

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BILLINGTON AND LANGHO PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON MONDAY 26<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2015 AT THE COMMUNITY CENTRE, LANGHO.**

**PRESENT**

Parish councillors Brian Haworth, John Green, Michael Collins, Martin Hincks, Simon Kerins, Frank Havard and John Aspden. Councillor Alan Schofield was also present.

Graham Lamb, Katie Dean and Andy Roberts from Pegasus group were also in attendance to discuss the outline consent for 18 Residential dwellings on land off Longsight Road, application number **3/2015/0010**.

**ITEM 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**ITEM 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- a) Register of Interests – Councillors were reminded of the need to update their register of interests.
- b) No members disclosed any personal or prejudicial interests in any matter to be discussed at the meeting.

**ITEM 3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1<sup>st</sup> DECEMBER 2014**

Minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014 were signed as a true record.

**ITEM 4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There was one member of the public present who attended to speak to the representatives who attended from the Pegasus Group.

**ITEM 5 PLAYGROUNDS**

.There were no playground issues

**ITEM 6 ACCOUNTS**

It was resolved to approve the following accounts for payment,

C Walton Lengthsman	£265.57
Nurture Landscapes	£119.20
Tracey McCarney Clerks Salary	£416.66

The November and December bank reconciliation was reviewed and signed by the chairman, the January expenditure was circulated.

It was agreed to ask Ribble Valley Council for £14,209 for next years precept.

**ITEM 7**      **PLANNING**

**3/2014/1134** – Construction of workshop extension to rear of existing garage, at 56, Highwoods Park, Brockhall.

No Objections

**3/2014/1069** – Single storey extensions to side and rear. Porch to front. At 15, Dale View, Billington.

No Objections

**3/2014/1113** – Demolition of attached garage and construction of single storey side extension incorporating a garage and extended kitchen area. 1, Bowling Green Cottages, Brockhall Village.

No Objections

**3/2014/1101** – Temporary workshop structure for rehabilitation use at Kemple View, Longsight Road, Langho.

No Objections

**3/2014/1053** – Erection of flag pole and flag at Northcote, Northcote Road, Langho.

No Objections

**3/2014/1086** – Change of house type and change of use from caravan storage yard to domestic curtilage on land adjacent Elker Farm, Whalley Road, Billington

Object due to size increase, over development and development creep.

**3/2015/0010** Application for outline consent for 18 Residential dwellings and associated access, landscaping and other necessary works on land off Longsight Road, Langho.

Having reviewed the application, and discussed our views on this planning application on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2015, the Parish Council has developed their response based upon the saved elements of the Ribble Valley District Wide Plan, especially policies G1, G5, ENV6 and H2 and Key Statement DS1 and Policies DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

## Valid planning objections

### **The proposed development is contrary to Policies G1, G5, ENV 6 and H2 of the Ribble Valley District Wide Plan.**

#### 1. Policy G1 - Concerns re access to the site

The A59 is a major East-West traffic link and is classed as a Road of Regional Significance in LCCs Functional Road Hierarchy. In the Functional Road Hierarchy, roads and paths are categorised in terms of function and actual use. The safe, effective and efficient movement of motor vehicles is balanced against the needs of other transport and non-transport users. The hierarchy is seen as the foundation of a coherent, consistent and auditable approach to managing the road network. The hierarchy recommends that development should be limited on these roads. There is no highway justification to permit the proposed development.

**This development should be refused in the interests of road safety, good highway design and the free flow of traffic along this road of regional significance for the following reasons,**

- The proposed development will lead to an increase in turning traffic along the A59 which will increase the risk of further accidents and adversely affect the free flow of traffic.
- A previous application opposite the proposed development was refused due to these reasons
- The egress from the proposed development onto the A59 will mirror the adjacent Northcote Road junction (no right turn across the traffic flow), This forces all traffic heading to the main village of Langho and beyond in a southerly direction (Blackburn, Manchester) and easterly direction (East Lancashire and all points east of this development) will be forced to use Whitehalgh Lane or Chapel Lane as the next element of their route. Both these roads are effectively single track in places and contain several sharp and blind bends. The junction of the A59 and Whitehalgh Lane/Chapel Lane is a dangerous high-speed junction with some limited sight lines.
- Accident hot spots around the Petre roundabout, Northcote Road junction with the A59 and Whitehalgh Lane junction with the A59.
- Northcote Road was blocked off adjacent to this proposal to keep the number of junctions onto the A59 down and reduce conflict.
- Traffic turning right out of Northcote Road from Brockhall even though it is left turn only.

- Compound effect of extra traffic from the developments at Clitheroe, Whalley and Barrow, and, as previously mentioned, Carr Hall (300+ vehicles).
- Flooding at the bottom of Northcote Road over recent years which could be made worse due to the increased volume of rainwater being directed into the stream on the East boundary of the proposal.
- The Junction at the bottom of Whitehalgh Lane is extremely dangerous with poor sight lines and severe risk taking a daily occurrence and increasing the traffic flow would simply endanger lives.

In February 2014 Lancashire County Council published the East Lancashire Highways and Transport Masterplan (this lasts up to 2023 with a vision until 2026) and in the document it states that:-

- The A59 is described as the “Ribble Valley Growth Corridor”. The A59 is also classed as one of the two principal east – west road links and a main artery, with the car being the dominant choice of travel. Keeping this key corridor functioning well is vital to East Lancashire’s aspirations.
- There are between 15001 and 30000 (data from 2011 so it has now increased) car trips daily between Langho and Clitheroe on the A59.
- There is no severe congestion on the A59 due to not allowing developments off it.
- Public health profiles that the Ribble Valley has significantly worse than the national average for road injuries and deaths. An increase on traffic would have adverse impacts on both road safety and air quality.

Policy G1 of Ribble Valley District Wide Plan states - all development proposals will be expected to provide a high standard of building design and landscape quality. Development which does so will be permitted, unless it adversely affects the amenities of the surrounding area. In determining planning applications the following criteria will be applied:

(a) Development should be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature.

(b) The likely scale and type of traffic generation will be assessed in relationship to the highway infrastructure and the proposed and existing public transport network. This will include safety, operational efficiency, amenity and environmental considerations.

(d) A safe access should be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated.

(e) The density, layout and relationship between buildings is of major importance.

Particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to

surroundings as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.

2. POLICY G5 - States that outside the main settlement boundaries and the village boundaries planning consent will only be granted for small-scale developments which are:

i) essential to the local economy or the social well-being of the area; or

ii) needed for the purposes of agriculture or forestry; or

iii) sites developed for local needs housing (subject to Policy

H20 of this plan); or

iv) small scale tourism developments and small scale recreational developments appropriate to a rural area subject to Policy RTI; or

v) other small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area which conform to the policies of this plan.

3.2.18 This policy recognises the need to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. In doing so, it must be accepted that the countryside is a working area and a source of many Ribble Valley residents' livelihoods. As such it is subject to change and to development pressures. If properly managed, these can be accommodated without harming the basic character of the area.

**This application fails to meet these criteria.**

The experts at Ribble Valley Planning Department who know the area, its amenities and infrastructure the best have identified Langho as contributing 18 units (3 of which have been fulfilled) to the housing stock between 2008 and 2028. Those 18 units have been assigned to a specific settlement area as defined in the Districtwide Local Plan. As this proposal is outside of the boundary of the settlement defined, and in open countryside, the 18 units identified for the village should not count. The proposal is in the area categorised as other settlements outside of the 32 tier 1 and 2 settlements, and the residual number of units for this category is zero. As such this proposal is in direct conflict with the core strategy.

This number was identified as necessary for the village over the life of the core strategy and as such should not be allocated all to one development with one type of house, as this does not give a good housing mix.

The housing density is also far too low and out of keeping with that of the village, and makes this an inefficient use of land.

Langho has been described in the core strategy as a tier 1 village. I think this is questionable with it only having a satellite doctor's surgery (open two afternoons a week for a very limited

range of services), and one village store to supply not just the village but the surrounding areas of Wilpshire, Rhydings & Dales, Brockhall, Dinckley and York Village. There are only eight businesses in the settlement area as identified in the SHMA update in 2013 yet it scored in line with there being ten or more and no direct public transport to Longridge.

3. POLICY ENV 6 - The land is described as lowland fringe farmland,

Positive landscape elements in the lowland fringe farmland are:

- The unspoilt settlements and their characteristics vernacular with only limited new development, well related to existing buildings;
- The open spaces in villages;
- Absence of urbanisation;
- Strong field pattern and well managed hedgerows, walls and fences;
- Trees, woodlands, hedgerows and hedgerow trees, particularly semi natural vegetation and trees native to the area;
- Open land which allows views of open water, rivers, becks and waterfalls;
- Herds of dairy cattle.

Existing or potential landscape detractors include:

- Intrusive, inappropriate and insensitive siting and design of new development,
- Telegraph and electricity poles and overhead wires;
- Road improvements including widening and straightening;

**The Borough Council will safeguard the best and most versatile**

- agricultural land (as classified by the Ministry of Agriculture) unless it can be shown that the need for development overrides agricultural considerations;
- any agricultural land taken should be the minimum required to meet Essential needs; ENV 6

4. POLICY H2 – Dwellings in the open countryside – Outside the settlement boundaries residential development will be limited too,

- Development essential for the purposes of agricultural or forestry or other uses wholly appropriate to the rural area.
- Residential development specifically intended to meet a proven local need

- The protection of attractive open countryside is an important element of both national and county planning policy – to achieve this development in the countryside must be strictly controlled.

**The proposed development does not meet the criteria within Policy H2.**

**In addition to the contravention of these policies the Parish Council objects because,**

- The proposed development is an over development of the area and is further erosion of land around a village. The railway line has traditionally been the natural boundary of the village and this development will cause an unnecessary spread leading to a ribbon development. It will have a detrimental impact upon residential amenities and the visual impact will also be detrimental. This includes the impact on the character of the area, the effect on the local infrastructure, density and over development. The proposed development is outside the identified boundary of the village, this being the railway line. This will result in the proposed development becoming an enclave with very limited access under the railway subway and no social cohesion between the proposal and the existing community (contrary to NPPF objectives).
- The effect on public services such as drainage and water supply. There is local knowledge of limited sewer capacity and the sewers have overflowed in the past.
- The development is also contrary to Key Statement DS1 and policies' DMG2 and DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications (May 2014) in that the approval would lead to the creation of new dwellings in the open countryside without sufficient justification which would cause harm to the development strategy for the borough as set out in the emerging core strategy leading to unsustainable development. The proposer repeatedly mentions 'identified need' for five bedroomed houses in their proposal. This need was not reported on in the Ribble Valley Housing need survey carried out for the parish of Billington and Langho back in 2011. The only need identified was for affordable houses, which has been satisfied by the development at Petre Wood (2010 and extended 2014). If there was a secondary need in the parish then it was for accommodation for the elderly residents, and this too has been satisfied by the application on Elker Lane at Billington (passed November 2014). The SHMA update in April 2013 identified a need for 600 units that were to be four bedroomed or more for the remaining life of the core strategy in the whole of the Ribble Valley. There is a possible 560 units that fulfilled this criteria on top of the developments at Barrow Lands and Standen Hall. Surely this need has already been satisfied. Finally, on identified need, why has the proposer not carried out a survey of the village to substantiate their claim? There has been no dialogue between the proposer and the residents at all. When questioned at the Parish Council meeting the

proposers planning specialists (Pegasus Ltd) admitted that the local community do not want this development and they have not surveyed the needs of the local population even though they repeatedly claim identified local need. They also admitted to want to work in the village for the next 5 / 10 / 20 even 40 years developing the sites which they think can accommodate 460 units hence this figured was asked for with Network Rail (which they queried in the previous application for 132 units).

- Policy DMH1 sets out the various groups that can access local affordable housing and refers to the Addressing Housing Need statement. This development would not be acceptable as potential affordable accommodation.
- Policy DMH3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Regulation 22 Submission Draft) which is relevant to dwellings in the open countryside and are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) in that it seeks to promote sustainable development by avoiding isolated new homes in the countryside (paragraph 55).
- The proposer claims that this proposal will 'round off the village'. This is contrary to the definition of rounding off given and used by RVBC which is 'development that is essentially part of rather than an extension to the built up part of the settlement. It can be defined as the development of land within the settlement boundary (which is not covered by any protected designation) where at least two thirds of the perimeter is already built up with consolidated development.' (Taken from a report to the planning committee 18<sup>th</sup> Sept 2014).
- The proposed development would set a precedent for the acceptance of other unjustified proposals which would have an adverse impact on the implementation of the emerging planning policies of the Council contrary to the interests of the proper planning of the area in accordance with core principles and policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- There are also concerns re the lack of employment opportunities, and amenities in particular doctors and dentists.

## **ITEM 8**      **HIGHWAYS**

There were several highways issues raised,

1. Speed reduction on York Lane – Councillor Schofield explained that LCC will look at accident/fatality figures to establish if there is a need for a speed reduction.



2. Councillor Schofield reported that a pedestrian survey was completed in November but the results have not yet been made public.
3. The Zebra crossing on Whalley Rd at the junction with Whinney lane requires more prominent signage.
4. There are reports of water on the road coming from the building work opposite the brass band club.
5. The footpath sign on Elker Lane near the water treatment plant needs replacing.

**ITEM 9 OFFICERS REPORTS**

There were no officers reports

**ITEM 10 CORRESPONDANCE**

1. Planning and Development Committee Minutes
2. Local Council Review
3. Ribble Valley Rail News
4. Carol Service invitation
5. Minutues and proceedings of the council
6. Parish Council Liaison Committee Minutes

**ITEM 11 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next meeting will be held on Monday 23rd February 2015.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm

Chairman \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_