan – Highways	Prior to commencement
9	Precise construction details of main vehicular site access to Slyne Road and associated off site highway improvements including carriageway/footway improvements and tactile	Prior to commencement

	Paving, speed limit change, upgrading of bus stops, and timetable for implementation, and site access road to base course level to site compound.	
10	Precise design and construction details of all other site access points (except main vehicular access pursuant to condition 9) including active travel routes and emergency access points to Greenwood Drive, Hatlex Hill and Slyne Road.	Prior to commencement
11	Asbestos remediation in accordance with Phase II survey	Prior to commencement
12	Scheme for the protection of the Grade II listed boundary/milestone marker	Prior to commencement
13	Submission of a Sustainable Design Statement including Energy and Carbon Statement	Prior to commencement
14	Employment and Skills Plan	Prior to commencement
15	Air Quality Mitigation Scheme in accordance with the Emissions Statement	Prior to Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
16	Updated Noise Assessment setting out precise scheme for noise mitigation based on the recommendations of the Noise Assessment	Prior to Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
17	Updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment/Tree Protection Plan/Arboricultural Method Statement	Prior to Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
18	Details of active travel connection points along the southern site boundary	Prior to Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
19	Habitat Creation Plan – species physical infrastructure	Prior to Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
20	Scheme for M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings – to be minimum 20% of all dwellings	Prior to Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
21	Details of housing mix to accord with policy DM1	Prior to Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
22	Construction details of the internal estate roads, private drives, footways and other active travel	Prior to commencement of estate roads

	routes to be designed to the adoptable standards and LTN 1/20	
23	Detailed scheme for external lighting (street lighting and lighting of open space)	Prior to above ground works
24	Sustainable drainage system operation and maintenance manual	Prior to occupation
25	Verification report of constructed sustainable drainage system	Prior to occupation
26	Details of Homeowner Information Packs and on-site information boards and signage	Prior to occupation
27	Travel Plan	Prior to occupation
28	Provide and protect visibility splays	Prior to occupation
29	Development in accordance with the specified mitigation set out in the approved Flood Risk Assessment	Control
30	Development in accordance with the fugitive dust emissions mitigation strategy	Control
31	Provision of turning and parking	Control
32	Unforeseen contamination	Control
33	Development to accord with the Nationally Described Space Standards	Control
34	All dwellings to achieve Building Regulations Requirement G2: Water Efficiency	Control
35	Limit to maximum of 2.5 storey building height	Control

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

In accordance with the above legislation, Officers have made this recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been made having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

Background Papers

None