

# Public Document Pack

# Blackpool Council

16 November 2020

To: Councillors Baker, D Coleman, Farrell, Hugo, Jackson, O'Hara, Owen, Robertson BEM and Stansfield

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Update Note and Public Speakers List**

Please find attached the Update Note and Public Speakers List for Tuesday, 17 November 2020 meeting of the Planning Committee.

UPDATE NOTE AND PUBLIC SPEAKERS LIST (Pages 1 - 16)

Yours sincerely

This page is intentionally left blank

**Planning Application Reports – Update Note**

Listed below are changes to the planning reports made as a result of additional information received since the publication of the agenda for this meeting.

Case:	Address:	Update:
20/0021	Land at Marples Drive	<p>Planning Committee Members are advised of a typing error in the updated Committee Report. The density of the proposed development of 90 houses on a site area of 3.85 hectares is 23.4 and not the 26.3 referenced in the report.</p> <p>The agent for the application would like to emphasize that the garage dimensions meet the minimum space standards for a car parking space.</p> <p>There has been a response to the publication of the agenda from the objector from Phase 1. The full response is appended to this Update Note and is summarized below:</p> <p>There is a request for confirmation that dusk till dawn lights will be required over front and rear doors at no additional cost to the customer. <i>Proposed condition 7 requires that the details of security lighting to be submitted and agreed and that no dwelling shall be occupied in advance of the installation of the agreed security lighting. Planning cannot require that the developer pays for the installation.</i></p> <p>The police requested gates at the side of the properties were fitted as flush as possible to the front line of the property. Condition 28 has been drafted to read:</p> <p><i>Notwithstanding the information shown on the plans hereby approved, details of the design and positioning of access gates located at the side of dwellings shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. These details shall show the gates positioned as close to the front building line as possible. The development should proceed in accordance with the approved details.</i></p>

		<p><i>Reason: In the interests of secured by design principles and to promote natural surveillance in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027 and Saved Policy LQ1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.</i></p> <p><i>The boundary 1.8m fence between Wheatlands Crescent and Kipling Drive is regularly scaled to gain entry to the estate and a condition requiring that the developer install a dense area of planting to prevent access to the estate is necessary. The Phase 2 application cannot re-dress issues in the Phase 1 scheme as it falls outside of the development site or 'red edge'. However, the developer has confirmed that the approved landscaping scheme for Phase 1, which includes the planting of native trees and shrubs along the boundary with Wheatlands Crescent and Kipling Drive, is scheduled to take place during the next planting season (November to April) and works are commencing on site.</i></p> <p><i>Documentation showing how the LAP will be maintained etc is required. Proposed Condition 19 states "The agreed LAP and associated play equipment shall then be provided in full and in full accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling on the site and shall thereafter be retained and maintained unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority" and it is considered that this condition is sufficient to ensure that LAP will be maintained. In any case, the developer would have a duty under other health and safety legislation to ensure that the LAP is maintained in safe condition.</i></p> <p><i>Covenants relating to solar panels or any other matters has not been addressed. As previously stated, covenants are not something planning can control. However, the agent has responded to this matter in the appended letter.</i></p> <p><i>Energy efficiency matters. The dwellings would have to be built in accordance with Part L of the Building Regulations in terms of the conservation of fuel and power.</i></p> <p><i>Residents weren't aware of conditions on the Phase 1 planning permission which revoked certain permitted development rights. These conditions are on the decision notice for Phase 1 which the conveyancing solicitors will have had sight of during the purchase of the dwellings in Phase 1. This is not a planning consideration in determining this</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>planning application.</i></p> <p>Comments on overly dense development and the proposed alternative options presented by the developer. <i>The Committee Report presents the professional views of you case officers on the matter of density and the alternative options presented by the developer.</i></p> <p>The agent has also responded to the comments from the objector from Phase 1 and the response is appended to the update note.</p> <p>Should Committee be minded to approve the application and defer the application to the Head of Development Management to issue the decision based on the originally submitted plans or upon receipt of amended plans showing the provision of on-site public open space pursuant to Option 1 identified by the applicant, an additional condition is proposed relating to the submission and agreement of a landscape management plan:</p> <p>(a) Prior to the commencement of any above ground construction, a Landscape Management Plan for the landscaped areas of the site to be managed and maintained by third parties shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This plan shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the third parties responsible for management (e.g. Site Management Company)</li> <li>• Set out a regime/timetable for inspections and regular management or maintenance works</li> <li>• Explain how issues can be reported, assessed and resolved</li> </ul> <p>(b) The approved Landscape Management Plan shall be implemented in full at all times when any part of the area to which it relates is occupied or in use.</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure that the landscaped areas are maintained and managed in the interests of visual amenity and the appearance of the streetscene and the wider estate in accordance with Policies CS6, CS7 and CS9 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027 and Saved Policies NE6, LQ1 and LQ6 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.</p>
--	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank

This is a formal response to the agenda published by the planning department for the planning committee meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> Nov 2020 which will decide the fate of planning application 20/0021. Rather than providing a lengthy speech during the meeting I believe its important to give both the planning department and the developer a chance to prepare a response so this application can be approved; as far as I'm aware no updated documentation has been published on the planning portal.

The only update from planning and the developer is to provide three proposed locations for public open space. Neither planning or the developer have responded to the committee members questions or the issues I raised. This will not help the planning committee approve the application.

### **Proposed Conditions**

On behalf of the residents of Phase 1 the following enhancements were requested to the suggested wording for the conditions that would apply to the application assuming it was approved (these were found at the end of the update note document for the meeting on 20th Oct 2020)

#### **Condition 7 - Secured by Design Principles**

- The police recommend and the council require dusk till dawn lights for front and rear doors. The developer in phase 1 only included the wiring for these lights not the lights themselves unless the customer paid £140 per light. The request was for planning to confirm the physical lights will be included as standard e.g. they will have to be provided by the developer at no additional cost to the customer. The developer's agent stated they were not included in Phase 1 to give the customer the choice of appearance however the price they were charging would suggest this is not correct.
- The police requested gates at the side of the properties were fitted as flush as possible to the front line of the property. Again, the council was asked to confirm this will be required.
- The issue over the boundary between wheatlands crescent/kipling drive and the development was raised, specifically that this is being used as method of accessing the estate. Even though this is part of Phase 1 the boundary effects Phase 2 and local residents who live outside the estate. The original boundary included planting (bushes, trees etc), during construction these boundary elements were removed and a 1.8m height fence was added, the planting elements were never restored. On the 8th Nov 2020 a group of youths climbed over the fence from wheatlands crescent to gain entry to the estate, they were confronted by a resident then made their escape back over the fence onto wheatlands crescent, finally heading off towards paddock drive, this happens frequently. A condition needs to be added that requires the developer to restore this boundary, all it needs is a dense area of planting and they will not be able to access the estate.

#### **Condition 18 - The LAP**

- It was requested that the council replicate the requirements in terms of documentation that they have requested for item 15 (drainage management and maintenance plan), the developer would need to provide documentation to show how the LAP will be maintained, inspected and how issues can be reported, this is in the interest of public safety.

## **Restrictive Covenants**

I made the committee aware of the vast number of restrictive covenants imposed by the developer. One of these was related to solar panels which not only surprised the committee members but the head of development. There are two specific sections in the 23 page TP1 document customers are required to sign that are related to Solar Panels

### **20.2.1.1 Buildings and alterations**

***Not (for the period of 5 years from the date hereof) to build or otherwise erect on the Property any new or additional buildings extensions or other structures and for the avoidance of doubt this includes any structures such as solar panels wind turbine or other similar external apparatus (whether intended to be temporary or permanent) without first obtaining the Transferor's and (if necessary) Local Authority's written consent.***

The above applies for the first 5 years after purchase

### **20.2.1.2 Buildings**

***20.2.1.2.1 Not at any time without the prior written consent of the Transferor (whose consent may be granted or withheld in its or their absolute discretion):***

***(c) to erect or permit to be erected on the Property solar panels or any external wireless or television aerial satellite dish or similar apparatus for the receipt or transmission of radio or television signals other than a satellite dish receiver discreetly placed and not to be visible from the Estate Roads and in any event not on the front elevation of the Property***

The above has no time limit, so if the solar panels have to face an estate road, they will not be permitted without the developers written permission and they cannot be installed on the front elevation.

The developer has not responded to this issue, I would have thought they would have provided an explanation along the lines of these restrictive covenants are used at all their sites and they simply include everything by default; they would make sure the restrictions do not apply to phase 2 and that they would be revoked for phase 1.

One of the committee members raised the query that if the developer does not allow solar panels what are they doing in terms of energy efficiency. The agent had no response, I would have expected the agent to be familiar with the construction methods and materials used by the developer. The developer has again provided no response. This was a concern raised; why has the developer not provided a basic technical outline? its relatively simple (loft/wall/pad insulation, windows, doors, lighting, appliance ratings, water conservation e.g. dual flush, restrictive shower heads/taps).

The developer has also not provided a copy of the restrictive covenants, in the interest transparency this should have been provided. The council members represent the people of this town, knowing what restrictions would be imposed on residents is important.

On this entire estate I have come across less than 5 residents who have read the TP1 document even though they have to sign it as its the land registry document required to purchase their property. Residents did not know for example the council had revoked certain permitted development rights (garages conversions, front garden changes etc) which are covered within the restrictive covenants. This situation is not unique to this developer but it is a problem.

## **Overly-dense Development**

The agenda for the upcoming meeting focuses on the principle objection to the scheme being the lack of open space resulting in an overly-dense development

The document has given many reasons why this development is not overly-dense however what has been stated fails to address the core reason for rejection, in this case lack of usable open space.

Based on a quick review of the applications they listed

#### **Land at Moss House Road**

Reference 13/0378 approved by Planning Committee 13/01/2014

No of houses 579

- No mention of SPG11 in the decision documentation
- LAP provided in initial plans along with some usable public space
- The developer calculated 29,902 m2 of public open space however the main usable areas were calculated at total of 13,119 m2

#### **Land at Moss House Road**

Reference 17/0095 approved by Planning Committee 03/04/2017

No of houses 422

- This is essentially a revised plan for 13/0378
- They removed open space from the original application, they didn't provide the revised total open space sizes which looks to be very limited
- No mention of SPG11 or any financial contribution to the council in the decision documentation
- The open space reduction based on the number of houses really should have resulted in the application being refused.

#### **Former Co-operative Club, Preston New Road**

Reference 17/0361 approved by Planning Committee 23/08/2017

No of houses 53

- LAP provided in initial plans, ~149 m2 (appears to be slightly larger than this Phase 2 application)
- No mention of SPG11 or any financial contribution to the council

#### **Former Booths site, Highfield Road**

Reference 17/0416 approved by Planning Committee 08/09/2017

No of houses 26

- I do not believe a LAP / formal open space would be required for a development of this size
- No mention of SPG11 or any financial contribution to the council

#### **Troutbeck Crescent**

Reference 19/0144 approved by Planning Committee 04/06/2019

No of houses 75

- More public open space than proposed for 90 properties on this Phase 2 application

#### **NS&I phase 1** (the adjacent scheme currently under construction)

Reference 15/0420 approved by Planning Committee 28/10/2016

No of houses 115

- Usable open space appears to have never factored into the decision, the only reference I can find is in the minutes from the committee meeting

***“The committee was advised that a viability assessment in accordance with the Core Strategy had been undertaken and it was not considered appropriate to pursue contributions towards affordable housing, open space or education for the proposed development in this case because of the abnormal costs associated with the development.”***

The council do not appear to have published their own viability assessment for the original application, its interesting to note that the developer has had two viability assessments carried out on two separate phases which diluted their responsibilities when it comes to local policy requirements.

## **Land at Warren Drive**

Reference 17/0466 refused by Planning Committee 23/01/2018, permission granted at appeal 09/04/2019

No of houses 86

- Original application included LAP and open space. Open space excluding LAP appears to be around 800m<sup>2</sup> which is larger than what this developer proposes for the same number of homes in this phase 2 application.

If Warren Drive is being used as the “standard” in terms of open space that would be approved at appeal this application would not meet that standard.

## **Open Space Options**

The developer has given the council two options

1. They accept the £99k which will be allocated to improve open space outside the estate
2. They accept one of the three options for open space allocation within the development

The developer has not provided the size of each open space area, all though my CAD skills are very limited I believe we would be looking at approximately

Option 1 – 584 m<sup>2</sup>

Option 2 – 740 m<sup>2</sup>

Option 3 – 516 m<sup>2</sup>

I would suggest planning confirms the above area sizes with the developer prior to the meeting taking place just in case I have made an error.

The locations specified within options 1 and 2 would not work for a number of reasons

1. Both are located on Marples Drive which is on the main road into the estate, this is subject to quite a lot of traffic, both from residents and the NS&I building, this does not create a healthy or safe environment for outdoor activities plus you would have the noise associated with the traffic.
2. As both locations are easily accessible from Preston New Road it would encourage further anti-social behaviour from outside the estate especially in the evenings.

Option 3 is the preferred location

1. Its close to the proposed LAP so both elements are in the same area, this helps with families that have children in different age groups
2. As its not on the main road cars should be traveling at far lower speeds so it will be safer and quieter
3. It removes some of the parking issues that would occur on this section of the estate as previously discussed
4. The LAP and the open space area should be shielded from Preston New Road by the existing boundary features (the council would need to verify through condition this would be the case)
5. Based on its location and the number of properties surrounding the area it should reduce the risk of anti-social behaviour.

The problem with Option 3 is its size, its too small.

The only way Option 3 would be viable is if plot 131 was not built, this should create an area of around 840m<sup>2</sup> which is similar to Warren Drive, essentially this creates Option 4. As a reminder this open space supports over 200 homes not just 90, no usable open space was provided in Phase 1. Even at 840 m<sup>2</sup> its a fraction of the size that is required under SPG11; this option would not be quite as large as a 5 a side football pitch requires but it would be usable for individuals and for smaller community-based activities. It would be a reasonable compromise.

The developer will no doubt come back with this would make the application not financially viable. This however would not be correct. The developer may not be a national developer however they are not small, just on the basic financial numbers they make significant profits

The figures below are from the developer's financial accounts which cover all their active developments (not specific to this development)

**2018-2019** (this financial year includes sales from Marples Grange Phase 1)

£68mil turnover

£15mil profit before tax

£5mil paid in dividends

**2017-2018**

£70mil turnover

£16mil profit before tax

£5mil paid in dividends

**2016-2017**

£59mil turnover

£14mil profit before tax

£2.5mil paid in dividends

Sacrificing plot 131 for option 3 would still allow a good profit yield from Phase 2.

Looking at the status of Phase 1 this will be finished at the end of Feb 2021; one property remains un-reserved; seven properties are reserved but have no exchange of contracts, the remaining properties that are not build complete have already exchanged contracts. Until this application is approved the developer cannot market or accept any expressions of interest in Phase 2, if this application is delayed further and ultimately ends up going through the appeals process, time and money will be wasted which will have a far greater financial impact than the profit gained from building plot 131.

If option 3 is revised to include the area occupied by plot 131 it would command the support of residents from phase 1. I cannot see the committee members refusing the application if a reasonable amount of open space is provided and they would have no valid argument if the open space offered matches or exceeds Warren Drive.

I would also request the developer provides a high quality representative for the meeting on 17th November, the agent unfortunately did not represent the developer appropriately in the previous meeting, in fact they damaged the developers reputation; clearly someone with basic technical knowledge should be present and ultimately someone from director level who can re-assure the committee members and make decisions if required, this would stop any further delays in this application. The developer and the agent share the same office, the office is owned by the developer so there is no reason why the developer cannot be present. The zoom meeting format allows the attendance from anywhere in the world so there is no excuse for the developer not to provide an appropriate representative.

If the developer compromises by not building plot 131 and planning include the additional conditions requested this application will be successful.

This page is intentionally left blank

Clare Johnson  
Development Control  
Blackpool Council  
PO Box 17  
Corporation Street  
Blackpool, FY1 1LZ

Our Ref: 2009

Date: 13 November 2020

Dear Clare

**REF. 20/0021 - LAND SOUTH EAST OF MARPLES DRIVE, BLACKPOOL**

As previously discussed, we had intended to respond verbally to the issues which required further clarification following on from the last committee Meeting. However, as requested, given the recent written representation received to the application, we will now respond in writing to both the representation and matters raised by Members.

**Viability Constraints**

During the last meeting, Members expressed concerns regarding the level of on-site open space and an absence of affordable housing. These shortfalls are purely as a result of the site specific viability constraints.

As Members are aware, the subject site comprises previously developed land. Whilst the former NS&I complex has been demolished, sub-surface structures remain and the subject site requires significant remediation, below-ground and earth moving works in order to bring the site's ground conditions to a developable standard. The development also requires the removal of an existing access road and associated sub-surface infrastructure. All of these factors affect the viability of the site and any other developer would be subject to the same constraints.

Furthermore, due to presence of existing trees, hedgerows, sewer easements and topographical constraints, over 27% of the site is undevelopable, further affecting the viability and in turn, dictating the areas of the site where both housing and green infrastructure can be located.

Both National and Local Planning Policy & Guidance acknowledges that there will be circumstances where developments cannot meet usual policy requirements in full, however, where this is the case it would need to be robustly justified with the submission of a viability appraisal.

In this regard, a detailed viability appraisal has been submitted to the Council demonstrating why the 90 dwelling scheme, as originally proposed, could not support the full policy requirement for affordable housing and on-site open space. As confirmed by Officers, the developer's viability evidence has been independently verified by expert consultants appointed by the Council. Following completion of the Council's independent viability assessment it was agreed that the scheme could accommodate a financial contribution of circa £125,000, based on the mix and number of units originally proposed. Officers considered that it would be



appropriate for the contribution to go towards off-site open space improvements (circa £100,000) and local healthcare provision (circa £25,000).

Whilst Mr Daley makes reference to other approved schemes in the Borough whereby greater areas of on-site open space have been provided, this will no doubt have been in scenarios where developers have not been subject to comparable viability constraints.

#### Alternative Open Space Options

Since the last meeting, the applicant has considered the concern raised by Members regarding the lack of useable on-site open space and has provided a range of options which seek to provide some additional on-site open space rather than an off-site contribution. The loss of three 3-bedroom units equates to the financial contribution. The three options presented would deliver the following total amounts of green infrastructure across the site as a whole;

- Option 1 – Total of 11,305sqm, of which 594sqm is the area of the new area of useable open space, together with the LAP at 120 sqm.
- Option 2 – Total of 11,458sqm, of which 747 sqm is the area of the new area of useable open space, together with the LAP at 120 sqm.
- Option 3 – Total of 11,237sqm, of which 526 sqm is the area of the new area of useable open space, together with the LAP at 120 sqm.

The scheme could not accommodate any further loss of units and remain viable, neither could it accommodate the loss of larger units. As previously highlighted, the viability constraints on this site have been verified by the Council's independent consultants and such appraisals can only be considered on a site-specific basis. It is not appropriate, nor is it standard practice for such appraisals to factor in the profit or loss of other business ventures pursued by the same developer.

The applicant is in agreement with Officers that the 90 dwelling scheme, as originally submitted, would make the most efficient use of the site and would deliver wider public benefits by providing the contribution towards off-site open space improvements. However, there is the option of some additional on-site open space at the expense of three dwellings and in lieu of the off-site contribution, if this is preferred by Members.

#### Density

Notwithstanding the alternative options presented by the developer, it is considered that the density of the originally proposed scheme is entirely appropriate in the subject location. As confirmed in the Officer's Committee Report, the density of the development is only 23 dwellings per hectare and is clearly comparable and in most cases, less dense, than a wide range of residential new build schemes that have already been approved by the Council. In fact the density is virtually identical to the adjacent Marples Grange development. As highlighted, over a quarter of the site will comprise managed green infrastructure, with further soft landscaping created in the form of private front and rear gardens. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling numbers also reflect the capacity envisaged for the site in the Council's emerging Allocations document which specifically states that the site can accommodate "approximately 90 dwellings".

#### Adjacent Marples Grange development

There has been a number of suggestions that the subject scheme ought to make up for the perceived lack of open space provided as part of the developer's adjacent 'Phase 1' Marples Grange development.



Notwithstanding the confirmed viability constraints, it is entirely inappropriate for the subject development to be linked with the adjacent scheme. This is a standalone planning application for a residential development of 90 dwellings and it can only be expected to meet obligations which are necessary, relevant and appropriate to make the 90 dwelling scheme acceptable. Indeed if the applicant were seeking to justify a lack of open space based on an exceedance of obligations delivered on Phase 1, this would not be acceptable to the Council. The subject site can only therefore be expected to meet its obligations based on the scale and nature of development proposed as part of this application.

In any case, the existing Marples Grange development does actually provide approximately 10,000 square metres of open space, of which around one quarter forms open, accessible open space in the north west area of the development.

#### Affordable Housing

Whilst it is acknowledged that the scheme will be unable to deliver housing which meets the definition of affordable housing, as confirmed in the Committee Report, the development will nevertheless meet a range of core housing objectives for the Borough. Whilst Blackpool understandably wish to secure low-cost housing for existing residents (it should be noted that 46% of the homes proposed are 2 & 3 bed terraced and semi-detached), it is equally important for the Borough to be able to retain and attract economically active households. A high-quality housing scheme, as proposed in this application, can compete with the neighbouring authorities of Wyre and Fylde, at much more competitive sales prices. The delivery of a predominantly detached scheme will also assist in rebalancing the Council's existing housing stock which, as acknowledged by Officers has a low proportion of good quality, detached family housing.

### **Other Matters**

#### Restrictive Covenants

The covenants imposed on the adjacent Marples Grange development are imposed as standard across all of Rowland Homes developments. Such covenants are not meant to be prohibitive but are imposed to safeguard residents themselves, as well as the Council and the developer from unlawful or incongruous alterations or installations. Specifically concerning solar panels, not all solar panels and related equipment can be erected without express consent from the Council. Ensuring that residents ask for prior consent allows the developer to advise them to check the regulations and to ensure that the equipment intended to be installed can be adequately supported in their preferred location.

There is no fee to residents to ask for prior consent and consent has never been unreasonably withheld. The covenant does not prevent the installation of solar panels on the front elevation where prior consent is given.

It should be noted that no request for prior consent for the installation of solar panels has been made by any resident on the adjacent Marples Grange scheme.

#### Sustainable Design and Energy Efficiency

New homes will be built to the required building regulations, incorporating energy efficiency and sustainable design measures. Such measures include floor, wall & loft insulation, thermally efficient windows and doors, energy efficient boilers and low energy lighting, all to assist in reducing the consumption of heat and power. Water wastage is also reduced through the installation of cisterns, taps and showers to reduce flow rates. Where provided, fridge freezers are minimum A- rated for energy efficiency.



Waste Management systems are also implemented during construction to reduce waste and promote the recycling of materials where possible.

#### Maintenance of LAP

The LAP would be installed to required standards and the appointed managing agent, who would deal with all other areas of open space, would be required to maintain it to these standards. If any issues needed to be reported, these would be made to the managing agent.

#### Wheatlands Crescent

The developer has confirmed that the planting required adjacent to Wheatlands Crescent, which was approved as part of the original Marples Grange consent is already programmed to be carried out during this current planting season (November to April), as is the case on all of their current developments.

#### **Summary**

The Council's own emerging Plan is seeking to deliver 90 units on the site in order to meet future housing needs. Councils have an obligation to maintain a five year supply of housing land and the delivery of this site will assist in maintaining this supply. The delivery of the subject site will make effective re-use of a longstanding vacant, brownfield site which has no realistic prospect of being developed for employment uses.

The 90 dwelling scheme also seeks to direct a sum of money towards local health care provision and off-site public open space improvements, contributing to wider community benefits.

Notwithstanding the viability constraints identified, the developer seeks to bring forward a high quality housing scheme which will assist in the rebalancing of the Borough's housing stock through the delivery of much needed family housing which seeks to retain and attract economically active households.

The application will deliver a low-density housing scheme, with over one quarter of the site comprising green infrastructure and all dwellings also benefiting from private gardens.

It is respectfully requested that Members seek to approve the residential development of the site.

Yours sincerely

**JEN BEARDSALL MRTPI**

[jen@depol.co.uk](mailto:jen@depol.co.uk)

**PLANNING COMMITTEE  
17 NOVEMBER 2020 – ORDER OF BUSINESS**

AGENDA ITEM NO /Recommendation	DESCRIPTION	ORDER OF BUSINESS	DETAILS
<p><b>Agenda Item 5</b></p> <p><b>Application 20/0021</b></p> <p><b>Officer’s recommend:</b> Resolve to grant planning permission and defer the application to the Head of Development Management to issue the decision based on the originally submitted plans, subject to the conditions set out in the appended update note and subject to delegation from the Secretary of State and the signing of a Section 106 agreement.</p> <p><b>Pages 15 to 70</b></p>	<p>Erection of 90 x two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings with associated car parking, garages, boundary treatment, landscaping, including attenuation basin, and highway works.</p> <p><b>LAND EAST OF MARPLES DRIVE (PART OF FORMER NS&amp;I SITE) OFF PRESTON NEW ROAD, BLACKPOOL.</b></p>	<b>INFORMATION FROM OFFICERS</b>	
		<b>OBJECTORS</b>	Mr Chris Daley, member of the public
		<b>APPLICANT/AGENT/SUPPORTER</b>	Ms Jennifer Beardsall, Agent
		<b>WARD COUNCILLOR</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>DEBATE BY COMMITTEE</b></li> <li>• <b>DECISION</b></li> </ul>	

This page is intentionally left blank